
ICANN86 Seville | PF – GNSO: NCPH Work Session
Monday, June 08, 2026 – 14:45 to 16:00 CEST

ANDREA GLANDON

Hello and welcome to the Non-Contracted Parties House Work Session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy, and the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct concerning statements of interest.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also post them in the chat for your reference. Only questions posted in the Zoom chat identified as a question will be read aloud during this session as time permits and when directed by the chair of this session. If you wish to speak please, raise your hand in zoom or otherwise as directed. When speaking please state your name for the record, and clearly speak clearly at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to Rafik, you may begin.

RAFIK DAMAK

Okay, thanks, Andrea, and thanks to everyone for making it to today's session, which is for the Non-Contracted Party House. Okay, so just maybe checking with our colleague from CSG if they can reach out to John. But in the meantime, maybe Mason, you want to take over till he comes? Yeah, okay. So that will be resolved. You're taking over. You didn't last for too long.

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.

MASON COLE Can I have an AOB though?

RAFIK DAMAK Yes, please, go ahead.

MASON COLE All right, thank you. Rafik, Mason Cole, Chair of the BC. I wanted to raise everyone's attention to the fact that we lost a member of the ICANN family recently and a member of the BC in Arinola Akinyemi. She passed away a couple of weeks ago, and it was completely unexpected, took many of us by surprise. We've prepared a memory book for Arinola for her family, which Devan so helpfully put together for us. It's right here.

If you knew Akinyemi or had a chance to work with her, you're welcome to add your remembrance to this book. It's right here. It will be available in the BC meeting as well, which will be tomorrow, and then in the GNSO Council meeting as well on Wednesday. So if you don't get a chance to sign it today, feel free to join one of those sessions, and it will be available, and we'll provide it to Arinola's family. All right, thanks, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMAK Thanks, Mason. And yeah, we are all sorry for this news and hope that everyone will sign and share some thoughts.

Okay, so I think now we can start first with the welcome and introduction. It should not take too much time. In terms of the agenda, we'll discuss about Board Seat 14, kind of lessons learned since we had that process, how we can improve, how we can do better for next time. Also, we have Day Zero, which is becoming one of our regular meetings, and that's for ICANN87.

What also I think we can add, maybe here not in the agenda, is if we can have some time to discuss the GNSO Chair election. Also we have Chris with us, so we can hear from him if there is any update or anything you want to share with us. Okay, over to you John, if you want to add anything.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Thanks, Rafik. John McElwaine, for the record. Sorry to be late. So, nothing really to add to the agenda. I think that the times should all work out. I don't know if the Board Seat 14 will go 30 minutes, but I think we can probably move on to that in the agenda and start with a discussion.

RAFIK DAMAK

Thanks, John. Yeah, so we can start with this one. I think, as background, we went several times through this process to appoint someone to Board Seat 14. We had some challenges before, maybe that's an understatement, but I think at the previous attempt we agreed to work on the process, and we had that small team, and we

came up with this procedure that was put in place and implemented in the last iteration.

The good thing, I believe, is that we could end up making a selection within the timeline, so we didn't have any issues in that regard. I think there are a lot of things we can share about that process, how it can be improved, and maybe we suspect that there are some points that were not maybe clear or not certain. By running this process, maybe we found out that we should work on those details.

So I think here it's just a retrospective, but I think maybe we can agree on how we will proceed. The idea is we should not wait for the next round, I mean in three or two years to see if we should continue with the same process or work on some improvement or come up with something new.

So this is just maybe we kick off this discussion, and hopefully we can agree on an approach soon to have, again, maybe some small team or whatever, just to work on the improvement. Nothing decided, but based on the discussion today, we'll find out how we should proceed. Yeah, John, anything you want to add here?

JOHN MCELWAINE

Thanks, Rafik. John McElwain for the record. You know, I think from the CSG point of view, similar to what you were getting at, we started a little bit late, so we need to be more cognizant of the timeframe and talking with each other about this process as it is

coming up. So we need to put it all into our calendars and diaries to look into this at an earlier point in time.

I personally did things a little bit differently than we had in the past. What the CSG did is we had our evaluations come out of the initial group we had assembled to look at the various candidates and then decided to interview those candidates on Zoom. We didn't interview all of them. We took the top four or five, I believe, and opened those interviews up to the entire membership of both groups.

I thought that was good because, at least personally from the IPC perspective, a lot of times just as a member, just not involved in the candidate selection. It's something that was being handled by smaller groups, and so I wanted people to get to know their current board member and their possible future board member and thought that was a good way to do that sort of candidate selection. We asked for feedback, etc. I think that's something, I don't know, that just landed on my plate by virtue of our rotation, but I would encourage the next CSG Chair to continue something to that effect.

So I think starting early and involving the entire membership of the constituencies were the two lessons that I learned. I guess my involvement in Board Seat 14 is not as deep as yours, and I know that we've got other CSG members. If anybody else has any comments about what they felt were lessons learned on the CSG side, please feel free to come on. Raise a hand, or. Philippe

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, John. Philippe Fouquart here. Just a couple of notes, and maybe speaking personally because I haven't checked that with the ISPCP. What I've heard, not being part of that process, is that maybe the interviews by the search committee, whereby the questions were provided in advance were not really, well my words, but were not quite as useful as they might have been, A. And B that's a question. I was wondering whether, in your case, in the case of the NCSG, given that, I don't know how to phrase that, but I'm just wondering whether you felt that you were pressed by the deadline in your decision or not.

It was a close shave. I appreciate that with our position our reading of this has been quite constant, so it was quite comfortable for us, let's put it this way. So I'm wondering whether, on your side of things, you felt pressured or not for that decision to be provided prior to the deadline, and to John's question as to whether we may want to review the timeline in terms of where we want to start next time, for example.

