
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – Joint Session: ICANN Board and CPH
Tuesday, March 10, 2026 – 10:30 to 12:00 IST

LISA SAULINO

Hello, my name is Lisa Saulino, and I'm the participation manager for this session. Welcome to the joint session between the ICANN Board and the Contracted Parties House. 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 will include English, French, and Spanish. For our panelists today, we ask you that you state your name for the record and the language you will be speaking, if speaking a language other than English. Please also speak at a reasonable pace. This discussion is between the ICANN Board and the CPH only, therefore we will not be taking questions from the audience unless from the CPH.

With that, I hand the floor over to ICANN Board Chair, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Lisa. I welcome everyone to the joint meeting between the CPH and the Board. As I've mentioned in our previous sessions, we look forward to these meetings because there's a candid exchange of topics and ideas. So, without any further delay, I'm

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.

going to turn this over to Greg DiBiase, my colleague on the Board, who's going to facilitate the session.

GREG DIBIASE

Thank you, Tripti. Welcome to our registry and registrar colleagues. We have two Board provided topics that we will discuss as well as a number of issues that the registries and registrars brought forward that were worthy of discussion. But before we dive in, let's go around the table and introduce ourselves so we all know who we're talking with. Prudence, I'll start with you.

PRUDENCE MALINKI

Hi, Prudence Malinki from Mark Monitor Registrar, member of the Registrar Stakeholder Group, governor and head of the governance team. Thanks.

SARAH WYLD

Hi, I'm Sarah Wyld. I work with Tucows in Toronto, Canada. I am the vice chair for policy of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.

JAMES GALVIN

James Galvin, ICANN Board.

GREG DIBIASE

Greg DiBiase, ICANN Board.

TRIPTI SINHA	Tripti Sinha, ICANN Board.
KURTIS LINDQUIST	Kurtis Lindquist, ICANN President and CEO.
SAJID RAHMAN	Sajid Rahman, ICANN Board.
BETH BACON	Beth Bacon, Chair of the Registry Stakeholder Group.
OWEN SMIGELSKI	Owen Smigelski with the Registrar Namecheap, and I am Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.
CHRIS DISSPAIN	Morning, Chris Disspain, Registry Stakeholder Group.
ROGER CARNEY	Roger Carney, Vice Chair of the Registrar Stakeholder Group.
GREG DIBIASE	Okay, let's dive in. Are we going to update the slides? So, my thought is we'll start with the Contracted Party House topics. One of them overlaps with a question that the Board asked, which is how is your group participating in the Review of Reviews across community group and share your thoughts on the proposals to

date. Basically, how this work is progressing. High level thoughts there. So, let's dive in with that topic. And Beth, I think I'll start with you for the CPH thoughts.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Thanks, Greg. This is Owen Smigielski for the record. Just want to let you know that we had a prep session before this and we readjusted our topic order of priority that we wanted to do from the CPH topic. So, if that's okay with you, just proceed with our order and then we can do your stuff because the first one on the left is the adoption of policies.

So, this is not the Review of Reviews. Great, thanks. So, the first one is the adoption of policies. And this is with regards to the transfer policy as well as the IDNs EPDP Phase 2 recommendations, which were approved and sent, I think approved from council and sent to the Board. And there's been a bit of a delay. And so, we just wanted to raise a concern.

What is it that seems to be blocking this from a discussion with Tripti yesterday. She had mentioned that there was a big truck that got in the way of the implementation of these. It was a next round SubPro. And so that truck was already there. So, the other ones kind of got behind that, which we totally understand. But I guess the concern is those other two policies had been approved 12 months ago or so.

I don't recall specifically on both of them. And there has been quite a delay. And it's only just now that we're finding this out. So, while we appreciate and understand that there's staffing and time constraints and priorities, it would just be good if there's a way to have this be a little bit more of an open or transparent or collaborative manner with the community, either to solicit feedback or at least give updates, let us know what's going on, just so that we're involved and not wondering what on earth happened to this black hole with the policies that went. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Sure. Thanks, Owen. So, maybe I'll start with the update. And that is the staff analysis for both the transfers and the IDNs is complete. It's going to the Board starting now. The IDNs will be considered by the UA IDN Working Group in March. And with the transfers based on the staff analysis, we might not even need to form a formal caucus to review it. We can just start review, looking to review by Manchester.

So that's the status and that this is ongoing, you know, regarding your point. Yeah, we totally understand that, that after it is adopted by the GNSO, updates would be helpful on what the progress is before it gets to the Board.

As Tripti mentioned to you, there was a fair amount of staff energy being spent on the next round that staff had to devote a lot of resources to. But that being said, the Board is thinking about this issue, how to more efficiently consider recommendations from the

community and, you know, certainly provide updates as to status. So, I think we understand this concern on both things. We're moving ahead and Kurtis, I think I saw your hand.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

But as I mentioned at the head of this meeting, as we talked about in Dublin, we have started publishing the scorecards that actually outlines the status of all the policies, both in development and implementation and pending Board reviews. So, those scorecards will continue to be published to give you that transparency and insight into where they are and what work is currently being done on them.

GREG DIBIASE

Sorry, Jim?

JAMES GALVIN

Yeah, so I wouldn't ordinarily want to jump in and say this, but since we're busy talking about timing, I feel obligated to clarify one particular point. As chair of the Board's IDN UA Working Group, we're not actually starting in March. We're going to start in April. Unfortunately, for recent reasons in the last few days, we actually had to cancel the March meeting. But just in case people are tracking carefully timing, I felt compelled to put that out there. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

My apologies, Jim. Any other thoughts on this topic? Beth.

BETH BACON

Yeah, thanks, Greg. This is Beth Bacon. Something else we flagged in our discussion was, if there's anything that the registries and registrars can do to help the Board kind of move these things along when they do come to your plate. And also, are there any suggestions or thoughts around having a more transparent just register of what's on the list, what's in the hopper? And is that something we can think about so that we don't have these questions and work just a little bit more transparently on the order in which you guys are going to tackle these?

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Beth. That's a great suggestion. I know we're working on that internally. And I think that's something we can consider to have a dashboard that provides more information as these things go on. Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA

Dashboard and potentially, since we do meet twice a year in this format, we could make that a standing agenda item, right?

BETH BACON

I think that sounds great.

GREG DIBIASE

Great. Any other thoughts on this topic? Okay. Owen?

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Next, we're going to move on to the Ombuds framework and I think that's going to be Sarah.

