
ICANN86 Seville | PF – GNSO: NCSG Membership Work Session
Thursday, June 11, 2026 – 14:45 to 16:00 CEST

ANDREA GLANDON

Hello, and welcome to the NCSG membership 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.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Everyone, let's start.

ANDREA GLANDON

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 directed. When speaking, please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a moderate pace. And I will now hand the floor over to Rafik. You may begin.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Thanks, Andrea, and thanks to everyone for making it for today's meeting. I think we are sorry for the sound. So, I want to thank

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.

everyone for joining. We had a few sessions this time at the Policy Forum for NCSG. This is to be the first one, really, for NCSG membership. And we have a few agenda items to go through. Basically, first is to try to hear about any highlights from this ICANN 86, to have some retrospective, and to get some updates about the different topics, such as the DNS Abuse SSAD session, also from the Council meeting and our joint sessions that we had with the SSAC, with CPH, and with CSG. After, I would like to share some ideas to help us in terms of planning and strategy of NCSG within ICANN, how we can prioritize and influence process. And last, we'll have a presentation, I think from Jan later on, about multi-stakeholder global governance. So this is our agenda for today.

With that, I guess we can start with the first or second agenda item, which is here, highlights of ICANN 86 and a retrospective. Let me share my screen. One sec. Sorry, some technical issue on my side. Okay. Just to explain, the idea here is, since we are at the last days, really to kind of recap or wrap up what was discussed and to hear from those who attended the session. And not just to get some updates, but really to think in terms of next action, follow-up, how we can do better, what we should do next. Okay. Oh, sorry. To start with DNS and SSAD session. And so I will want to ask those who are representatives there or who attended if they can share any points of concern or highlights that we should be aware of, and if there is any discussion about next steps. Yeah. Okay. Yeah. Please go ahead.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO

Hello. Michaela, for the record. I'll join the Zoom shortly, sorry. There's been a lot of movement on the PDP this week. I think, trying to think high level, to give some background for folks. So we have, between the NCSG and NPOC and NCUC, we each have two representative members, voting members, who are in the room. And so, those of us who are here physically here, like Yao and I, have been coordinating quite a bit. We have weekly check-ins on where we want to go with the policy development process. So up until this week, we were basically taking a charter question week by week. Then at this stage, based on the preliminary recommendations collated from all the different constituency groups, we got to the point where there are straw man proposals, so initial draft language put forward by ICANN staff on every single one of the questions.

The ones that we were most focused on as NCSG, NCUC, and NPOC were around the scope of the investigation for when it comes to an associated domain check. Maybe as a reminder for folks who aren't in the weeds as much on this topic, the idea is to try to develop a requirement for if a registrar sees a domain where there's evidence that it's being used in a malicious way, that they are then required to look at other domains that are associated with it. That term is still to be defined, but that they are required to look at that as a means of trying to stop a potentially pervasive issue. And from our perspective, we're concerned that this check could become a tool for collecting even more data about the registrant than maybe is

necessary for the intended outcome. So that kind of alludes to the concerns that we had around how broad of an investigation this should be. We want it to be narrow, and how can we get language around that, that kind of constrains a little, puts some kind of check and balance into the equation, because otherwise we don't want it to be a free-for-all, collect whatever information you want and just go your merry way, while also still acknowledging that we do want to be able to prevent bad actors from using domains in a way that is dangerous for folks in this space and beyond.

So I guess just to say where we are now, there's draft language on all the different elements there. But I think the last one that's still to be negotiated is how we measure success of this policy. So when it comes to that, we would like to see something not just like number of takedowns or amount of abuse being reduced per se, because that might not be a good reflection of a good policy. We would like to see that it's measured, that it is actually addressing the abuse at hand, while also not overly taking down domains that are, quote-unquote, "good" and being used for good. So I've talked a lot there. I can delve into more specifics as is of interest in the room. But maybe, if you don't mind, Yao, could I ask if you want to come in? Because you had a lot of great contributions this week and earlier.

YAO SOSSOU

Thank you very much. Yao speaking for the record. Yeah, I think, Michaela, you kind of already mentioned everything we've

discussed so far. But just to comment on the fact that we still have a lot of homework to do on our side in terms of aligning with other constituencies on key language for the preliminary recommendations, which we hope we'll do this week before our next meeting. But I think one key takeaway for us, where we stand when it comes to the registry and registrar performing the ADC and the domain check, is that we really want, at a point, to make sure that, as Michaela mentioned, it's not like a full audit that is done every time. It should be very narrowly scoped based on what they want the domain to be. The investigation they are performing should be very narrowly scoped. And we want to tell them we don't want this to be forcing them to have additional data collected every time they perform those ADCs. So minimizing the data collection and avoiding giving surveillance power to registrars for performing this ADC and domain check. So that's basically what I want to add to this. Thank you.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO

And just a quick follow-up kind of bouncing off of that. I think what could be helpful also for folks to know is, at this stage, we've actually been quite pleasantly and nicely aligned with a lot of the registrars. I think that's been a really net positive. And we met with the Contracted Party House yesterday, and I think there were a lot of positive developments there. I think they understand the need to have some kind of parameters and safeguards there. We might not get the exact language we want in the way that we've proposed it, but I think there's been a lot of alternative language proposed

that will kind of get us to the same endpoint. So I can go through all the slides and all the changes, but honestly, I haven't had a chance to go through all my notes. But just to say, even though you might not see the exact language that we had originally proposed, I still think that we've won on a lot of the substantive elements there in terms of putting some curbs and a recognition that there does need to be some kind of, I guess, yeah, curbs put around this so it's not just, again, like anything goes, it's free-for-all. And still accomplishing what the GAC and the registries and the BC really want, which is, of course, that this be a robust kind of safeguard for registrants and a way to stop more malicious domains from being out there. So I hope that's helpful, but happy to take questions or comments on anything I've missed.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thanks, Michaela. So I think also maybe let's cover yesterday's discussion with the Contracted Party House, and I think you mentioned that. So it seems that you are already working on some language, and we shared some suggestions. But I understand that there are several sessions, and so that means some progress for the working group. I'm not sure if you can share more what are kind of the plan here, next steps. And also because the timeline seems quite, I mean, not going to say aggressive, but there should be something by maybe next ICANN meeting, or...