RAFIK DAMAK

Okay, I think in terms of a timeline, maybe we know that we will have some challenges, because we kind of started late, even we know that we have some steps when we need to kick off or kick start the process. But I think from our side, the deadline was not, I believe, the main factor. I mean, it's something we should, we believe, all of us, we wanted to not have the same situation like last

time. But I don't think it was the factor for decision. I think just we can be maybe here clear and direct it.

We know from your side who you selected, and that you are not likely to be convinced or to change. And I think we reached the conclusion, it's just okay. I mean, at the end, we need to reach that compromise that we need to select the candidate. We understood that. And so it's not that we call the deadline, but we know it's just going, maybe trying to push it. I think it's not the most effective way to build more trust. So we thought, okay, we can avoid the situation is maybe something we can work in the future. I know, Philippe, you always insisted we need that tie breaker and to create more certainty, but we don't have that yet, I believe.

So I think maybe from our side is how we can really knowing that the interview and having all the -- I think that worked well. We got good pool of candidate, that interesting profiles that could give us choice compared to before. But the question remains is how, even with that pool of candidate, how we can, as the two group, we can end up selection without feeling that one kind of pushing to other what they think it should be.

Because we don't want to be in a situation that we have to kind of to give in just to move forward. I don't think that's what we are looking for. And it's not how we can build something sustainable for the long term. So how we can avoid that, I don't have the answer yet. It's something we need to discuss and to figure out. So maybe asking others in NCHG if they want to add anything.

SUSAN PAYNE

Marie has her hand up.

RAFIK DAMAK

Marie too? Yeah, Marie, and then maybe Farzaneh.

MARIE PATTULLO

Thanks, Rafiq. Marie from the BC. If we take this in two parts, if we start with the original working group that we set up to define the procedure, I can honestly say hand on heart that everybody worked together really well. And you used a very interesting word, compromise. We are a house of very many different parts and very many different opinions. So of course, there's never going to be something that straightforward, in particular when you're choosing a candidate who is, we're looking to represent the house.

Now, I don't want to misspeak here, Chris, but I know that you don't represent us in that we ask you to do things and you do them, but there is a two-way exchange of information, a dialogue of information that works hopefully both for us and for the Board. I think one thing that really came up for me, and I'm not speaking here for the BC because I haven't discussed it with the gentleman to my right, and if I'm talking rubbish, he will shut me up quite quickly.

One thing that really became apparent to me during the selection process was something we hadn't factored in, which is the time it takes to onboard a Board member. Again, I'm not speaking here

for Chris, I'm just speaking from what I've seen, that so much of what the current Board member does within the board, has achieved within the Board, took about a year or so of figuring out which committee should be on and which, and that's human and normal and nobody can do it any faster. Having a great pool of candidates I think is really useful.

I do agree with Philippe that pre-defined questions tend to lead to pre-defined answers, but I do think, because we have not managed to agree on having a tiebreaker, there will always be a need for compromise, but I do think we need to factor in the time taken for the Board member to become effective in the process. Which, it seems to me, is about a year or so in seed. Thanks.

FARZANEH BADIEI

Farzaneh Badiei, Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, NCUC. I'm going to disagree with you, Marie, and I also wanted to say, I mean, I think that we need to reflect on this, but I also wanted to say that we should do this process every three years. I think that we shouldn't just have the board member for three years and then just all agree and then he or she can, yeah, yeah.

So I'm just saying that because some argument was that we should not reopen the selection process because we want a board member that has had that experience. So that's why I'm saying, I slightly disagree with you, but I think that we need to consider your concern and come up with something that can both address this procedural thing that I'm talking about, which is reopening the

process every three years, even if we are super happy with the incumbent, because I think that brings transparency and it tells people that this position is there.

For many people, they didn't know that we actually appoint a board member. As NC management, actually, we have a board member, and the number of people that applied and the qualifications were impressive. So people care about this position, and I think that was really great to see.

And I think that this is my suggestion. I think that in our procedure, we say that if we are happy with the current board member, we should just go ahead and do the reappointment automatically. I am suggesting that, no, every three years we should open up the application process. It's good for the system, it's good for transparency, and it's also good to give other people the opportunity to get to know us and to participate in this process. That's all.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Thank you for those comments. Bruna, over to you.

BRUNA SANTOS

Thanks, John. I think in my case, first, I don't know if you all remember, but I was against reopening every three years and so on, but I really enjoyed the fact that we could create a pool of candidates, and to me, personally speaking, was really interesting to see how each of them, according to the level of expertise and

whether being part of the ICANN community for long or not, or just approaching it more externally, which was the way that they replied to each of the questions.

And when we were assessing them, we knew that, right, that many of them were, like, have been members of the broader internet governance community for years, but had a little bit of a less understanding of what ICANN was, but had still interesting critical visions on some of the topics we addressed and so on.

So, I liked that reopening the process allowed us to have a pool of candidates and get to know the work of some of them. And since I know this doesn't just speak to Chris, and Manju is also in the room, I'm going to use her as an example of an interview that she was, was really interesting to see how someone that was emerging from our community could also react in a rather neutral or in a different way as just opposed to being an NCHG member. So, I think that allows us to create a different expertise on that.

What I still think we lack, and perhaps that addresses the point of the questions that Philippe raised, it is something more related to the GNSO policy work that, that maybe could be a different part of the assessment that we could do, because in many of the candidates, I felt like the questions, they over-focused on GNSO policy questions or GNSO policy discussions, and maybe we can find a different way of assessing that level of knowledge. I just don't know, I just wanted to highlight that, that. The interviews, they allowed us to have interesting pool of candidates that we can use

in the future, and we can reassess and think whether any of them would be a good, interesting candidate for the future. That's it.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Susan had her hand up. Susan, do you still have a hand up?