SARAH WYLD

Thank you. Hi, this is Sarah Wyld. The Registrar Stakeholder Group supports and appreciates the revisions to the Ombuds framework that we've seen recently. It provides a clear scope for the Ombuds role, a defined path and timeline for complaints, and an expectation of public reporting, which are all important components of a successful program.

There are two things that we're thinking about now as possible areas for added improvement. First, we note that there exists both an Ombuds person and a complaints officer. And without in any way commenting on the effectiveness of either, there's some lack of clarity as to why both of them exist. We've reviewed the info on the website for the complaints officer.

It's somewhat helpful. But we do note that the complaints officer reporting does not seem to have been updated in a couple of years. And so, we would like to see updated and regular reporting that would help us better understand the role and effectiveness of each.

Separately, second, the Registrar Stakeholder Group does note that ICANN staff members should also be able to bring issues to the Ombuds person where they are the subject of unfair or

disrespectful treatment. As such, we would like to see further adjustments to the framework providing staff access to the Ombuds process. And I would ask for reflections from the Board on that topic. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Great. Thank you, Sarah. Sajid, I think you have.

SAJID RAHMAN

Yeah, thank you. Thanks for the feedback. I think in general; we are seeing quite a bit of step change in Ombuds function. And the feedback that has been received from different community groups have been quite positive. I had a chance to have a broad look at some of the feedback that has been received from different community groups. And Ombuds now is in the process of shifting through the feedbacks, consolidating it, and bringing it back to Board, which of course we'll review and see how much, how many of those can be incorporated.

On your first point, definitely that's something we can look at in terms of updating the websites and on the recent ones. On your second point, there is of course an element of employment contract that comes into play whenever staff is involved. So, that somehow restricts what Ombuds can do when a staff is either of the party in both cases. But if there is an action or if there is something where a community is involved, Ombuds can of course facilitate that discussion on the community side. But as far as the, whether

to bring a specific staff complaint within Ombuds, there has to be a different employment contract law that needs to be taken into consideration.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Sajid. Chris?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Sajid, thanks. I just wanted to sort of add a little, perhaps a slight nuance. You're completely correct, obviously, staff matters are subject to employment law and so on. I think the question is more, what, the Ombuds process can be used by the community if they have an issue with a staff member.

We don't know what a staff member can do if they have an issue with the community. What we know is they can't go to the Ombuds. So, it's not staff v. staff as such. It's more, is there a process that enables staff to be comfortable that they can say something if they have an issue with the community and that it gets dealt with in a manner that is perhaps not the same as an Ombuds but similar to an Ombuds if indeed it isn't sensible to let them use the Ombuds process. Does that make sense?

SAJID RAHMAN

Yeah, definitely. And staff can of course always go to Ombuds. There's nothing stopping that. The point is that whenever in the equation, either between community and staff and staff and community, whoever the complainant is, whenever there is a staff

involved in the equation, that needs to fall into the employment contract in terms of next action. But yeah, you can talk.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

Secretary, yes, staff do have a reporting process internally. There is an anonymous external reporting mechanism that can be used by staff and it will be followed up anonymously as well and or they can go to their manager or they can go to ICANN HR to report and this has happened by the way.

This is an exercise, a process that has been exercised. We know it works. The staff does have access to similar protection and resolve mechanisms for raising issues or having them resolved as the community does but not through the Ombuds as this is an employment matter towards us.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Kurtis. Did we answer your questions?

SARAH WYLD

Yes, thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

So I guess, is there still more clarification around the difference between the complaints officer and the Ombuds officer?

SARAH WYLD

Thank you, this is Sarah. Yes, clarity on the differences and their separate purviews would be useful and then with regards to the staff, I think what we're looking at is just, if I harass Terri, what does she do about that? Who does she go to, right? Thank you. I just want to make sure that I'm clear. I just picked the first staff person that I thought of but my point is just, she can't leave, right? She's stuck here. I could leave, I could complain. Where does she go?

KURTIS LINDQUIST

No, no, no, no, no. Staff has a reporting process, they know we have raised it with staff, they can raise this, they do, it has been raised. Either with anonymous hotline, they can go through a manager, they can go to ICANN HR, ICANN HR are present at the ICANN meetings for that reason.

So, that is in case that is dealt with inside employment and we're doing that as an employee, as our employer towards them. And the staff, absolutely, if they get harassed, they do hope they leave and go contact ICANN HR first, ICANN HR executive, they can fine. So, Sarah, please don't do that.

SARAH WYLD

That helps and I would certainly never want to.

SAJID RAHMAN

So, I think the summary is that if for some reason, staff is harassed for some reason, she or he has enough options to, you know, either anonymously or some other channel. So I don't think that has been

an issue or that should not be an issue. Where the complaint is dealt with is the purview and that's where the employment contact comes in.

GREG DIBIASE

Any other comments on this topic? Thank you, Sarah.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

All right, for the next topic, we'll be moving over to Beth.

BETH BACON

Thanks, friends. This is Beth Bacon. When we were reordering things, we put Urgent Requests next. We wanted to know, we understand that Urgent Requests, we really appreciate that the policy has gone out for Public Comment. We have the Public Comment report. We would really love to see that policy language published and finalized.

Perhaps something for our fresh new dashboard to put on the list. But along with that policy work that I think that in the end, the community came together and we did a really good job on a very difficult topic. There's the other path of implementation. It was the policy and then the law enforcement authentication which the Board had noted, you know, is foundational to those types of requests for responding to those types of Urgent Requests.

We don't necessarily want to get into any of the nitty gritty on that. But we did want to know that there are now kind of disparate

conversations happening throughout the community on what to do next and how to address that. I know that the Board and the GSO have had some discussions on options and we really appreciate that.

You guys are being so thoughtful and helping us push this forward. But we do want to discuss next steps and take, maybe have a little more discussion on what the Board's views are there. How you're feeling about this, and then we can take that back and very much look forward to discussing that with our stakeholder groups. And then hopefully we can kind of, again, engage and pull all those disparate conversations together to a constructive path towards getting this all locked up.

GREG DIBIASE

Great, thanks, Beth. And that is also the board's priority of streamlining this and making it comprehensible, for lack of a better word. So, I think we can break this into three parts. So, first is the timeline that went out for Public Comment that will be published as soon as feasible after ICANN. And we really appreciate the support in publishing, especially considering, I know some in the contracted party didn't love the timeline, so we appreciate the ability to come together on a compromise there. So that's one piece, the timeline.

Then there's the authentication mechanism. The issue is that the word authentication mechanism, in other words, that Urgent

Requests should be authenticated is not in the language of Recommendation 18.