MICHAELA SHAPIRO

Yep. Michaela for the record. Yes. So in the next few weeks even, and between now and the next ICANN meeting, I believe we'll be really workshopping the language. So now that we've already done some edits to initial language, I think they're going to try to start collating all of it, have us look, and really hone in on the specific language and make sure that every comma, everything is dotted, or our I's and T's and whatever are there. And that's how I understand it. I'm struggling to remember the exact timeline, but yes, my sense is there should be something even available for public comment by something like February, March of next year. But I can drop in the chat the exact dates.

Yes, so the next steps will really be finishing up the language, reviewing the language on the metrics for evaluating a successful policy, and also what will go, I guess this is the other element too that was a tricky bit for us, what should go in the actual policy versus guidance versus what is an obligation that compliance will use to hold contracted parties to, versus what are explanatory notes that are not necessarily enforceable by ICANN compliance. And we've had to give in some ways, but also we've gotten some more explanation on the terms that are there, that then if it's a note, it will be, as far as I understand, and lawyers in the room correct me, but if it's an explanatory note in the policy, something like how do we define proportionality, that is something that ICANN can enforce. But if it's in the advisory or recommendations, those are not binding in the same way. Or no, sorry, the recommendations are not, but advisory that comes from ICANN

compliance, that is binding, if I understood correctly. Anyway, all that's to say, there's a lot more next steps to come, but yeah, we should have something soon.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay, thanks. So you meant first that now you're working about the metrics, that's what you said, the metrics, and then implementation guidance, advisory. But with regard to the policy recommendations themselves, starting to draft, that's not yet? You're not working yet on that?

MICHAELA SHAPIRO

Sorry, what was the last part?

RAFIK DAMMAK

Policy recommendations. That's really what will be approved and that will be later implemented as consensus policy, because all the rest, they are kind of, let's say, supporting the policy recommendations. Implementation guidance, as it says, gives guidance how to implement. But the policy itself, the substance, is in the policy recommendations. That's what goes through the consensus call to be approved and so on. So when that will be, if we have the first draft initial report, you mean it will be in February. So that's the timeline, and by that time we will have them. So you're not working yet on those.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO

Michaela, for the record. Yeah. Oh, sorry. Go ahead, Yao.

YAO SOSSOU

Yeah, sorry. Yao speaking for the record. I think in terms of the preliminary, right now, we are at the preliminary report space, and after this, still collecting input from other constituencies and the members of the working group. And by, I think, I believe it's February, beginning of January or February, the timeline, we can also share the timeline, when we will have actually the draft recommendation. And after that, the committee will have input through the public comments, and then we have the final draft somewhere.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO

No, just to say, I think maybe I made it more confusing. We've been talking about the implementation guidance and the potential things that could go in the advisory, but this is what we've been negotiating, the responses to the charter questions. Is that what you were trying to get at? Sorry. Because that language is language we have been working on.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Yeah. In terms of the process, you have the charter questions, you respond to them, but the main outcome we are looking for are the policy recommendations. There are a lot of things around implementation guidance, but also the explanation, the background, there can be some annex and a lot of things. But even

if we vote for a final report, really the main substance is the policy recommendations, because those are what will be the reference and that's what will be implemented. All other parts of the report are to give the background, to help for implementation, people can interpret, and that will help a lot. And so then when the GNSO Council will give guidance and so on. So, yeah.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO

Michaela, for the record. No, if I understood correctly, yes, that's exactly what we've been working on. We've been responding to the charter questions, and my understanding is those will then be the policy recommendations. So we have been working on that, and I just pulled up my presentation from yesterday to double-check. And again, maybe things will shift, but the plan now is all the deliberations on the charter questions will be completed by November of this year. So I think we'll probably be using some of the time in Bali, but in theory, by the end of the next ICANN meeting, we'll have something. The draft will be published in February with a deadline for public comment in May 2027. So I guess they're trying to time again to have another meeting in the middle for people to discuss before the public comment is due.

RAFIK DAMMAK

I think usually in terms of process, if you publish in February, it means the working group won't have to-do list. You have to wait till you get the public comment and the summary and start to review, to respond, to check the comments to see what changes you can

do in the report. And after that, it will be the final report and go through that process for the consensus call. So, okay. It's quite still an aggressive timeline because it means you will finish within one year to deliver the policy recommendations. Okay. So that's good to share more about the process and people understand what we can expect. But in terms of next steps or action, what do you expect as a group, maybe Michaela and Yao, to pay attention and to follow up?

YAO SOSSOU

Yeah, I think, so Yao speaking for the record. In terms of next step, we are still going to work as we try, as a group. Michaela is guiding us very well in that, trying to see our position in terms of defining the different language that is problematic right now with the other participant working groups. And I think from there, we just send again our inputs, and yeah, next step will follow from there. And if we also need, we will send to the mailing list anything we want the broader community to contribute to.

RAFIK DAMMAK

So let's see if there is any question from the audience, also from Zoom. Okay. So I think we covered the DNS Abuse Working Group. For SSID, the challenge... Yeah, Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN

Yes. Hi. Thanks. I typed my question in the chat. Just basically, I wanted to know if ICANN compliance had shown their hand at all. I

realize it's premature yet, but how are they going to judge proportionality if it's up to them to judge?