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, sorry. I got thrown out of Zoom. I don't agree that we should open it every three years just as a matter of course. I think we obviously, we have a process which we only just agreed anyway, and if I understand that process correctly, there's an initial conversation and like, are we all happy to reappoint? And if we get to the point where we're all happy to reappoint, we should reappoint. We shouldn't be wasting people's time, and we should be considerate of the fact that the incumbent also has to plan their life and earn their keep and work out what they're doing in the next years and so on.

So if we're running a process, because it's kind of interesting to, to meet some new candidates and to, to find a pool and so on, we can do that in another way. We don't have to do it -- you know, we can, we can run an exercise where we identify and capacity build for future possible incumbents. But if we've got a candidate in place, they're doing a good job, we're all agreed that we are comfortable that they're doing a good job, then we should be taking that into account and, and taking into account things like the considerations

of the board where continuity and board appointments are made in advance.

It is incredibly disruptive to have someone who's just been appointed to chair an important board committee, and then for them to get spilled, or worse, for them to, to seem like they might get spilled for six to nine months' time causing disruption and uncertainty. And I think we have to be a bit more respectful of the individual as well. Now, if, if there's a feeling that we need to look for a new candidate, then fine, but let's not do it just as an academic exercise.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Bruna, yeah, over to you.

BRUNA SANTOS

First of all, interesting how you flip that argument, Susan, but that was not the point, and neither what I was saying. I think that when we're doing the exercise of assessing candidates for the Board Seat, we also need to think of the future, right? Because this person only has three terms, he might be going for two, and I'm not talking about you, Chris, I'm just like pointing at you. I mean, you have up to three terms, right?

So it's an interesting exercise for us to get to know who would be the feasible people to take over this position. And by no means I'm an academic, I have a law degree and stuff like that, so that's not the whole point. What I said, it's just that it's interesting for us to

assess, to assess the capacity, see who would be fitting for the positions, and who would actually make the effort of taking the compromise of sitting in a space that it's divided by two sides of a rather complicated house.

So I feel like it's an interesting assessment for us to do, and I'm not claiming that as a academic exercise by no means, I just think we need that exercise, because again, they have up to three terms, and we will have a point that the tiebreaker might be a conversation that's going to come back, and we don't have the name, so how do we do in this moment, then? That's all.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Okay, so we have next, Peter, I believe is online.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI

Yeah, thanks, can you hear me?

JOHN MCELWAINE

We can, thanks.

TAIWO PETER AKINREMI

Yeah, thanks. Peter from NCSG. I'm just, because during the assessment, it was kind of difficult to really assess the performance of the incumbent, aside of what the incumbent was telling us what they've done in the committee that the incumbent is serving on. I'm kind of thinking, if possible, as a way of improving the process, getting a kind of a metrics assessment or performance assessment

from the Board member, or directly from the Board, maybe that can sort of help us to understand what the incumbent actually is doing, and how we could use that to really assess rather than relying on the words you know, the incumbent and what they're doing, or what they're achieving, I guess that will help us to determine.

Because if you're looking at improving the process and getting competent persons on the Board, then we need to sort of understand what they are doing and their performance on the Board. I would suggest we kind of get, I don't know if that was done by the committee, looking at the performance of the Board like directly from the Board, maybe we need to start thinking of that metrics and getting that metrics, maybe that can help us to inform and improve the process. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Thank you for those comments. Susan, over to you.

SUSAN PAYNE

Yeah, thanks. So, Bruna, what I was trying to say was, if one of the learnings out of this process was that by doing those interviews we identified some potential interesting candidates for a potential future role, I think that's great. But if we think that that's something that's really valuable to do, then let's do that, but we don't have to do that in the context of, at the three-year point,

we're going to put the current candidate that everyone's happy with in an uncertain position. We could just do that generally.

And that's what I was trying to say. That's not a reason for opening the recruitment process. That's a reason for us doing a really valuable exercise of, let's see what our capacity building and future-proofing is. But they don't have to happen. They're not mutually exclusive.

JOHN MCELWAIN

Thanks for those comments. Susan, I'm going to pause for a moment, and I've learned to pause for an uncomfortable period of time of silence. I can't stand silence. And what always happens in IPC meetings is I say I'm going to pause, and then I pause for a little bit. And then I start talking and immediately then people, yeah, see, it gets people to get in the queue.

JULF HELSINGUS

I was just going to say, never visit Finland.

KATHY KLEIMAN

Is the mic open for those of us who didn't participate in the process? Is that okay? Kathy Kleiman, for the few people who don't know me in the room.

So, from outside the process, I just want to congratulate you. I know it took a lot of people's time, but I thought it was a good process. I think for many years there's been a renewal expectancy,

and Chris individual notwithstanding. I thought it was a process that engaged a lot of people and let them know.

And I just wanted to provide, with my hat as a historian, some historical background that in many other areas and jobs we do not have renewal expectancy. You get to bring all your experience with you, including the current chairmanships that you have and committees that you're on, but for the ISOC Board they go through the whole process of reelection. For the Public Interest Registry Board, we go through. I just came through a reappointment process through the Internet Society, and three years is just one factor. They put out the open call.

For the U.S. presidency, you run for reelection, so you go through the whole process again. And that checking in with your constituency might be a good thing, especially from out on Mount Olympus, Chris, coming back down. Not that you don't check in all the time, but that check-in moment seems a valuable one with the people who kind of put you up there.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Okay. So, Chris, I think, did you want to say something? And by the way, we did have applicant feedback. So please feel free to say how awful the process was.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

That's kind of what I was thinking. So if there are others in the house who want to speak, I'm happy to wait till after, but also happy to offer some feedback now. Okay.