So, there is a first task of bridging that gap. So, when we talked to council, we said, we see a couple paths forward. We said, council can write a letter to the Board and ICANN Org saying we consider this implementation guidance, right? It aligns with Recommendation 18 to have an authentication mechanism. Or there's a more specific policy path, right?

So there could be a supplemental recommendation on Recommendation 18 specifically that could be done in the review of the SSAD recommendations which are going back to council or a slightly more complicated path of Un-Adopting Recommendation 18 and doing a supplemental recommendation, which I'm not hearing a lot of excitement for, which we're happy about.

So, I guess summing that up, we have to ensure that Recommendation 8, that the authentication mechanism language is incorporated into Recommendation 18 either by a letter from the council or a very specific, efficient supplemental recommendation to update it, okay. So that's the second piece.

And then the third piece is the authentication mechanism itself, right? So, the language says authenticated requests should be responded to within 24 hours, but that is only operationalized once this authentication mechanism is finalized, right?

So I think the plan is we're finishing the timeline, we're updating, filling that potential gap in the actual language of the recommendation and then moving our focus to the authentication mechanism itself to get that finalized and set up a path where that Recommendation 18 can be operationalized. All right, I see, hopefully I didn't lose everybody. Chris then Sarah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Greg, thanks, that's really helpful and I don't want to get down into the nitty gritty of it, but I do want to just briefly talk about the authentication mechanism. So, Beth mentioned this, that there is currently a Small Group looking at it, Gabe is leading it, I'm on it. Beth, are you on it, Beth? Yes, you're on it. You're on the authentication, you're on the Gabe's group, aren't you?

BETH BACON

In spirit, yes.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

In spirit, yeah.

BETH BACON

In person, not as much.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

But it's a very small group and it's not what Beth would describe that was saying a sort of like community-based approach. I'm not

saying anything wrong with it, but it just, it can't complete the work. The concern is that we need to be, we need to be sure we clear what we mean by an authentication mechanism. Because there's already been talk in the GAC about, well, what we'll do in the interim period is we'll send you a list of email addresses.

And every government will be able to send a list of law enforcement email addresses to registrars and that will be enough for now, until we've managed to build whatever this authentication mechanism is. That isn't an authentication mechanism, that's a list of email addresses.

And then there's been talk of the fact that the FBI already has a mechanism. And that Europol is working on a mechanism. And my concern there is that we can't introduce this piecemeal. It has to be available to all law enforcement, to all governments. So, we really need to get a handle on what it is we expect the authentication mechanism to be, so that it does what it needs to do. I hope that makes sense.

GREG DIBIASE

It does, and I agree. And I think the challenge, the next challenge we have to tackle is how do we finalize an authentication mechanism, right? There're no piecemeal efforts before. Those don't trigger the 24-hour time period. We need an authentication mechanism that is finalized. And I'm not sure we have drilled down

entirely on the answers, but thinking about questions like that makes sense. And I think we understand that perspective. Sarah?

SARAH WYLD

Thank you. This is Sarah. You said something that frightened me. We should not consider reversing or Un-Adopting recommendation 18. That is a very large recommendation that mostly focuses on normal disclosure requests. There're many bits and pieces. Registrars have all implemented individual registrar processes to respond to reasonable request for lawful disclosure of registration data. Let's not mess with that. It's working. The piece that needs to be finished is Urgent Requests, but changing, Un-Adopting that whole recommendation would be much too big, I think. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

So, I think the Board agrees with that. I'm just saying, I was just outlining the universe of options that are available before council, right? So, I get the impression that council would be erring towards a letter giving guidance or looking at this in the SSAD supplemental recommendations, but that is still in flux, but I think the Board shares your concern with a heavyweight process of Un-Adopting recommendation 18. Beth?

BETH BACON

Yeah. I just want to say that I appreciate that you guys have been thinking about this again so thoroughly, and you can tell from our

conversation here, it's really hard not to get in the weeds, and that's why we wanted to raise this up and note, we just need that.

We need to identify the path first, and then we can ask all these really hard questions in a more robust process, rather than the smaller group that I think has done really nice work and has tried to kickstart us, but has really raised a lot of the questions that we're going to have to answer.

So, I just appreciate this, and again, I don't have a comment on the options yet. I want to take that back to my stakeholder group and get some views, but really happy to keep engaging on this and appreciate you guys being kind of on the same page of let's figure out how to do it before we figure out what we're doing.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Beth. Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA

Can I ask a more fundamental basic question here with regard to Urgent Requests? So, clearly, we're struggling with it, but we haven't put urgency on hold and said, look, we're not going to deal with this until we figure this out. So, clearly, it's being addressed today. Have we had that discussion? And what are we solving for here, and how are we dealing with it?

BETH BACON

Okay, this is Beth. So, maybe to rephrase before I answer to make sure, I'm answering the right question, which is everyone's favorite thing and that happens in a discussion. Are you, you're asking if we don't finish this, if we don't have the authentication mechanism, are we not addressing Urgent Requests right now? No, I think that registries, and I will not speak for registrars, but looking pointedly at some of the registrars.

Absolutely, through our existing processes, if there is a request from law enforcement, we have a process for that. If it is an Urgent Request, quite frankly, it's that very narrow definition that exists in the policy that's now final.

It's a very small number of requests, and that's why authenticating those is important, but also kind of, we think, a more doable task than trying to do all of the authentication conversation, but we do absolutely respond to them. It is a very small number, but in general, it is a pick up the phone and Gabe from FBI calls and says, we need your help right now.

KURTIS LINDQUIST

So, let me close, we understand this. You said that Urgent Requests are handled. So, when Vietnamese law enforcement calls you with an Urgent Request, you are processing that today.

BETH BACON

Well, so to be clear, there is no definition of Urgent Requests right now. It's not in the policy until we have policy language, but if we

have what would be considered an Urgent Request or what falls under that, we do, we absolutely respond, but it's a person-to-person, it's an individual moment where it's, you know, I know the agent and they call one of us and we try and do this, or we get a court order or we get something like that. So, we do handle them, but I guess we have other hands, so.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Owen Smigielski from Registrars. So yeah, this is, I think, part of the perplexing thing is why so much attention has been focused on this, because we've been responding to them. I checked with our head of legal who's been with us about 10 years, and she recalls one incidence that's ever happened, and Namecheap is one of the largest registrars in the world. So, it's not a thing that happens that often. And when it does, it occurs outside of ICANN processes and it's being responded to promptly.

I mean, I haven't heard any examples of an Urgent Request failing to be responded to timely. I mean, an actual Urgent Request from an applicable law enforcement. Kurtis mentioned, you have a Vietnamese one responded. I don't know how that might work.