MICHAELA SHAPIRO

Michaela. Thanks, Stephanie, for the question. Yeah. And I responded also in the chat, but as far as I'm aware, I don't know if there's a definition that they've put out there from ICANN compliance. That being said, that's why we're quite pleased that at least in the working group discussion today, people seem to be in agreement that we need to have somewhere from the working group, we need to put out a definition of proportionality. So if you have thoughts or a good definition that you think would be helpful that you'd want to see us put forward as an idea for how to define that, and whether that goes in the guidance, glossary. Right now, there's a glossary section of the PDP so far that we've been developing, so we might also advocate for proportionality to go in there. So anyway, there's a few, what's the word? There's a few pathways we could go down to try to have a definition that we could try to get ICANN compliance to use. But it's also a good question, and maybe worth also, we could raise this with the working group, that there's a need to ask ICANN compliance about how they define that term.

STEPHANIE PERRIN

Well, I must confess, Stephanie Perrin, for the record, I've been slacking off. I haven't been following this work as closely as I should have. I think you guys are doing a tremendous job, so I felt it wasn't

necessary. But I do worry about ICANN compliance actually getting a hold of something without adequate policy guidance, and that definition might be key. So I think it might be a good idea to have a look at all the different approaches to proportionality that the European Data Protection Supervisor has taken to the interpretation of the word, and sort of do some homework prior to getting ambushed in a meeting when we get around to implementation. So I don't mind doing some of that. I'd already done some work on that for another project. And hopefully, I'll come back to you with a suggestion. But it's certainly something that's key and ought to be researched. Thank you, and congratulations. Great work, you guys.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Thanks, Stephanie. For SSID, the challenge is that there is a session right now going on, and so I think most of our representatives are there. But let me check if anyone wants to share anything from SSID. Want to volunteer, Pedro? Yeah, please go ahead.

PEDRO DE PERDIGÃO LANA

I am not following the SSID work. All of our guys are in the SSID session.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Yeah. That's why I'm checking if someone even is with us, but he can share anything. But if not, we can move to the next agenda item. And it's about Council meetings. It's basically two or one.

Yeah, two. And if there are any topics of interest or concern that we should be aware of, we have to follow up. Not talking here about what was voted, because that's already done. But if anything that's going on, there will be some follow-up that we'll have to work on.

Checking, going around to see about our GNSO Council. We don't have here other than Julf, if you can share anything. No? Okay. Okay. I put some notes there, but I don't think I will develop a lot. I think one of the issues that was discussed at length, it's about two. First, about that letter, informal letter from or to the GAC, I think that was discussed. And a lot of concerns were raised there. The other is about the prioritization, which is more procedure, but at the end, it's important because that's how we can decide what should be developed first as policy and where we will put our resources and attention. And that's something still being discussed. But I cannot recall other topics that were discussed at the Council. So checking, going around if anyone wants to share anything. Okay.

PEDRO DE PERDIGÃO LANA

Rafik? I just had a question, I think.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Yes.

PEDRO DE PERDIGÃO LANA

Just Julf.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Can you speak close to the mic? I cannot hear you.

PEDRO DE PERDIGÃO LANA

Sorry for that. But Pedro Lana, for the record, just considering the prioritization process...

RAFIK DAMMAK

Sorry. Can you speak close? I cannot hear you in front.

PEDRO DE PERDIGÃO LANA

There we go. Pedro Lana, for the record. Just a question to you considering the prioritization process that is going on at the Council right now. When will NCSG start talking generally about the policy priorities that will be pointed out? If you can, I don't know how on priority to it, but explain the process.

JULF HELSINGIUS

Sorry, I will give you.

PEDRO DE PERDIGÃO LANA

I think now it's a little better. Yeah. Just about the prioritization process that is going through the GNSO Council. If you could explain a little bit how it's going to work, because I got the first steps back then, but I don't know how it ended up being finalized, and when will the choice of policy topics be done within the NCSG?

JULF HELSINGIUS

We should really have Tapani here because he's really been looking into that process very intricately, because what the Council was trying to come up with was some sort of mechanism where they could rank the priorities. And of course, there were lots of proposals for very simplified numerical rankings. And Tapani did a great job on our part of pointing out all the ways it could be manipulated. And he has been trying to come up with a much more transparent and open system where we can actually see the actual rankings different people give and discuss them and then arrive at the result. And it's still being processed. And I think one of the problems is that the mathematics aren't entirely trivial, and it seems also some policy people aren't very good at mathematics. But fortunately, we do have Tapani on our side there, so he's the guy to talk to if you really want to know the intricate details.

PEDRO DE PERDIGÃO LANA

Perfect. So it's not finished yet, right? It's still ongoing. Perfect. That's my question.

JULF HELSINGIUS

Yeah, it's still being worked on. There are some discussions about how to do it most efficiently.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay, thanks, Julf. Yeah, I think it's still under discussion, and I think one of what was shared is that maybe they have a pilot or

experiment to see how it works. It's not the first attempt, I believe, from the GNSO Council in how to prioritize, because there are a lot of to-dos. We can visualize the work with that, what we call the ADR. But it's deciding what to work on first, where to put all the resources, because it's not just about ICANN resources, but the community attention and limited resources on it has big impact. And that's the whole point about, you cannot just use some mathematics and say that it's objective. It's not, because there is always risk of gaming, and that's why we need to have more discussion and to decide. But we'll see how things will go. Yeah. Okay, anything other about the Council?