Well, so first, I should say thank you to the house. It is a real honor, and I do feel very privileged that you've chosen to seat me again. So thank you for that. And thank you to all of the people who were involved in the search committee and in the interview and in the discussions, because it is a not insignificant amount of work. And I think, to Susan's point, this process doesn't come without cost in terms of the amount of time, and time that could otherwise be devoted to other work.

My own personal view, and you can take this for what it's worth, it's certainly not a decisional factor, is that opening it up every year, sorry, every three years, let's be reasonable here, can be productive. I think from the incumbent's perspective, it's not an overburden in terms of them having to think about their future and think about defending the legacy that they have and whether they want to do it again.

So there is, I think, a timing question. One of my points of feedback would be perhaps this could start a little earlier in the process. And I don't think it should be a concern that it would make the Board member feel uncertain about their position earlier on. I think this is something we all live with on the Board. I think after three years, I'm very aware of how fickle the Board membership can be in term of membership. It changes every year. There are those who don't

get renewed, who everyone thinks should have or could have or would have. This is the environment we're playing in.

Two points I would make, and both kind of relate to transparency of the process. One is I would encourage, perhaps, and Manju may have a different view to this, and other candidates, but I would encourage some transparency about who the candidates are because we are quite a small community. There may have been reasons for privacy or confidentiality not to publish those names in a more public way, but you find out anyway. And in my case, I found out from a number of them, from them asking me for tips on applying for this board position that apparently I'm not applying for anymore. So, yeah, I think it would be easier in this community of this size just to be upfront and transparent about who is running and the process that's underway.

The only other comment, and again a bit of transparency, would be perhaps developing some more clear instructions or expectations going into the search party search committee interviews because that was a somewhat strange and, I think, talking to other candidates, unexpected format, which was essentially, you've had our questions on email, now you have half an hour to speak to them, which I think was not what was expected by most of us. It's a perfectly valid approach, but it would be useful to be able to prepare for that and to get the best out of all of the candidates.

But on the whole, I think this process went well. It's easy to be magnanimous in having the seat, but it went smoothly. I found the interactions very respectful and professional. So thank you to all.

RAFIK DAMAK

Sorry, I was trying to speak for a while. Oh, she's leaving. What did I do? She left. Okay, yeah, sorry. I'm a little bit worried that we got stuck on this one point regarding should we reappoint automatically or not because there is some history about all the elections we had. So we didn't really succeed for some time in just reappointing a Board member, and we tended to change often.

So lately, we have now a Board member with two terms that I think may be progress in terms of continuity. But I don't want us to get stuck on this. Yeah, there is a lot of merit to reopen to get candidates. There is no guarantee to be reappointed, and we can see even other groups, how they do. They just run the election, even if the incumbent has a lot of chance to be reelected or reappointed.

Okay, so regardless of that, I just want to check what we can improve in terms of process and what other points, because still, if we just drop this point about reappointment, if we start the process, how we can end up, what will be the tiebreaker, and so on. So these are other aspects that we should maybe work on and try to find how we can improve the process, not the procedure.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Thanks, Rafiq. Michael, over to you.

MICHAEL GRAHAM

Yeah, real quick. I think I did have a concern as we entered this past process and that was that I don't think there was a clear expectation on the part of Chris that this was going to happen. I think if we decide that this would be in every three-year review, we ought to make that decision and we ought to make it clear to Chris and then in future to any other candidates who we appoint to the Board.

I also think, and this was the second point you made, Chris, that in doing so, if we decide to have an every three-year review, I think we really do need to put down clear expectations that we have of our Board member, both in reporting, in approach, whatever we decide. And I suggest that might be a small group that would help put that together. And in part, I am coming at that from the angle of what we did on NomCom, as you say, and other organizations in reviewing candidates for the various positions. That the candidates, as well as whoever's doing the consideration reviews and interviews, have clear expectations of what they're looking for. Obviously, it cannot expand according to the candidates.

Then a third and final point, I like the idea of it actually being a two-step process. The first step being, are we happy with the person we have now? Are they interested in continuing after, especially when it's a first term Board member we're considering for a second term or second term for the third? If there is disagreement or if we

decide, well, maybe we could find someone better or know someone better, then opening it to the further process. Because if we do that second process correctly, it is time-consuming and it is intensive, both for us doing it and for the candidates. So, just a couple suggestions. Thank you.

JOHN MCELWAINE

That's a great, Michael. Thanks. Jim, over to you.

JIM PRENDERGAST

Yeah, thanks a lot. Jim Prendergast, not a member of the House, but I am sharing some feedback from another candidate who's not here or not participating remotely. Echoing what Chris said, this person felt as though that 30-minute monologue was awkward. I realize this is the first time you went through it. So, that's something to maybe improve upon.

There was also a desire to have over-communication via email about what the process was going to be. It was unclear to this person that what the steps would be. And then there was no finality. They never received notification that they were out of the process or had not been selected. So, just some more feedback from another applicant.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Damon, over to you.

DAMON ASHCRAFT

Sure. Thank you very much, John. First, Chris, congratulations. Thank you. Great to have you back on. So I was on the team 14. We went through, we designed this process, which we've implemented. I don't know how well we've implemented it or not. I think we did probably the best we could. But part of that also was we also were striving to give our Board members feedback as they serve their term. And I think we definitely want to stay on top of that.

And the point of feedback is not necessarily to signal to the person, no, you're not going to be reelected or yes, you are. I think the point of feedback is, for one let's help improve our relationship with that Board member. Let's help ourselves. And let's also help the organization. I mean, it's this is something that hopefully as Board members go on and as Chris goes on, that what they do next year, they do a better job than they did this year and then so on.