It would probably depend upon the scenario. I'm aware of other registrars who have had foreign jurisdictions reach out during mass crimes or something along those lines where there's an urgent need to find data to assist with something that might be outside of their jurisdiction. So, that does work sometimes, but it happens outside of the ICANN process. And again, if it isn't broke, don't fix

it. But again, we'll work with the community to put something in there if needed, but we certainly don't see that giant need of urgency to fix something that's "not broken". Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

So, okay. So, Tripti, I think you put your finger on exactly the issue. What the community started in the GAC, I guess, is asking for is what amounts to a formal process. So, one can be held to account. Whereas currently that doesn't exist. There are personal relationships with US registries and registrars with US law enforcement, Australia, UK, and so on. But your point, Kurtis, about a request coming in.

The problem when you go to decide, when you decide you want a formal process is it raises all sorts of questions. Not the least of which is if I get a formal request, sorry, if we have defined what urgent is, which we have, and we have defined we will have an authentication mechanism so I can say I know it comes from law enforcement, I still have to, under many jurisdictions, do the whole privacy balancing test thing.

And how do I do that if I don't know who the law enforcement, I can say it's law enforcement, but are we being expected, are the governments expecting us to take that as read? That if it comes in from authenticated law enforcement, and it's marked as urgent, we do not have to do any investigation to check if it is actually urgent.

And what's lacking from this conversation at this pointy end of making this policy is the data protection people who are simply not in this room. Not this room, our rooms. And that we need, I think, in order to solve this problem, I think we need to get them in and we need to be having a discussion with them that talks about this is a very, very, very narrow, unique circumstance.

Surely, we must be able to say that all bets are off and we can just say yes. Otherwise, what we're doing is creating simply an ability to always say no, which is not a sensible thing for us to be doing.

TRIPTI SINHA

Exactly, and you said the whole purpose behind this is to be held to account, right? So, do we have an accountability problem today?

GREG DIBIASE

Let's go to Sarah before Wes.

SARAH WYLD

Thank you. Sarah, I got excited. This is Sarah. To support what we've already heard, yes, we do receive Urgent Requests today. Within my registrar, we report publicly on how many we receive. And in terms of holding people to account, a significant problem is that we receive requests marked as urgent, which really are not. And that takes time away from or slows down the process of finding the ones that really are urgent so we can answer them as fast as possible. Which we do, but it makes it harder.

So, perhaps the value of this work could be to limit in policy the scope of what is urgent. And within the IRT, we looked at the definition from EPDP phase two, which was agreed to by the community, but also ensuring that those requests that pertain to these very specific legal situations are raised by legitimate law enforcement, not just somebody checking a box that says, yes, I am LEA because I want to get fast-tracked, and making sure that they're within the appropriate jurisdictional limits. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Sarah. Wes?

LISA SAULINO

Can we have the handheld mic on, please?

WES HARDAKER

Greetings, all. I'm Wes Hardaker. I'm actually the chair on the Board of the DPP caucus that oversees a lot of what we've been doing. It has been a very rapid few months, and I apologize for a minute. I almost came up here. I obviously should have, in the beginning. If I can try and get through the collection of thoughts that I've had for the past 10 minutes while listening, I think the good news is I believe to a large extent we're all in alignment. We've made a lot of progress recently. That includes even coming to agreement that 24 hours is, you know, sort of the right Urgent Request. There is never a perfect in these kinds of discussions, and we have to recognize that, of course.

There has been talk about the timeline of how do we progress on all of these issues on a rapid basis, and obviously Un-Adopting Recommendation 18, as you referred to, would be the slowest, and I believe that there's generally consensus seeming to form that that is the slowest and the worst way to go about doing that.

One thing to keep in mind is that there is no desire to remove existing relationships, right? RDRS was not designed to do that. It is designed to be the lookup mechanism when you don't have a relationship.

So, when a law enforcement agency needs to contact a registrar and has never spoken to them before, or potentially the law enforcement agency or the registrar is small enough that they don't really have a team to form these relationships yet. So, it is a mechanism to fill that gap, and that's the gap that's filled. If you have the phone number of an agent and that you talk to on a regular basis you don't really need the RDRS kind of system.

There is no policy mandate that I'm aware of that says everything has to channel through. So, the other thing to consider about that as has been hinted here is that authentication implies. I know that this request came from this organization. They have stated they're a law enforcement organization, and jurisdiction is obviously an issue there because just because they're a law enforcement agency does not necessarily provide authorization, which is the word that hasn't been mentioned on the stage yet, right?

So, all of those pieces are very challenging, and what we are trying to do both in the ICANN Board and I believe the GNSO Council and everybody else is how do we parallel these tracks of effort in order so that we can make reasonable progress in a reasonable period of time both on the policy front and on the implementation front and allow relationships to continue happening so that we're all in agreement.

The good news is I believe that we're making significant progress on all of those fronts. That doesn't mean that there's not work to do there. I know if I was designing an authentication system, it would probably look different than what is currently being designed, but those are all the building blocks and the components that we're working very hard on, and it seems like, as I started off saying, we're all in rough general consensus on the direction to go forward.

There are intricate details to work in the best mechanism for doing that, so that's my view at least as the chair of the DPP group, and I'm not part of a registrar, so I have less skin in the game than others. I'm trying to get the consensus to be done.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Wes. Yeah, agreed, and then I wanted to touch upon something Sarah said that you can also think of this as authentication as a tool to be able to respond quickly, right? Like, if you're going back to kind of what started this conversation in the first place, the Board said, yes, it should be an excavated

timeframe, but for registrars to be able to respond in an expedited timeframe, they can't start from scratch in evaluating a request, right?

Information of whether this is legitimate helps that determination move faster, so I thought that was worth highlighting. Okay, great conversation here. Any other comments on this topic? Okay, what's next?

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Next up, we have the Board ability to revoke policy, and Sarah? That's not you? That is you, okay.

SARAH WYLD

Thank you, once again, this is Sarah. So, we've seen recently a draft process that would allow the ICANN Board to reverse the adoption of GNSO policy recommendations in very limited circumstances and with appropriate guardrails, and the Registrar Stakeholder Group is supportive of that work moving forward.

In our Public Comment, we made some suggestions relating to information gathering and collaborative decision making, which we do hope are considered and incorporated as the process is finalized. Also, we suggest that any reversal decision should be subject to both specific review of that individual reversal, as well as a broader regular review and reporting of all reversals that have occurred in whatever reporting period.