Okay. If not, we can move to the next. We have the joint session with SSAC, the Contracted Party House, and with the CSG. So I can start maybe with the Non-Contracted Party House, because we didn't really discuss substance, policy. It was more about some... It's important to explain about the context, because for many years, we are trying, but I think we are making a lot of progress in how to improve our relation with the CSG since we are in the same house. And then we know that in policy, we have some agreement, few topics, but we don't have in many. But we still have to select who will be in board seat 14, and also about the GNSO chair election and who we put as a vice chair and so on.

So we discussed first about board seat 14 since we already appointed this year Chris Buckridge for a second term. And what happened is that we followed the new procedure that was agreed, I think, last year based on the experience we had in previous

election that it didn't go, I'm not going to say it didn't go well. We took time, and we had really to appoint the new board member quite late after the deadline. And so based on that experience, we decided that we need to agree on some procedure, some process to follow, and we had a small team. So that process was put in practice, but we experimented for this time. I think it worked as expected. What is more a point of contention is about if we are happy, the idea is if you are happy with the incumbent, should you open the process for other applicants or candidates and go through the round of interview and selection and so on? From NCSG, we were keen to open, to have a pool of candidates that we can go through and to see how much interest there is, while on the CSG side, they were more, if we are happy with the incumbent, why should we go through that process? I don't think we are agreeing, or we are saying that we will review the process, but I do believe we still have to do proper retrospective and see the learnings and see what we can do on that front to make improvement, to add more clarification. And if we want to do it, it should be done in the next year or after, because in fact, the process for the selection will start within two years. So I do believe it's quite close, so it's better to agree on that.

The other topic was about Day Zero. Day Zero is something now we have, it will be the third time, I believe. Previously, a long time ago, we had intersessional meetings, but that's not the case for several years. And so we decided to have this Day Zero before the AGM every year for NCPH, so we can go through several topics during the

day and we try to discuss policy, some administrative matters, and also to request a meeting with the Board. That meeting with the Board doesn't replace our usual joint session, either NCSG with the Board or CSG with the Board, but we want to meet with the Board as a Non-Contracted Party House to share our position as a house. So that's the attempt. Previously, the interaction, if we can call it that, was more the chairs of the CSG and NCSG going to a session in front of the Board and sharing mostly a briefing. I don't think that's what we want. It's more like we want to open more, so others can join. Doesn't mean they necessarily can talk or speak, but at least to be more open and to have more interaction. And the goal is really to share with the Board what we are working on as a house, how we are trying to improve our relation, and also, in some area of policy, what we have in common. Even if there are some disagreements, we can try to work on some common ground. So that's basically the topics we discussed. Nothing about policy, but for the possible meeting with the Board, we have the draft list of topics. But I don't believe we agree on all, and not sure that we can have a common position on all. So that needs to be worked out prior to Day Zero. So that's something I have to work on with the next CSG chair, because just for information, the CSG, they have rotation in chair every six months. So next will be Mason from the BC. And I see that Stephanie is in the queue. I will stop here and see if she has any question or comment. Yes, Stephanie, please go ahead.

STEPHANIE PERRIN

Thank you very much. Stephanie Perrin for the record. As some may be aware, I've been on the NomCom for the past year, and that has, of course, caused me to do quite a bit of thinking about the Board and what we look for on the Board. And I'm wondering if it would be a good idea, as we think about board seat 14 and our relationship with the Non-Contracted Party House, if we put it in the scope of a broader conversation of what we expect the ICANN Board to be doing, how we feel about the composition and balance of the Board, how we feel about the structures for populating the Board, regional balance, all of those kind of tricky issues. Because I'm not satisfied that we have a... And don't get me wrong, I think there's been tremendous work done cleaning up practices since the NomCom review on the NomCom. And I'm sure James has a more mature view of this whole thing. But I'm wondering if we shouldn't have a broader discussion on what does civil society think the Board should look like, the role should be, the composition should be, et cetera, and the talent pool should be. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thanks, Stephanie. If there is any comment on this or... Yeah, maybe just a quick comment. Yeah, it's a question every year if we can input or share with the NomCom what our expectation is in terms of candidates who should be appointed. But I don't think we had a chance this time, or maybe there was. I think, yeah, there was

this time, and I believe we responded. But is it enough? I'm not sure. I see that Pedro wanted to add something.

PEDRO DE PERDIGÃO LANA

Yeah. Pedro Lana for the record. Just a small comment. Can you hear me? There we go. I think it's a good discussion to bring to the mailing list, because it's hard to think about the criteria on the fly. So maybe still... Oh, too loud now. It's a good discussion to bring on the mailing list. Hard to think that on the fly. And I don't remember, did we do that this year? Thinking about criteria of what the NCSG would think is important for the Board members? Because I think you mentioned that.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Yeah, there was some input this year, I think. I think we submitted, but Yao, you wanted to add something?

YAO SOSSOU

Thank you very much, Rafik. Yao speaking for the record. I think regarding the process of how seat 14 was filled, I was generally happy about how it went, generally speaking, but not happy about the end result we got because we had some huge candidates we were really leaning to as NCSG to get selected, but in the end, we had to align with the CSG for the candidate. So I think I agree we should try to come up with our own set of criteria and put it into discussion now with them, so in the end, they know this clearly where we stand. This is what we are willing to have to do and to

compromise on right now, so we get ready for that. Regarding the regional representation on the Board, I just have one question. Do we have a say in that, or is the ICANN Bylaws setting that already? If not, is there anything we can do to influence that somehow? Okay. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thanks, Yao. Yeah, Stephanie? Is it an old or new hand?