And so I think we really want to not just look at this as an every three-year thing, but look at it kind of as a living thing that we need to be in communication. We need to be giving feedback. And also getting feedback what are the limitations from the Board? I mean, Chris, I mean, I know you can't change the world. You can come close, but you can't change the world. So those are my comments and thank you very much.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Thanks, Damon. I've got to close down the queue because we're going way over. I'm sorry. So Marie and then Farzi.

MARIE PATTULLO

Thanks, John. It's a brief point both to what Michael mentioned and also Susan. It's already foreseen in the procedure that we wrote. In other words, okay, is the incumbent Board member any good? Looks around room. Is everyone happy with incumbent Board member? Yep. Get in touch with incumbent. Are you happy to stay? Yep. Right. Cool. Skip to the end. We already have that foreseen in the procedure.

I completely agree, Susan, that opening something for the sake of opening something so we can tick a box that we've opened something, we've all got better things to do with our lives completely agree. There was never an indication or suggestion from my part that we should auto reappoint in any position, no matter what that position may be. But if everyone is happy with the current person, we really don't need to just start recycling everything from the beginning.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Thanks for that, Marie. Farzi, over to you.

FARZANEH BADIEI

Yeah. So I just wanted to say that communication-wise, actually, we discussed this in our procedure, Damon. I think we were supposed to send them personalized feedback, and I found that so

hard. And I think like for in the future, we have to think about. Andrea sent them an email saying that Chris was chosen. But I also like find it a little bit hard, but I think it's very important to think about how we can do it to give them feedback. I think it's good for the process and like for us as a group. So we should like think about how we can do that. And also like appoint somebody in charge of sending that feedback.

And so just one last thing. It's not just opening the process for reopening the process. We might be happy, but we might want to make ourselves happier. We want to have that potential. So I think that as Kathy also said, also like we have it's a usual practice that you open it every three years or every term but that's like if you don't want to do that, you don't have to. But if we say that we want to reopen the process, it does not mean necessarily that we are unhappy with the candidates.

We want to make that very clear because we had some difficulties during other meetings. You know, there was some perception that we have a problem with Chris, and we don't. We do give him feedback and you know, he's been like working on a few things, but it's not more than like pay attention to what we want and stuff like that.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Thank you for those comments. Okay. As I said, I'm going to have to close the queue. We're going a little bit over on the Board Seat 14. I took good notes and I think it was a really good discussion of

how we can improve our process with the main takeaway, start early and be on time for the schedule that we've developed. So love to have that discussion.

All right. So moving on, we have been approved for a Day Zero in now Bali, which is great. The agenda that we sort of developed at the leadership level was to cover review of reviews, the new gTLD programs, and then where we can find common ground and coordinate policy. But I wanted to open up the floor to any other topics that this group thinks we should cover at a day zero.

LORI SCHULMAN

Maybe that's a good time for a Board check-in. All right. Time these check-ins when we can. Yeah.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Michael, over to you.

MICHAEL GRAHAM

Well, I think we just identified another subject, Chair 14.

RAFIK DAMAK

Sorry, John. I'm not sure to get to what's suggested from Lori.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Lori, you want to kind of give a bit more color as to what you're getting at? I don't want to speak for you.

LORI SCHULMAN

No, well it's kind of both, but I'm brainstorming here. Number one, to check in with Chris. If Chris is there on Day Zero, which I presume he will be, maybe, whatever, if Chris is there, I think Chris should be part of a report to use every part of the Day Zero session.

Our last Day Zero, it was only the leaders. It was special invitees. It wasn't totally open. That's another thing you might want to think about. I mean the fact that it wasn't completely open, I didn't love. And I was the president of the IPC then. I mean, not to have everybody funded, although that would be ideal, but I don't think a closed Day Zero is super helpful. If there's a way to limit funding but open it to any member, I think is fair.

The other thing specifically regarding the Board, if Chris is there, I think that would be a good time to have a one-on-one conversation with Chris. Anybody can ask anything, an open moment with Chris, if he's willing, which hopefully you are. No. But to Michael's point though about the process, I think this is all part of the process. If you all recall, and Philippe and I, and -- anyway, bottom line is leaders from both sides, we, you know how this started, and I think it ended extraordinarily well, and I think we should be very proud of ourselves, okay?

There was a lot that we had to work through, and we worked through it enough that we have a candidate we feel good about, and who is serving another term. And I want to thank Chris specifically, because I saw a real difference, at least on the IPC side

to communicating in a really different way. And even to the point where, when we were at other international meetings, Chris took the time to talk to IPC members that were there. I don't know if he did the same on the NCSG side, but we asked. So he made himself available to us in a really positive way, and I do appreciate that.

In terms of the process, yes. I mean, we're six months in, so even if Chris is not there, I think on the agenda there should be a discussion about Chris. He can be in the room or not be in the room. It's open. It's recorded. But this is the time to think about how we want to be represented, understanding he's a neutral Board member, but it's a weighted neutral. I've always taken issue with that neutral, because quite frankly,

I understand that every ICANN Board member has a fiduciary duty to ICANN. That is absolutely true. But if you're sitting in a Seat 14, you're sitting in a Seat 14 for a reason, because you're going to be expected to look at issues from particular angles. Whether you vote on those issues that way, you don't have to. We know that. You have to vote what is in line with your fiduciary duty. But at the same time, weighting, and I do believe there should be some weight added to the interests of those who put you in the chair, right?

And I don't know that that has always been super clear, because there is a story that is told that every ICANN Board member is completely neutral. I think that's true to a limited extent, because almost every ICANN Board member there is put there by an interest, except for ones from NomCom. And it's not my place to

reform the whole Board, but I think it's important to understand that fiduciary duty doesn't necessarily mean abandoning the interests of those who put you in a seat. That's my point.