Generally, I would say, if an adopted policy is being reversed, there would have to be a really good reason for that, and it's not something I would expect to see happening very often. So, a review and reporting would help make sure that this is occurring within appropriate limited circumstances, and we would invite reflection from the Board on that topic, especially with regards to reviews. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Sarah. And it's good to hear that you're supportive generally, and I think this is a rare use case, right? That the Board adopts a policy, something changes, and it is no longer in the global interest. So, you said, I heard you say, like, it has to be a good reason. Like, that would be the reason, right? The Board only accepts things that are within the mission and are within the global public interest.

So, if circumstances change that evaluation, which is what we saw on the SubPro recommendation that was the basis for this conversation, there may be circumstances where we have to be flexible and pull back a recommendation, either to rework it or think about it again.

So, yeah, from my perspective, I understand that, and I think the Board was always envisioning this to be a dialogue, right? So, that in the example of the SubPro recommendation that was unadopted, that was a link the Board went to council, explained

why that, what had changed, right? And why it was no longer in the interest of the global public interest or the organization, right?

So yeah, from my perspective, I think that thinking aligns that, A, this would be a collaborative process, but B, there should be a process because we're living increasingly, things are changing faster, right? So, there needs to be that flexibility. And just in general, our processes need to evolve, right? Like, we're looking at Review of Reviews, that same holds true of GNSO processes, right? That these were bought up however long ago and we always need to be scrutinizing our processes and where they can improve and how we can make things more efficient. So, that, yeah, yeah.

SARAH WYLD

Thank you. As per usual, completely agreed with you, Greg, processes do need to evolve. And I think that's part of what we're looking or thinking about in terms of ongoing reporting or consideration of this. If we find that we need to, we the Board, need to regularly reverse a policy, that means that there's something happening that should have been changed earlier on. If it happens once or if it happens because of like specific circumstances that change, that's fine. We do need to be responsive. But if it keeps happening, then maybe we need to do something else earlier. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Right. That makes sense to me. Wes?

WES HARDAKER

Thank you, Sarah. Wes. One just quick comment. You know, one of the things that happens and has happened with RDRS, right, is we have learned through implementation that things weren't perfect. So, I would hope that when we're reversing policies in any way or non-adopting policies and going back for revision or submitting supplemental policy in the future, it's from lessons learned more than, or the world's changed, so.

GREG DIBIASE

Could be, yeah. Anyone else with thoughts on this topic? Okay. Moving along. Beth, Owen?

BETH BACON

Yeah. The next is Review of Reviews. And I'm not going to cover it because I can't even say the title. I'm going to pass it to Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you. I get the privilege of reporting on the Registry Stakeholder Groups view of Review of Reviews and listening to myself so that I can take the feedback back to the review of review committee, which is even more exciting. I think we can, if it's all right with you, we can sort of wind this into addressing the board's question because it's all kind of the same thing.

So just generally, the Registry Stakeholder Group is, I'm delighted to say, supportive of what's going on. I think the key words for a

future system are predictable and flexible. And we're a predictable system but some flexibility built in so that we don't have a situation where you have to do a review on that date because it says you do, but the CCGs are working on that.

I'm keen to ensure the situations where, sorry, avoiding situations where reviews accumulate and otherwise get out of sync or get synchronized to a point where they start to bump into each other.

In answer to your specific question on the CIP, or the part of your question on the CIP, at the moment, the CCG has in its review B, bucket B, a CIP review assessment, which is a lightweight assessment of the outputs of the CIP in each of the SOs and ACs. And there's a note on the table that says, obviously there will need to be a review of the CIP itself.

In conversations this week, and one of those conversations has been with a Registry Stakeholder Group, there may be a slightly different way of looking at it. So, the CIP is a pilot program at the moment, and so obviously it is subject to review. And it may be that actually what the CCG should be doing is recommending that there is a review of the CIP, not the outputs, but the CIP itself, and let's just say that could be in year three or year six, one cycle or two, and suggest perhaps that that review would make recommendations about how the ongoing work of the CIPs is assessed in an ongoing way, rather than try and create an assessment process now that may well be not fit for purpose when the CIP itself has been reviewed and maybe changes.

I hope, I've said it so many times in my head, I understand it, but I may not be saying it as understandable to everybody else. So, in essence, what would happen is we wouldn't make a bucket B review that would be an ongoing review. We'd say there should be a single review and of the CIP itself, of the pilot, and then that review would be charged with reviewing the CIP and recommending changes to it and recommending how its outputs should be assessed over time.

That's kind of where I think we're, and the registries I think have said that they're comfortable with that as an idea. And then the other point, and I think this is very valid, is that we need to make sure that the reviews don't impinge too much on just the general work of the policymaking and ICANN, et cetera.

It's challenging, especially if you're going to do big reviews, but we need to build it in a way that ensures that the main purpose of ICANN is kept at the forefront, and that's making policy and implementing it and getting on with running the things that need to be run. But I'm happy to answer any questions.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Chris. Jim, any comments as our resident reviews' expert?

JAMES GALVIN

Well, thank you, and let me also acknowledge my partner from the Board, Leon Sanchez. We are the Board members to the review CCG.

I'll say three things. One, in response to your comment about the CIP, I think it's useful just to take on Board and recognize that it's being seen now as a particular choice of method for that particular type of review, and I think that's a good thing, and that'll ultimately be a decision that's made by the review CCG itself, and the community will have an opportunity to comment on that and move that along.

So, I think that that's a good thing, and we certainly welcome that and don't otherwise have a strong preference at the moment. We do want to acknowledge the emphasis on sustainability that's going on in the reviews work. We got ourselves into this place by the fact that suddenly the need to do reviews was excessively resource-intensive, and whatever comes out of this work needs to address that and take that into account, and we do think that's important, and we welcome the opportunity to continue to contribute to that discussion within the CCG. So, that's an important thing.

We also want to remind everyone about the need for the fundamental importance of accountability in how these review activities are structured how we execute all of them and what they mean. So we need strong clarity of purpose for the review system, and I think that that's something which is certainly on our list, but want to bring that out as something that we are representing certainly within the group and calling it out At-Large to the community at large, and would hope that people would comment on that and keep it in mind going forward. You know, the reviews

have to be successful. If you're going to have a review, it's going to have an outcome, and what happens with that outcome is part of the question here. So, accountability and what that means and how that applies to the overall system, to everyone, the community, the organization, and the Board. So, thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Jim. And, oh, Prudence.

PRUDENCE MALINKI

Hi, Prudence for the record. Thank you, Jim. Your comments about sustainability are really important and really quite prevalent and relevant. So, with regards to the registrars, we are finalizing our input with regards to the work of the Review of Reviews, and we really do appreciate the importance of this work. Just to reiterate what's been stated here, we're going to be looking at how to identify the registries.