STEPHANIE PERRIN

It's a new hand. Stephanie Perrin for the record. Just responding to Pedro. It is in the bylaws. We had a chance during the NomCom review. This is a long-term goal. If you want to influence modernizing and turning that Board into something that actually reflects broader civil society interests, I would suspect it's going to take years. But if we don't formalize our feelings on it and make it a priority, all we've done really on this, in my opinion, maybe I missed something because I haven't been participating physically for the last few years, all we've done is shout for more seats. What we really ought to be shouting for is looking at the criteria that are being used to evaluate applications for the Board, in my opinion. And I've seen a lot of wooden-head boards. And the average corporate board, from which Board selections are made, they have a much narrower remit, and they don't have to figure out the public interest, which is what ICANN is purporting to do. So I think it behooves us to talk about it, talk about it often, and align our

thoughts and start publishing on our website a paper of what we think ought to be there. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thanks, Stephanie. Yeah, there was the NomCom review, long process. We raised many times the number of seats in the NomCom, but were not successful. So it really will take time. Maybe when we will have the structural review, maybe we'll bring that topic again. But all this is really long-term, so probably not going to happen soon.

Okay. If there is nothing else to add here, we can finish with the NCPH meeting. Maybe we can cover quickly about the SSAC and the Contracted Party House. So for SSAC, they asked us to explain about the human rights impact assessment. So we expected it would take maybe 30 minutes or 45, but took most of the session. As Farzaneh presented, she took some examples, and she included authentication and authorization, and we got some reaction, various reactions, from the members of the SSAC. I do believe it was a good opportunity to hear from them, and we can use that input for next time to rework our proposal to go in more details and explanation. But I think there is some support from some members. They can understand our concern. We particularly discussed authentication. We spent quite some time there. There was a question about data. So in general, I think it was positive. I won't take some of the reaction as negative. That's fine. I think that people expressed some concern or raised questions. And one of the

outcomes is that we got maybe a request, a kind of follow-up, maybe they can pick up or we can pick up one advisory and do the human rights impact assessment, kind of to the whole process, and show in practice how it works and how we can come up from such exercise with the SSAC.

Other than that, they talked about the technical series. So the SSAC had that with the ICPCP. The ICPCP shared with them some topics, and SSAC brought some of their experts to explain different issues to the ICPCP membership. So it was a suggestion if we would be interested to have something similar. I think that's fine. We can select some topics, and we can hear them from a technical perspective, and that would be helpful for us to hear more from SSAC, and we can share our thoughts. The whole point of the interaction with SSAC, we know that they are supposed to be technical, but we should not forget they are a group of individuals, so there is diversity of opinion. And some, they are working more on cybersecurity and so on. So they have different perspectives from us. And my aim was always to have those more regular meetings with them, to share with the SSAC what we are working on, try to understand what they are doing, and to see how we can collaborate in some area. Doesn't mean we'll agree on everything, but that's not the goal here. But if we can find some common area, that will be good for us. And I hope we will have a session next time. And we need to work more in terms of the topics or what we can share with them. Okay. Any question or comment on this?

Okay. Other than that, for the Contracted Party House, what I can say, it was short. I'm not sure how to read that. Either we are in violent agreement on everything, or it's just because also people, we went through this topic many times, like DNS Abuse. But I think, maybe Michaela, I believe you shared, from our perspective, some of the language we proposed, and we got some feedback, some advice maybe, and to work some of those suggestions. I think that was helpful. Yeah. Yeah, please go ahead.

MICHAELA SHAPIRO

Yeah. Michaela, for the record. My read on that was, I'm aware a lot of the contracted parties now are very focused on the new gTLD process, and I wonder if that's why maybe there wasn't more substantive discussion on other elements. And I also, to the point earlier about a lot of conflicting sessions, I think there were a few other conflicts with that session too. But there was clearly a lot of interest in the ADC portion. People were vocal, and there was a lot of discussion. So I wonder if thinking about kind of the advice or best practices going forward, like a lesson learned for me was, I think when we put out the topic and we want to have a more robust discussion, having something prepared ahead of time, like something to respond to, I found that quite helpful. Even if there was pushback, that at least got the conversation going, and it allowed us to better understand where they were coming from. I felt like otherwise, their contribution initially was just very high level, and I think that's where we've been for the most part, which is not necessarily a bad thing, but now that we have a very specific

topic to work on, that's something that I'm also very happy to commit to doing in future sessions when it comes particularly to the PDP. Like, "Here's language that we're workshopping. We'd love to get your thoughts on why this may or may not work from your perspective." I'm trying to think. I think those were the main kind of learnings for me. But also, I think the other element too was the PDP discussions were ongoing, and our meeting with CPH happened to just be right before our last session of the PDP, which was today, the last in-person one for this ICANN. So, yeah, I think it was good timing. It allowed us to respond quite quickly as the discussions were evolving. So that's also not something necessarily we can control every time, but having the CPH session in some ways kind of in the middle when the discussions for the PDP are still ongoing, I've personally found that very helpful so we could bring things back live. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Thanks, Michaela. Yeah, I think getting feedback or input, even if, like I said, pushback, I think it's fine. We want to hear, to understand, and to work on this, because at the end, it helps you later in the working group to advocate for some of the positions. And kind of here is what you said about the conflict, and that's what I put at the end. The challenge this time was the scheduling. A lot of conflicts. Even we had to move things, and we canceled meetings. I worked with Andrea, and it was a big challenge. Why this time is because there were all those SSID and DNS Abuse sessions, like five or four for each, which made it impossible to

meet internally. So that's the challenge, that you have to work on those topics, but you don't also have the time or the opportunity to meet internally and prepare. And moving back to the joint session, I think we have to work more. It's more preparation. I think we prepared our presentation, like slides, et cetera, to help steer the discussion, but still we have to do more in terms of preparing for each. So we don't need more sessions, but to be more ready and work together in how we can move forward. It's not just about the agenda or selecting. That's just one part. But after that, how we can do preparation. That's an aspirational goal, but it has to be done to be successful next time. So, okay, if there is no question or comment, I can move to the next slide, and then we try to finish quickly so we can move to the last agenda item to give more time. Okay, maybe before moving... Yes, Stephanie, what do you want to add?