RAFIK DAMAK

Thanks, Lori. I want to respond to about two points. Day zero is open. It's open. It was, I think, always open, and there is remote participation.

BRUNA SANTOS

There wasn't remote participation?

RAFIK DAMAK

I remember participating. I was not there. Anyway, I think it's open. It's just maybe only there, because since it's day zero, we get, for those, we need to have travel support to be able to come early. The other point is, yeah, remote participation is there, so we don't have problem. I think what we are working on with John is about the meeting with the Board to have that one hour, because we don't want the same experience like in Istanbul, and so that's what we requested to have a meeting interaction with the Board, and Chris, he's in the room, so just a clarification here. And I believe we have a queue with Bruna and then Mason.

BRUNA SANTOS

Just coming back to Day Zero, can I take the floor? I'm sorry, Mason, I just saw you waving. I just thought we would rotate

between the two houses, and since Lori spoke, I thought it was okay for me to take the floor. Anyways, I'll be very quick, just about Day Zero. I think it would be nice to have a collective review of Chris's performance, closing the three years rounds. I don't know if we want that part public. If we don't want that part public, that can be a little bit of a discussion within the house, but I also thought it would be a good exercise to do a three-year review, feedback points, just a suggestion.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Okay. Mason.

MASON COLE

Thanks, John. Can we go to 3B, talk about the Board meeting? We're sort of covering that now already.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Absolutely, and I just wanted to mention I dropped the agenda into the chat. This is not carved in stone. It's just something that Rafik and I had kind of worked, and Mason and Philippe had looked at as well, so thanks.

MASON COLE

Okay, thanks, John. So, by the way, this is Mason Cole of the BC. The last time we had meaningful interaction with the Board, I believe, was when my last turn as CSG chair, and Julf was in the chair as NCSG chair, and we put together a pretty good briefing for

the Board. Julf and I cooperated really nicely on that, and it came off very well. The objection I think that we probably both had was we were the only two allowed in the room, and that was difficult. I don't want to borrow from the contracted parties, but I think they have better opportunities to interact with the Board at the contracted party summit than we do.

I would be in favor of opening the room to members, maybe not having everybody have the opportunity to speak just so it doesn't go off the rails, but at least have the Non-Contracted Party House in the room with the Board so that we can demonstrate that, in fact, there are other perspectives in the community that the Board deserves to hear.

In terms of the agenda itself, I think, John, that was very helpful that you put what the contracted parties covered during their time with the Board in there. I listened to the recording, and they did sort of a state of the industry report from their point of view. I think that could probably be helpful if we do the same. You know, I think if we had the opportunity to put together perspectives that the NCPH has on the true state of the industry and how we see things developing on multiple fronts, right? I mean, DNS abuse is very important to the CSG. The human rights impacts are very important for the NCSG. All those things are important to put on the table so the Board can see the perspective of the full community and not just one side of the community.

So I'm not sure who's going to be in the NCSG chair. I'll take over for CSG on July 1. So whomever that is, I look forward to cooperating on actually a very productive Day Zero and hopefully a very productive session with the Board. Okay. Thank you, John.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Thanks. We have one second because there's something in chat. So I didn't do a very good job of teeing up what the agenda for the Board meeting was. So as Mason mentioned at the contracted party summit, they get a pretty sizable chunk of time to provide what they, I think, termed as the state of the internet. So essentially advising the Board on what issues that they're seeing in their lives.

So I took the opportunity to put together sort of a state of the internet from the non-contracted parties house viewpoint. So I just wanted to answer the question Susan's question particularly. The agenda that I dropped into the chat was, again, not carved in stone, but what we came up with jointly amongst the leadership to provide a briefing to the Board. And so I'm now going to be quiet and turn it over to Julf who had some comments. Thanks.

JULF HELSINGUS

Thank you. And Julf speaking. Just want to sort of add to what Mason was saying that sort of last time we did it. One, we didn't really know what to expect and things were kind of thrown at us very quickly. So I think now that we sort of have more time to

prepare, what Mason is saying, having a properly prepared sort of briefing to the Board would be helpful.

But also I would also like us to turn it a little bit around because last time it was really, I think Mason and I felt we were being kind of questioned by the Board, but we had no opportunity to ask them anything. So maybe we should make sure we prepare that we also have a chance to then ask the Board how they feel about our issues.

RAFIK DAMAK

So just maybe a few points and clarification. First about Mason, it will be still me as chair of NCHG till Bali. So we'll work together for Day Zero. And I think we can announce that it will be after Bruna will take over as NCHG chair at the end of the Bali meeting and she will start working with you guys in the rotation.

The other point, I think as made clear by John, it's important to reiterate this agenda just really we wanted to, because we got the request, like when we communicate with Russ asking for the Day Zero and to have that interaction with the Board, the first question, what do you want to talk about? And so we just quickly come up with those topic, but I believe we need maybe to work out, maybe to shorten. T

he most important also what I shared with John and others, really we want to speak as Non-Contract Party House, not just we will try presenting NCHG view, because it's, I don't think that's the aim of such interaction. We want to talk as a house. So this is just, let's

say it's a straw person list, and then we can work out what we want really to share with the Board. That's all I wanted to clarify.

JOHN MCELWAIN

Okay. So I wanted to just pause. Chris, did you have something to say on this topic or do you need to go soon?

Okay, all right. I'll put you in the queue and just I'm going to have to close the queue down because I do want to give Chris some time to speak and I think we're running up on time here. So Ann, over to you.