We are overall largely supportive of this work and really do understand its relevance and importance. We have a concern with regards to the potential for overlap, or as it's lovingly referred to, the synchronization of the reviews. So, this is something that we're being mindful of, and we'll comment to that in our input. But all in all, with regards to what we've seen so far, we really appreciate the work that's been undertaken, and we think it's going to be really good with regards to outcomes. Thanks.

JAMES GALVIN

So, let me just say thank you. I guess we're all aligned on the important issues and questions that are out there, and that's a good thing. And again, just to encourage everyone to ensure that your contributions and your concerns are brought to the Reviews Committee through the membership that you have from your representatives on the Review Committee.

So, it's good to hear that the registrars are thinking about this and working on it, and that you'll have the opportunity to bring those concerns and address them with the group at large. So, thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Jim. Thanks, Prudence. Any other thoughts on reviews?

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Okay. Beth, Owen? All right. Back to me, Owen. Thanks, Greg. So, next is registrars in underrepresented regions, and I just want to make a point of clarification that previously we discussed it as underserved regions. Those regions are certainly being served, but they're underrepresented within ICANN with regards to registrars.

So, I know we had talked about this in Dublin, and it asked ICANN what they're doing, and so we'd be just curious to follow up on that. But first, I wanted to just give some updates on what the Registrar Stakeholder Group has been doing. So, we have a session that we'll be doing Wednesday at 4:30. It's called Strategies for Registrar Accreditation and Participation.

That is done in conjunction with ICANN. We'll have some local registrars there, and that's just more of a way to help how to get more registrars involved within ICANN, as well as how to potentially get them in to participate in the stakeholder group.

We also put together and published on our website the Registrar Stakeholder Group Guide to Registrar Participation in ICANN Policy work, and that's a document that's intended for all registrars who want to get involved with that, and I'll drop the link for that in the chat so that people can see that. But that's for any registrar, and it's a two-page document about how to get involved, how to proceed, things to think about when getting involved with ICANN policy within ICANN, again, trying to encourage more registrars to participate, because, as we all know, this can be a very complicated place, and it's a good place to start.

And another thing that we're happy to announce this week is that the Registrar Stakeholder Group has just decided to do a 75% discount to Registrar Stakeholder Group membership for registrars in underrepresented regions. I don't recall exactly. We did the analysis of how many existing ICANN-accredited registrars that would be, but we seem to have forgotten the number. It's in the range of 50 or 60 or so.

I don't want to oversell or undersell, but it's a significant number, so we'll be working with ICANN and on our own as well, too, to reach out to these registrars to try and get them to participate, because the cost is sometimes a factor with getting involved with

these things, and we'd certainly like to broaden up the membership and encourage them to apply and be able to do that.

So, we have adjusted our own membership fees internally to account for some of these costs as well, too, increase the fees on some of the larger registrars. And it's not just for any registrar can do it. It has to do with being in a certain region, having a certain number of domains under management and stuff like that, but we're certainly trying our best, and we'll continue to do our best to make sure we have a broad coalition of registrars from all over the world.

GREG DIBIASE

Yeah, thanks, Owen. Yeah, the Board is so encouraged by this work. I mean, this is a pillar of our strategic plan, right, inclusion, and we've also been encouraged by the work that we've done together, right? I think ICANN Org and the Board have worked together on programs to increase participation. We're very encouraged by that.

On the ICANN staff side, we'll continue to conduct training sessions, expand those efforts, and add training sessions to things like ICANN Learn. But, I mean, perhaps more generally, that this input is really great to hear, not only to understand what you guys are doing, but how we can improve ourselves, taking ideas from what you've shared. You all have been doing.

I have a more specific question. Of these you're doing a lot of different things. Have you found something in particular that has been particularly effective?

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Well, we just launched the discount program, so no. But there have been a little bit of stagnant growth in the stakeholder group, in fact, perhaps a little bit of contraction. A lot of it had to do with consolidation between registrars, where multiple registrars come together as a family, and then they drop a credential or something along those lines.

We have been seeing some growth of late for new members. I'm not sure what those efforts are, whether it's directly, we haven't done a poll or anything like that. But we also have an observer program where somebody can join as a kind of like a member light. They can participate in some of the, or join the meetings for six months, making sure that it would overlap with an ICANN meeting.

We have not yet had any takers on that observer program, but hopefully with these efforts here, we can get some more people involved. And just as an aside, I forgot to put the link in the Zoom chat for the membership discount guidelines, which Zoe, thank you for putting that in there, but I just wanted to highlight that, that there is a document that we have on our website about that.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Owen. Tripti. Oh, sorry, Sarah.

SARAH WYLD

So sorry, just to add a little bit to what Owen was saying, as he mentioned, these are new programs with us. We also have a mentorship program and we have an outreach team that's doing a variety of things. We've got meetings that alternate times for different time zones. And what, not to speak for the outreach team, but I think after some time has passed, we've been able to gather some data, then we'll be looking at the success of these programs and trying to identify which things have worked best.

OWEN SMIGELSKI

And just really quick, thanks, Sarah, for pointing out our mentor program, which I think has been very successful. We've been able to identify members who may not have participated as much. In fact, we can now have somebody on our ExCom who is a graduate of the mentee program.

GREG DIBIASE

So, Tripti?

TRIPTI SINHA

Yeah, a quick question. Have you looked at the universe of all registrars and how many are members and have you broken it down by region and so you have more data on--?

OWEN SMIGELSKI

Yeah. This is Owen Smigielski, when we tried to determine the program, what would be the scope and what type of registrars would be there? Yeah, the ICANN Org website's actually very helpful for going through and selecting which regions where registrars are. So, we first had to identify what was an underrepresented region, which we use, and that's detailed in the document that I linked in the Zoom.

And then from there, once we had those countries, we looked up ICANN accredited registrar and ticked the boxes for those various countries. So, we're able to identify what the potential impact could be for there, for ICANN accredited registrars. We could then reach out to, on our own, as well as in conjunction with ICANN Org.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Owen. Sajid?

SAJID RAHMAN

Sort of follow up to Tripti's question, and how do we define underrepresented?

OWEN SMIGELSKI

I don't have those details in front of me handy, but if you, the link in there, it does explain, I can take a quick look, but I don't want to read the document while we're on the screen here. No, I don't have it handy on my screen here, but it does explain how it's defined through OECD or UN distinctions there. But we also reached out to ICANN as well, to how they do that, and looked at what other

groups in ICANN do as well, too. So, it wasn't just something we invented on our own, we did some research.