STEPHANIE PERRIN

Stephanie Perrin for the record, and I'm sorry to hold us up, but I just want to raise an issue that has me very concerned lately, and this is a bit of a tangent. On the customer authentication front, it's an area where we ought to have common cause with the Contracted Party House because there will be pressure to authenticate consumers on, well, it's already there in the fintech industry. It's being taken over by the banks and the big data monger players that are already doing anti-terrorist financing checks for the banks and for the existing financial services. But as this maps out, it's going to be broader. Plus, governments,

including my own in Canada, are bringing in requirements for authenticated identity for children so that they can't get onto social media. So I think those are warning flags. We do not want this kind of authentication going into customer ID in the DNS. And we should make sure we have a common position with the contracted parties who probably don't want to have to pay for it. It's a growing industry. Lots of money there. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Thanks, Stephanie. Okay, moving to the next agenda item. I'm sorry, I'm not a PowerPoint or slide deck person, so I just prepared something. And I wanted here just to... It's an idea that came up to me lately, and I wanted to share to see how we can work on this. So just to set the scene, and what I mean here, how to impact ICANN planning. Soon, the process will start about the ICANN budget and operating plan. And it might be even late for us to think about this, because a lot of work probably has started to be done by the different teams in ICANN. And why am I bringing this topic about the budget? Because the budget practically sets the priority for ICANN with regard to funding and resources. So if you don't have those, you can raise whatever you want; things are not going to be moved. It means also impacting policy work. In terms of process, and we had previously an explanation from the ICANN Planning and Finance team about the process that starts from July and continues around December when they have the draft budget and there is the public consultation. We tried lately to submit our comment, but I do believe, based on the experience, that we are

sharing our input at quite a late stage. Because again, as I shared in the beginning, a lot is shaped by the GNSO policy team or the policy team in general at ICANN. They work with the finance team to kind of see what are the policy work that will be planned for the next fiscal year. So my take here is, and that's a discussion I started with Russ, the policy vice president, how we can work together to input our concerns. And here, a lot about securing independent studies and funding for working groups to bring external and independent experts. Other than the annual budget, there is also the five-year strategic plan, which sets the long-term goals and priorities for ICANN. It's another process. We are not participating effectively on that, and it has some impact.

So just here, kind of the background, what I'm proposing, and again, straw person document or proposal. First is we have to work with the GNSO policy team to input at an earlier stage. So something I'm taking here as action. I will work with Russ, and I will work within NCSG to list all our, what we think is priority for us. What kind of requests? We want independent studies for which PDP? Do we think we need some independent and external expert? Do we need something? Do we need the training? Do we need capacity building? I don't know. But we make the list and discuss with them from now on, so they can factor that into the budget they will share with the finance and planning team. On the other hand, the GNSO Council previously had a committee to work on budget, but we don't have that. But still, for GNSO Council, they need also to work on that. And here we need to coordinate at the Council

level or GNSO level to secure resources for PDP and policy work. So something we need maybe our Councilors to help us and to pay attention to.

The last, and here it's more like how we can support these activities. I'm not suggesting creating another committee, but at least to have a vehicle in NCSG that can help to coordinate all this kind of effort, like for the budget, for the planning, for prioritization, for strategy, and so on, instead of just taking things separately. And for that, I'm proposing to have a kind of working group that comprises members of the NCSG Financial Committee, from the Council, because they are at the GNSO Council and they are following the policy work, and other NCSG members who are interested to join that effort. And we coordinate with the Policy Committee. It's just some space, doesn't need to be a working group, whatever vehicle, to help us do planning and prioritization. So we tried last time, so we should repeat, but this kind of more inclusive, to make a list of all the topics, areas, things we want to work on, and to secure the budget. Coordinate with the GNSO policy team. That's my role, and I will work with Russ on that. And I will use the taboo word "strategy," but draft NCSG strategy and all the requests. Here, we should not say we want independent studies. We want to go into more detail about what we want, what we want to achieve, because they don't necessarily understand what we are requesting. And last is this group is to help draft a comment for the public consultation. Here, the point is to have this committee, group, or whatever to help with planning, to help with

strategy and for those activities. We can add to the scope, but this is my proposal in a way to help, not just count on one Finance Committee or to count just on the Policy Committee, but to have this to help us as NCSG, but also constituencies, to plan, to prioritize, to set our goals, what we want to achieve, and to secure the resources to do so. So this is the idea. I'm looking forward to any comment, suggestion, or if you have any concern, you can tell me too.

Okay. Probably we need to follow up with the NCSG list, but here at least sharing during the meeting, so I can go into more details and share with NCSG later on. But again, we have to start soon because trying to submit or asking for change in December is quite late. They can make some changes, but not drastic changes. And I will also try to engage with the finance and planning team, but they would prefer that we discuss more with the GNSO policy team. Okay. With that, we can move to the last agenda item, and that's with our guest, Jan. Jan reached out to me and asked if he can have some time, 10 minutes, to introduce some project related to the multi-stakeholder model and to explain it. And so here we are. So Jan, you've got 10 minutes. Yeah.