ANNE AIKMAN-SCALESE

Thanks, John. It's Anne Aikman-Scalese with IPC and regarding the agenda that was pasted in the chat, I noticed that we have an item called structural review, ICANN structural review requirements, and I'm kind of anticipating that the answer to that might be, well, that's up to you, the community, and in your review of reviews, you're talking about doing that every 15 years.

Now there's been some concern expressed, Osvaldo knows a whole lot more about this than I do, but concern expressed regarding that time frame of 15 years, and I'm not sure what you mean by having this item on the agenda, but if it relates to the work thus far by review of reviews CCG, then I kind of get it, but I'm not sure. I think the answer would be, well, that's up to you in the community because you're doing the reviews of reviews CCG and you guys are

going to decide what you're recommending to the Board for structural review.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Yeah, and I think it would be the NCPH's view on what that structural review should look like or the outcome of it, but we're not at that granular level yet, and I'd love to get your feedback on that topic. So, Bruna, over to you.

BRUNA SANTOS

I'm just taking the opportunity that Michael lured us in. Just two things. It would be nice to include human rights on this list, perhaps, and artificial intelligence from the NCPH perspective. I don't think we have a shared perception of this topic in the house, so if we are to include this on the meeting, it would be nice to engage in conversations about that. Just these two points.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Absolutely. I mean, this is going to be a joint presentation, and there may be some topics that will be very, very short or ends up not even really being something that we want to cover. So, just as Rafik said, straw man. Okay, Chris, over to you, and I think we would also be going to your updates if you want to kind of like have any final comments on that and then any update. That'd be great.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay, I'll segue here. Well, okay, I will break it up into first commenting or replying to a couple of points here. On a very logistical level, I would certainly be keen to be part of the Day Zero event. It will likely be day three of the Board workshop, so as much as we can sort of schedule in advance, allow that to sort of integrate with Board ops and how they're planning the workshop so I can be in the workshop when I need to be and also joining you when possible.

There's a bit of an open question for me, and maybe it's for everyone to consider, is whether a sort of one-on-one, one-on-many discussion would be better before the meeting with the Board or subsequent to that. I can see arguments for both, but probably useful to be intentional about how we plan that. And yes, I mean, certainly the session with the Board, I think very interesting to hear people's views. I agree. I think you're saying it should be a two-way dialogue. We're very keen as the Board to be asked questions and to sort of be able to provide clarity or provide further expansion on our positions or decisions we've made. So please do come in with those.

And again, not to make decisions for the house here, it's certainly useful to have the position of the NCPH and sort of bring that. I would actually say it's also useful for the Board to understand the differences that exist within the house and that sort of need to be balanced and why those differences exist. I would encourage not to sort of whitewash things too much in terms of saying, okay, this is all clear and easy, when obviously this house is very complex and

has a lot of complicated positions and discussions to have. So that would be what I would say to that. Happy to continue on here if everyone's cool with that. Okay.

So basically, yeah, just an update here from what the Board's been doing, the workshop we had. The workshop obviously was a somewhat sad affair in that we lost Alan Barrett not even two weeks ago. And so that was something very unexpected for us. I'm not sure who here had a chance to work closely with him. As it happened, I did work quite closely with him in my first two years on the Board during the next round caucus.

So we were meeting really on occasion every week, certainly every two weeks. And he really was an exemplar as a Board member, sort of stepping out from his experience with the numbers community and really taking on that very name-centric work. So really a good example, a good inspiration in that sense, and very sorely missed. And so I wanted to note, just for everyone to be aware, there is a session on Wednesday at lunchtime in Memorial, and a chance for people to speak who knew him. I would encourage people to go along to that.

In looking at what we've been discussing recently, so I was having a conversation yesterday with Ann, actually, about the Organizational Effectiveness Committee, which I think many of you are aware I'm now chairing. It's been an interesting experience in that committee, because in many ways it's a committee that's in stasis a little. Its main remit, its primary remit, is in relation to

liaison for the Board to the review processes, and so a lot of that is on hold as we do the review of reviews.

The Board has been following that review of reviews very closely. The most recent OEC meeting, we actually had the three co-chairs of the CCG come and join us. That was after some discussions in the CCG meetings themselves about the Board position, and so we had them join, and I think had a really rich discussion there. Again, just one phase in the process. I think this is a community process. The Board is following with interest, but not looking to put our finger on the scales too much in that sense.

One thing that's been clear, and again from the discussion with Ann, Organizational Effectiveness Committee is probably not a good title for this committee. It implies a much broader discussion of organizational effectiveness, and we found this this year with a number of the newer Board members joining the committee, and I think having their expectations somewhat dashed in coming in into that. That in itself, though, has provided some really, that sparked for some really interesting discussions within the committee about how we as the Board are engaging with organizational effectiveness.

And I would want to link this a little bit to the letter that was sent on, I think it's May 6th, in relation to policy recommendations, and the timelines, the delays that have happened there, how that -- sorry, 25th, that's why I need the reading glasses. They're points that we're very much aware of.

I think we had a number of discussions this week in the workshop. We also have a working group in the Board that's now looking at efficiency of how the Board works, which I hope will sort of lead into that. We've had a number of discussions about improving the tools that we have in terms of dashboards, ways to be aware of where recommendations are at, what's happening in relation to each of those.

We have, I can report as of Sunday, passed the transfer policy and the IDN-PDP EPDP phase 2 recommendations. But both of those came with significant delays that were the subject of that letter, and very much on the Board's collective mind in terms of how we can ensure that those sort of delays happen much more rarely, when they do happen for reasons, that those reasons are very clearly conveyed to the community and there's an awareness of what's going on and how this is progressing.