GREG DIBIASE

Great, thanks again, Owen. Any other thoughts on this topic? Okay, what's next?

BETH BACON

Thanks for the flexibility again. We did some reorganizing. From the registries, we wanted to just bring back and highlight the kind of appreciation for all the Board support on SOIs, the Code of Conduct on SOIs. Registries were obviously very vocal about supporting putting in place the Code of Conduct, and now that it is out and complete, wanted to highlight our work to make sure that the enforcement of that and use of the code is really practical.

The registries are creating an internal process based on the code, and then some of the enforcement guidance that is in the appendix, identifying just some principles for enforcement, and then a process for us. I keep saying selfishly, I don't want to have someone flag a complaint or a concern, and not have a predictable process in place.

And we hope that whatever we end up putting together can be helpful, and as well, and just really allow for true use of it, as opposed to just having a nice to say, you should have your SOI in place. So, just an update on that. We are working on it, and happy to share as we move forward.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks, Beth. That would be great, and yeah, we really appreciate the efforts from the contracted parties in actually implementing this, because the work of actually doing it largely falls on the constituencies themselves. And I know ICANN Org is engaging with the various constituencies to see how each one is implementing it. So, I think the more information and lessons learned, and particularly if there's a successful way to implement, I think that's really helpful to distribute through the community. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Greg. Just to say, I think one important aspect of this is not, is moving outside. In other words, it's not just the Registry Stakeholder Group needs a process for dealing with its members. There needs to be, each of those groups need a process for dealing with an outside complaint coming in that says one of your members isn't doing the thing. And so, it's not just how do you deal with your own, does the chair of how does Beth deal with the fact that my SOI isn't up to date? It's what happens if someone comes and says there is a problem. And for that to work across community, that needs to be a robust process that is predictable for everybody, I think. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Thanks. And yeah, I guess I'd also note that it's happening at the SOAC level too, right? The GNSO has its own processes for

implementing and those would cross between the different constituencies. Any other thoughts from ICANN on this?

TRIPTI SINHA

I just wanted to say, it's good to know you're being so proactive in this space. So, thank you very much. As you know, this is very important to us. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Okay. Are there more topics?

BETH BACON

I think there's just one last one that is frankly not even a topic at this point because ICANN staff is super. They already fixed it. We were noting just some, following up on some issues with the next round. There were technical issues, the way that the RSP testing was displaying the status of applications and it's no longer an issue. And we flagged it for staff and they just nailed it as per usual.

So really just a nice spot to say, thank you very much for that. Appreciate the back and forth and always staff is always super willing to engage and we appreciate it very much.

GREG DIBIASE

Wonderful, I love that topic. Okay. Then I think that just brings us to the other question from the Board. ICANN Strategic Plan Highlights Priorities that support ICANN's vision. From your

perspective, what are the top, what is the top emerging trend that may impact ICANN that you think the Board should consider?

BETH BACON

I'm going. Thanks so much for this. I think Chris started to get to inch towards this topic. We've really saw that the question one, question two, that they're kind of thematically approached of really focusing on the efficiency of ICANN's work, implementing the effective reviews so that we can show progress in policymaking.

And while we appreciate the question is about an external force, it's also, we really wanted to make sure that we are just highlighting how much, how important we think that internal work is. And as part of that, the thought is, instead of the constituencies and others saying, we think this is a threat to ICANN, it might be in that review process and that self-reflection process be appropriate to say, to have a third party do an assessment and provide that information to ICANN as opposed to us just pointing and troubleshooting. So, I thought that would be an interesting approach as well. Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

This kind of dovetails into the review stuff because the purpose of the structural review would be to look at ICANN's bizarrely structure. That doesn't just mean perhaps looking at the ccNSO and seeing if it works, et cetera. It means looking at ICANN's whole structure. And I suspect that one of the likely parts of a recommendation coming out of the Review of Reviews is going to

be that an initial step for any structural review would be, should be some sort of external landscape assessment because the challenge of course for a fish is that it can't see the water that it's in.

And it would be useful for us to be able to say, part of a structural review might look at, do you add new things? So, Steve Crocker, I know for example, believes that the DNS resolvers should have a home at ICANN. I have no clue, make no comment, but some form of an external landscape assessment that says these are what's out there, blockchain domain names, another example, that comes back in and feeds back into a structural review. It's just as relevant for the strategic planning, I would argue.

So it comes back in and says, this is what we think. Now that needs to be, I think, a joint exercise. It would need to be an ICANN and external exercise. But you do need to have external people because they will bring a different perspective. And it will certainly, from the concept of actually running a structural review, it would be almost essential to have that outside look that came in and said, actually, you could do this, but you'd have to change your mission.

You could do this and you don't have to change your mission and you've never considered it; you should maybe consider it. So, that's the sort of level, but I think that that works both in respect to the need for requirement, both for the structural review, but also in the general strategic planning as a process that might be worth considering. Thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Thank you, Chris. Any thoughts from ICANN on this? Jim?

JAMES GALVIN

So, I think my response on behalf of the Board would also be to put a question back to the CPH to think about. Don't expect you to answer it here, but I think it's part of this problem space. It's interesting to, what I heard from you just now was more of a focus internally about efficiency and the pressures that we see internally, and we've had some discussion about that all through this morning and all through this meeting. So, all of that is good.

And the Board is taking note of that. Those are priorities that we care about, too, in the space that we're going. But I think here, we'd like to broaden the scope of what pressures mean, and not just think about it as an external thing, but keep in mind that we are all subject to interesting disruptive technologies in the external world that come to bear on us.

And what does that mean to the way that we conduct our business, the way that ICANN operates, what impacts us, what happens to registries and registrars in this model? So, we've already been dealing with one of those examples of disruptive technologies, and that would be alternate name systems, blockchain systems, that kind of thing.

They haven't gone away. They're still there. There's still stuff going on. So, it's useful to think about how much that is or is not going to

affect us, and in what ways it might not. But now we have AI and Artificial Intelligence and agent AI, right, agentic agents. And the Board certainly has opened up that topic for itself and thinking about what impact does that have to us.

So, I think it would be interesting for CPH, registries and registrars, to think about what that might do or not do to the way that both your businesses are conducted, how that affects ICANN in general. So, it's kind of a larger question. And I'll point back to the resiliency plenary session that was had yesterday, which really got into this whole different discussion about thinking about stability and trust in a different way than we have been to date.