JAN AART SCHOLTE

That would help. Yeah. Shows you how well I've socialized. Good. Thank you, Rafik. Thanks to the rest of you, too, for being here at the very end. I want to, at the very end, maybe get out of the weeds and take you to a bigger picture of things. Some of you may know

me as someone who was around in the IANA transition as an accountability advisor to ICANN. Then I disappeared for a couple of years, then I came back and did a study on legitimacy at ICANN, and then I disappeared a couple of years and did work on the RIRs, and I guess I'm just infected with this place, so I just come back again. So I just wanted to let you know a little bit of what I'm doing at the moment together with the team. So it's partly for information, it's partly for transparency, he says. So when I'm sitting in a meeting taking notes, you know what I'm doing.

So this is a project that is funded by the Dutch Research Council. I'm now at Leiden University in the Netherlands, and with three others. Marten de Jonge, you may remember from other previous work that we've done with ICANN. We're busy during these four years looking at the capacity, effectiveness, and legitimacy of multi-stakeholder global governance, hence MGG. I don't need to tell you what multi-stakeholder global governance is, but just for the sake of it, as a design, it's an interesting way of doing the governance of global problems. The conventional way is to bring governments together, and that goes back 150 years and more. Early in the 20th century, you get the first multi-stakeholder global governance arrangements at the ILO and the International Organization for Standardization in the 1940s. But in the 1990s, there's this great proliferation of multi-stakeholder global governance. So bringing together not governments, but bringing together people who represent different stakeholders, so actors who have a stake in a problem. It also differs from private global

governance, where you just have a trade association or you have people coming from the private sector alone. So in the financial markets, for example, you see a lot of private global governance. The International Capital Markets Association, the International Organization of Securities Commissions, Derivatives Policy Group, and et cetera. Lots of bodies that you've never heard of, but it's just to say you can do things in a non-governmental way, in a purely market-led way.

If you look at this historically, then the dark line in the middle is the multilateral, intergovernmental, formal, treaty-based way of dealing with global problems. And you can see that in 1970, there were already some 200 multilateral global bodies. Then they continued to increase till the mid-1990s, and then you see that the line flattens out. So global problems don't decrease. On the contrary, they exponentially increase since the 1990s. But the multilateral response is kind of dead in the water. So not surprisingly, people try to do other things. The dashed line at the bottom is transgovernmental ways, and that word may not be known to you, but that refers to informal global intergovernmental collaborations. The G7 or the G20 are prominent examples. So the G7 and the G20 in international law don't exist because they're informal. They don't have a secretariat, they don't have their own staff, they don't have their own email address. But of course, they do stuff. So you can see that there's quite a growth in recent decades of transgovernmental informal global governance. So you're not the only ones doing something new. In fact, one could

also look at other things like networks of cities and so on, which are also... But then you've got this dotted line and that goes way up, and that's you. That's the growth of transnational, multi-stakeholder, non-governmental global governance. And you can see that since the 1990s, that has skyrocketed. You also see that if you look at the very end, it levels off. And we're not quite sure whether that's leveling off because of COVID, or whether it's leveling off because we're actually seeing a stalling of the multi-stakeholder approach as well. Anyway, I'm waiting for the colleagues who do this data to quickly give us some more so we know what's going on.

But anyway, what we're interested in in this project is to say, well, what makes multi-stakeholder global governance operate well? So what we're doing is looking at three bodies, one of which is ICANN. Three multi-stakeholder arrangements that have been around for 30-ish years, that have grown quite a lot, that have continually reviewed their multi-stakeholder processes, so they haven't institutionally stood still, but they've constantly been thinking about how they do things. Again, this morning I was in a session for the 47th and 48th amendment of the ICANN Bylaws. Anyway, you keep wondering about things. So these are really good examples to look at and say, how do they get capacity, the means, the resources to do things? How do they get effectiveness so that they actually make a difference in the policy areas that they're working? And how do they get legitimacy? In other words, how do they get approval? How do people buy into them? And our argument is that if you have

capacity and effectiveness and legitimacy, then you're good to go. And if you don't have capacity and you don't have effectiveness and you don't have legitimacy, then you've got a problem. So we're trying in this research to look at where that all comes from.

Briefly, and we're also looking comparatively, because what's interesting is that people in all these different policy fields think that they invented the multi-stakeholder model. And of course, what you find historically is that if a historical moment is ripe for a good idea, there tend to be multiple people who have that idea. So Charles Darwin was one of about four people to come up with evolution theory in the middle of the 19th century. He just had a better publisher than the others. So you in the internet governance area, you're doing multi-stakeholder, yes, and that's great. But people in the environmental area, like the FSC, or the health area, like the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria, they've been doing it too. So FSC you might know, because if you look at your paper or something, it'll have a little forest tree around it. Or if you go to IKEA furniture, and they tell you that, anyway. They manage 300 million, or they want to manage 300 million hectares of forest across the world. They lost a little bit with Russia pulling out, but anyway, that's a longer story.

Okay, so we're looking at how these things fit together. I don't have time in 10 minutes to go through everything, but just to give you a flavor. So we look at capacity not just in terms of whether there are people around and whether there's money around, but we also look at capacity in terms of how effective the institutional

organizational arrangements are. And Rafik was talking about some of those points in a mini sense a moment ago. So we look at all those kinds of issues. We look at questions of mandate, whether there's competition for mandate, and so on. And at the bottom, we look at ideational capacity. And this might be a little bit elusive to you, but we find that people have emotional investments in a process. I think if all of you look at yourselves in the mirror this morning and say, "Why am I in Seville?" Part of the reason why you're in Seville is probably because you feel some sort of passion about this, and that's what keeps you going, because otherwise people would say, well, in terms of the money, and anyway. So we look at ideational aspects too.