The other point I would make, just in relation to going back to OEC in reviews and review of reviews, is the IPC communication or correspondence that came in in relation to the importance of a more holistic structural review. Again, this is something that the community will decide on, but it is useful to have that input, to have that understanding of where different constituencies and elements within the community sit on these positions and maintaining the awareness that this is a high priority for parts of the community and parts of this house, I think is really important for the community.

It's also important for the Board in thinking about how this is all going to develop post-CCG.

Moving on to a somewhat different thing, and this is news as of today, ICANN has made a \$1 million contribution to the IGF. Okay, not the reaction we were going for, Farzi. No, but there is information about this on the ICANN website. This is surplus from the operations fund and it came around through some unexpected twists of fate in relation to finances, but I think it's also important to note that this is a key moment for the IGF. We've come out of the WSIS+20, there was a considerable amount of community energy put into the WSIS+20 process, including in this house.

So I think it's very positive that there was this opportunity for ICANN to contribute to strengthening the IGF. The contribution is made with certain conditions, so ICANN is putting conditions on how it will be used remaining within ICANN's remit, but I think it is a very positive opportunity and I'm very supportive of the fact that ICANN has seized it and made that contribution.

The other sort of, I guess, key committee that I'm on and where there is certainly a great deal of interest is the Board risk committee. I think we're looking at the risks that ICANN as an organization, as a multi-stakeholder institution is facing and probably breaks down to two key areas, neither of which will be a surprise, one of which is geopolitics, the other is emerging technologies. On geopolitics, we're all, I think, acutely aware now

that some of the events that we see unfolding at a global scale affect issues of how we meet, where we meet.

We have moved the next meeting to Bali and I'm honestly in awe of the meetings team in being able to, for the second year in a row, make a last minute shift for a meeting of this size in the circumstances that we are in, but very glad and it was good to have the community's feedback that a virtual meeting was not the preferred option. I think we heard that very clearly in Mumbai and it was something that the Board was very keen to ensure that the community did have the opportunity to meet in person, particularly with very important processes underway and still unfolding there.

In terms of geopolitics, we also obviously have the plenipotentiary in the ITU coming up later this year and this is something that ICANN is paying quite close attention to. We can look at the WSIS+20 as a sort of important moment in sort of positively reinforcing the multi-stakeholder model, but I do think we still see in a lot of the ITU discussions, in some of those member state communications, there is skepticism or a preference for more governmental control and we may well see that play out in the discussions at plenipot in relation to things like internet-related public policy decisions, IDNs, even IPv6, the resolution 180, and how that develops I think is going to be quite interesting.

In terms of emerging technology, not to harp on about artificial intelligence, but I think we are seeing some development in how

we're discussing that and looking at that in quite distinct areas. I think from a Board fiduciary perspective of an organization, all organizations of this size are looking at how AI is used internally, is used by staff, and looking at the risks that attach to that. So I think we're sort of as a Board looking to ICANN org to really think this through, come through with a strategy, with principles, with guardrails, how this is going to be used.

At the same time, how AI affects the DNS, the technologies there, is very much an unfolding area of discussion, and we will have next, I think, or is it happening now, the discussion? Okay, well we can all go back and look at the recording. But yeah, so it's a good discussion coming on that.

And then I think the other point is in terms of is there a role for ICANN in all of this? We're seeing discussions now about the use of identifiers for AI agents. There have been a couple of proposals that are looking at using the DNS for that kind of a task. What does that mean for ICANN's role? Does ICANN need to be taking a more proactive awareness here?

I think ICANN traditionally, and I think I've heard it from parts of this house, is not going to be jumping into AI governance discussions in any lightweight way. But if there is a role, and if ICANN's role is going to be affected by a call to integrate the DNS into some AI governance models, that's something we need to be aware of, that the community needs to understand, and that we work through together.

So I think that's everything I wanted to update on. Obviously this week, between the SSAD recommendations, the DNS abuse PDP, and the review of reviews, there's a huge amount going on. Much of it, I think, is community work. The Board is engaged and involved, but as I say, not wanting to put our fingers on the scale too much there. But happy to answer questions or discuss any of this further.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Thanks. We're at time, so people might have to find you at a cocktail party or in the hallways or something like that.

LORI SCHULMAN

And maybe we can defer this to an IPC working session, but I think as the NCSG, it might be better addressed by the whole house rather than part of the house on these AI questions. I think it would be very smart of us if, between now and Bali, we could think about some joint statements or positions, because I may have a strong bias against AI. I'll just disclose that, which in my world is not common. I am very much a minority speaker in my universe.

But that being said for ICANN even think about using it at a staff level with the costs that are involved and the environmental impacts and all the rest of it, I think we do ourselves a disservice if we don't get ahead of how we feel as a house about these internally and where we would think we would to be in discussions externally. But again, I have personal biases against AI, and I fully disclose

them because I'm in a community that quite naturally supports. So I'll leave it there.

JOHN MCELWAINE

Thank you, Lori. And thanks, Chris, for coming out to the meeting. So we really appreciate it. Final words? I know we were going to do an AOB. We're past time. But do you want to say anything or take that up, Rafik?

RAFIK DAMAK

Yeah, I mean, I thought we would have some time, at least a few minutes to discuss about the GNSO chair election, but it seems we don't. If I understand correctly, you have a candidate you want to propose?

JOHN MCELWAINE

No.

RAFIK DAMAK

No? Okay. So let's resolve it. So if there is no, we don't have, I think, in our side at this moment. So yeah, maybe it's not an urgent matter. Thanks

JOHN MCELWAINE

Yeah, I think we should probably just talk amongst ourselves and then talk. You and I can talk or Mason and you and I can talk.

Thanks. All right. Well, that will do it. Thank you, everybody, for coming out. Thanks.

ANDREA GLANDON

Thank you. You can stop the recording.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]