So yes, we asked kind of an open-ended question to see what we would get, and I offer to you to be thinking more broadly as we go forward about what we might do about this and expect that we might have other questions in the future about this. But interested in any quick comments or response from anyone on that. Thanks.

GREG DIBIASE

Trpti, did you want to say something real fast?

TRIPTI SINHA

I just wanted to add to what he was saying because he went where I wanted to go. So, to rephrase a little bit of what Jim is saying, but from a different perspective, registries and registrars together have visibility into the world of domain names. And my understanding is they've gone up recently quite a bit. So, do you have a sense of

why more domain names are being generated? Where that's coming from? And do you feel you have a reasonable amount of control over that?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Okay, so what Jim said, I think, it fits exactly with what I was saying, which is that I think what those disruptive technologies, as you call them or whatever, that they are out there. And all I'm saying, I think, is that I don't think that this internal community can look at those on its own. I think if it's going to run a process that actually does an assessment about what the threats are or what the issues are, what the opportunities are, it's probably best to have some outside help with that, because I think we are obviously only going to see it from our own very specific viewpoint.

I agree with everything you've said. And I think that fits with what I've said. Tripti, on your point, I don't know the answer to that question. I think registries certainly on their own, as sort of commercial beings, will have done their own work on why their TLDs maybe are going up or going down. But as a group, I don't believe anything has happened, but I'd pass that to Beth.

TRIPTI SINHA

So, there's no general consensus as to why it's going up. So, you cannot directly tie it back to agentic AI, in other words.

BETH BACON

So, I think we would have had to have the discussion to have a consensus, and we have not discussed that at all. I think, and Ashley, I see, is gently hopping in the queue. So I think, to your point, Jim, and goes along with Chris', in order, we are happy to look at external forcing factors. We think those exist. And from the strategic planning, I think that it's very good that ICANN is posing this as saying we do need to evaluate external risks, so not just strategically plan.

I think that's also going to be able to really feed into perhaps the Review of Reviews as that goes forward, as having that kind of external forcing matter, and say these are some risks, is this something for a review? And I'm happy to take back these more specific questions, and we can noodle on those things, but we just haven't had that conversation as a group.

GREG DIBIASE

Ashley?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN

And it works, thank you. Sorry for the hopping, too much coffee. So, I just wanted to respond to what you were saying, Jim, and to note that we actually have a session planned for the Contracted Party Summit. I won't do a pitch here, but there is an IETF protocol looking at agentic AI and using the DNS as a vehicle by which to identify agents on the internet, and also a way to use certificates to make sure that they are trusted.

And I think this is potentially a way that we can use existing infrastructure, which is the DNS, and build a lot more new business opportunities in this space. So, I think there could be a tie to increased domain usage if we go down that path. But we're going to be discussing in Manchester this very topic, and seeing if there's a way that we can use open protocols developed out of the IETF to do that. And I think this is very exciting, and could breathe a lot of life into the DNS. So, thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA

Ashley, real quick question. So, while I've been scouring journals on this matter, on this developing field, I hear that GoDaddy is developing ANS, Agentic Name System. Is that what you're referring to, or is that, what approach are you taking? Are you tying that to the DNS, or is this a brand-new naming system?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN

So the ANS, that is the protocol I was referring to, that's open. It's not GoDaddy specific. But it's something that we are utilizing, and we're encouraging other registrars, in particular in registries, to look into this. Because again, this is something that, if we embrace as an industry, it is something that we can stay ahead of. And also, I think, creates an environment where it's not just a handful of AI companies that control the space, but instead make it more distributed, and bring more players into the usage and promotion of AI that could benefit us as a business and an industry.

TRIPTI SINHA

In part of your deliberations, are you looking at autonomous agents that are not necessarily associated with a human being or an entity, and how you deal with that?

ASHLEY HEINEMAN

Yes, looking at getting them engaged and on Board will be critical, because without that, it won't work. And we're just in the very, very early stages. And again, I think we're looking at ideas of creating an alliance that brings together registries and registrars, but also those agents as well. But it's something that's going to require a lot of coordination to make work, but I think it's really exciting.

GREG DIBIASE

Thank you, Ashley. Oh, sorry, Roger. Oh, Sajid.

SAJID RAHMAN

Thanks, Greg. I think one additional lens to this whole AI discussion, of course, AI has this impact of agentic AI, the DNS market, et cetera. But I think one additional aspect is, because AI is so much at the top of the mind of the different governments, how AI gets used and how ICANN react to problems in DNS abuse, et cetera, because of AI, will bring some additional risk to us, unless we are in front of the curve. So, I think that's an additional lens we probably need to bring in to this discussion.

GREG DIBIASE

Thank you, Sajid. Oh, sorry, Jim.

JAMES GALVIN

So, thank you, Ashley. Thank you, Sajid, Beth, too, for at least putting some context and color around the question and what needs to go there. I am familiar with ANS and the IETF work in this space, and I think the distinction that I want to call out to build on what Sajid was just saying is what you were describing, Ashley, is sort of the positive side of all of this.

So, the IETF is focused on identifier methodology using the DNS to provide identity. With respect to AI agents, and it's also considering other protocols that might be relevant. Agents need to be able to talk to each other, for example. So, those kinds of things. That's all the positive side of the presence of AI with respect to the DNS.

My question is more about where Sajid was going, which is, well, how is this really going to impact us in the large? And I don't necessarily have the answer to that. I have my own opinions, but I think that it's something worth thinking about. I mean, as Sajid was saying, we all, what is the context for AI in this ecosystem? And what happens? You can imagine agents, they could outnumber actual people doing things.

Now what happens? What happens to abuse in that context? What happens to abuse mitigation in that context? I mean, what happens to all of our systems when suddenly we're getting orders of magnitude more transactions than we ever had before instantly?

That's sort of the future that we see in this particular disruptive technology and its relationship to us. So, just trying to motivate those kinds of questions and discussion in all of this. And there's a lot to be done. And thank you.

GREG DIBIASE

Thank you, Jim. Any other thoughts on this topic? Okay.

GREG DIBIASE

Seeing none, I think that brings us to the end of our agenda. Thank you so much for meeting with us. I feel like this was a productive and thorough conversation. And I'll turn it over to you, Tripti.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Greg, for facilitating. And this actually was his first meeting facilitating this bilateral. So, you did a very good job. Thank you.

Well, this has been a great discussion. I just want to part on one thought, which is don't underestimate what's going to happen in the agentic AI field. I think our threat landscape is going to be amplified and it will get very, very complicated. So, please, your fingers should be deeply in that pot and looking at that. Thank you, everyone. Meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]