And then when it comes to effectiveness, everybody talks about effectiveness, but it's not often very systematic what people mean by effectiveness. So we are trying systematically to compare FSC and Global Fund and ICANN in terms of the effectiveness of their processes, their policymaking processes. The effectiveness of their outputs, in other words, whether anything comes out of all this talking. Then whether the things that are put out actually get implemented, whether they are effectively reviewed, and then whether they actually make a difference. So if you took ICANN out of the world, would the world look different? I think so. And then finally, legitimacy. You might be interested that out of previous work, we know that the legitimacy beliefs towards ICANN, as well as these other two, Global Fund and FSC, the legitimacy levels, the approval that people give these multi-stakeholder global bodies, is

roughly equivalent to the multilateral institutions. So after 30 years, you're more or less on an equivalent with the UN system and the like. Certain UN bodies like the WHO, even during and post-COVID, are higher. Others like the International Monetary Fund, the World Trade Organization, maybe not surprisingly, are lower. And well, actually, since today's the opening of the World Cup, you might be interested that the very lowest approval rates for global governance institutions in the world that we studied was FIFA. But anyway, I don't think you want to be compared to FIFA. But then we also look at where the legitimacy comes from, and that's again, a much longer conversation. But at this future point, maybe we can talk about that. It's actually written up in research that we've done.

Okay, then we're looking at the connections. So the idea is more capacity gives you more effectiveness, gives you more legitimacy, gives you more capacity, gives you more effectiveness. So you get a kind of virtuous circle spiral. But of course, you could get a downward spiral as well, less capacity, less effectiveness, less legitimacy, and so on. This is the boring academic part where we have to sweat and run around and do far too much work. But what you hopefully get out of the end, and that's why in the future, towards the end of the project, maybe I can come back again and say something about the data that we've got, the concepts that we've put together, the comparison between the different regimes, and maybe all of that leads to some half-creative ideas for you to take forward. Anyway, that's it. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK That was quite effective. Okay, thanks, Jan. Let's see if there is any question.

ANDREA GLANDON Stephanie had a comment in the chat about fascinating research, and she wanted to know if she could get links to a reading list and put it in the chat.

JAN AART SCHOLTE Yeah. We have publications about ICANN from the past, and I could send them to you, Andrea. Is that okay? Yeah, let me do that. Publications out of this current work, not yet. I guess the other little pitch that I want to give is if I come up to you and ask you, "Would you talk with me on an interview to help me with this?" then I hope you might spare some time, because in the end, it's your expertise that gets this done.

RAFIK DAMMAK Yeah, I guess people like talking, so you can get those who want to be interviewed. Yes, Mikhail?

JAN AART SCHOLTE Yeah. Absolutely. We're doing interviews, and we're doing surveys, and that's where a lot of the evidence comes from. And in the previous project, we had 529 people take the surveys, and that was

brilliant because the quality of that data basically was really secure. But unless you help, we can't do it. Yeah. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Flavio?

FLAVIO WAGNER

Thank you, Rafik. So I'm Flavio from Brazil, from the Brazil Internet Steering Committee. So have you had a look at the São Paulo Multistakeholder Guidelines that have been proposed by the NetMundial+10 event last year? Would you think they are valuable to measure, for instance, legitimacy of multi-stakeholder processes?

JAN AART SCHOLTE

What we are doing, yeah, NetMundial is really helpful, and it's an input, and it brings together a lot of wisdom over many years about what multi-stakeholders, especially in the internet sphere, is about. So that's a really useful resource, and we draw on it for sure. What we look at in terms of legitimacy is empirical or sociological legitimacy. What it means is what do people actually think? What NetMundial does, it makes normative legitimacy. It says, "These are the criteria on which you should measure." And what we do in the research is to say, what do people actually measure? So maybe you and I would say, "Oh, democratic participation should be the basis for legitimacy." But when we do the research, we find out that

what really drives people is whether they have self-interest served, for example.

FLAVIO WAGNER

Yeah, but maybe normative legitimacy can help achieve the sociological legitimacy.

JAN AART SCHOLTE

Indeed. I think that's what we hope when we do these end-long exercises. But this research, to some extent, allows us to find out to what extent that actually happens. It usually comes up pretty well, actually.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. I was told we have two minutes, so quick, can we finish so I can wrap up the session? Yeah.

UNKNOWN

So, thank you, Rafik. This is a quick question. You are talking about multi-stakeholder at a global level, right? Are you planning to do this the same at regional scale or just a global scale?

JAN AART SCHOLTE

Thanks. No. Resources don't allow us to go too much further, but what is the case is that all three of these bodies are multilevel to different extents. So ICANN is the most global-centered of the three, so most of it is a global operation. Though in ICANN, you do

have the national offices, sorry, the regional offices in Istanbul and Singapore and so on. If you go to the Forest Stewardship Council, the Forest Stewardship Council has a global secretariat. It has regional networks, and it has national networks. It's a bit like the AIGF in that sense. So that's more multilayered. And the Global Fund has a global secretariat in Geneva, and then national coordinating mechanisms that work at the national level. So part of what we look at in this is indeed, does it make a difference whether you spread yourself across the levels or whether you're more concentrated? And in this case, although ICANN has aspirations to be across layers, it's actually pretty centralized comparatively.

RAFIK DAMMAK

Okay. Thanks, Jan, and everyone. I think we are good here to close. So first, thanks to all for joining and attending. It was not easy with all those conflicts, but sincerely, thank you for being here. And last, we will have the next session. It's titled NCSG Wrap-Up, but it's not. We kind of swapped it. It will be about human rights impact assessment, and it will be in Roma. And I'll say all roads will bring us to Roma here. Okay. Thanks, everyone, and see you soon. And with that, we close the meeting for today.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]