
ICANN86 Seville | PF – GNSO: ISPCP Membership Work Session
Monday, June 08, 2026 – 11:45 to 13:15 CEST

DEVAN REED

Hello and welcome to the ICANN86 ISPCP Membership Work Session. Please note 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 reference. Only questions posted in the Zoom chat identified as questions will be read aloud during the session as time permits and when directed by the chair of the 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 speak clearly at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to ISPCP Chair, Philippe Fouquart.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Devan. Good morning, afternoon or evening for those of you who are participating remotely. This is Philippe Fouquart speaking here. I work for Orange and I'm the ISPCP Chair.

You have the agenda on the screen. Before we start, as usual, any updates to your Statement of Interest, anyone? Okay, I see no

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.

hand. So, as you can see in the agenda, we try and have two parts in our session today. We'll have topical presentations during the first half and we'll go on to the more policy-related issues after that. Maybe we'll have to rearrange this a bit with item four that we may want to defer. But let's start with the first presentation.

And our guest speaker today is Andrew Campling. The topic is CSAM and forwarding DNS and the challenges relative to combating abuse in that area. I'll leave it to you, Andrew, to introduce yourself and we'll probably have a discussion after that as to what I can do potentially on these challenging topics. Andrew, the floor is yours.

ANDREW CAMPLING

Thank you, Philippe. And good morning, afternoon, evening, everyone. Let me just see if I can share my slides. Looks like I can. Okay, so this came out of a discussion in the hallways in Mumbai with Philippe. I'm going to be presenting on two topics, fraud and child sex abuse material. By way of introduction, my name is Andrew Campling. I'm unaffiliated within the ICANN community.

For transparency, I'm also a trustee of the Internet Watch Foundation, which I'll be mentioning in a moment, but I'm not representing it for this presentation. These are my own views. If anyone specifically wants to talk about the CSAM aspects from an IWF point of view, three, as it happens, of the IWF team are in the

room, and we'll no doubt be happy to chat to people afterwards as you wish.

All right, let me just get to my next slide. And, yeah, so just to state the obvious, this is not a feel-good presentation. If you have any issues and this could be a trigger for you, now would be a good time to get a coffee and come back in 15 minutes. With that in mind, if you like, the rhetorical question I'm posing really is, is the Internet still perceived by others as a net good?

So going straight into the specifics, if I look at fraud as an example, I'm trying to just give you a scale of the challenge that this is presenting to the Internet as a whole. I've sort of quoted from the latest figures from the Global Anti-Scam Alliance, which is a grouping of mainly tech companies and finance companies that is focused on the issue of fraud. They publish an annual global state of the scams report, and this is from the most recent one of last year.

Two specific stats I want to highlight. In the last 12 months, roughly, we're just under a quarter of adults globally have had money stolen through online scams. So a quarter of the Internet, adult Internet users globally are victims of scams. To put a financial figure to that number, again, this is all from the GASA report, that's currently worth in the order of \$442 billion a year as a problem. That's a very abstract number, and this is purely online scams.

Obviously, fraud generally is bigger than that. If online scams were a country, it would have roughly the 30th biggest GDP globally,

about the same size as Austria as a country. So that's what fraud is costing, online fraud specifically. So the Internet, if you will, is costing the world's population, so a non-trivial number.

And as we know, often the Global South is underrepresented for all matters Internet-related. Sadly, in this area, it over-indexes. So if you're in the Global South, you're much more likely to be a victim of fraud, specifically to lose money through online scams. So given that the Global South is generally underrepresented, this is unfortunate, it's over-represented in terms of being targeted.

If I then move on to child sexual abuse material, I get that these first numbers I'm quoting are from Child Light, which is a grouping that's affiliated to the University of Edinburgh, focused specifically on child sexual abuse data gathering, largely. On the left-hand side, you'll see a chart where they're really looking at their estimates of tech-facilitated child sexual abuse and exploitation, to explain the acronym on the top of that chart.

And sadly, over the last year, for example, roughly a quarter of children, victims of online sexual exploitation, roughly, sorry, not a quarter, 2.5% of sexual extortion, when you look about extrapolate that the lifetime experience, if you will, then just under 10% of children globally are victims of tech-facilitated child sexual abuse and exploitation. A similar number of sexual extortion, etc. So these are big numbers. And online solicitation, again, lifetime experience, over a quarter of children who use the internet fall victim to it.

And as before, if you look at so-called self-generated child sexual abuse material, again, sadly, the Global South is over-represented in these statistics. So you're more likely to be a victim if you live in the Global South, certainly for self-generated. And when we talk about self-generated, that might sound like that's somehow less of an issue.

So a quote from the IWF annual report really shed some light on this. Self-generated is often extorted. So it's not voluntarily self-generated. So the predators employ emotional manipulation, intimidating, aggressive language, and threats that escalate as soon as they gain possession of nudes. So basically, we're talking about blackmail, largely. You know, pay or see your images sent to family, friends, schools, etc.

Predators are rapidly embracing new technology. So using AI, generative AI to produce material. You can see some of the stats. Again, this is from the IWF annual report. And draw your attention to, for example, the top one, the category A. So that's the most extreme content. You know, as you can see, there's a high percentage of what's being produced is the most extreme type of content.

And to, again, add some sort of detail to that, yeah, you have so-called AI companion sites where you can have explicit conversations with a chat box. And now they're embracing AI to produce sort of photographically realistic material to support these illegal explicit chats.

In terms of how and where it's hosted, an awful lot of the content that the IWF finds is on image hosting sites, but also other types of sites. You can see those on the chart. And a high percentage of it, three quarters nearly, is hosted within Europe of the content that the IWF is currently finding. And a tiny percentage, less than 1%, is on the dark web. So just to be clear, all of what I've just said refers to content on the open internet. We're not talking about the dark web here, although clearly there is illegal content there as well.

To put that into numbers, again, for the IWF, last year, reports were received, so little under half a million reports, so one every 70 seconds. And of those, roughly, what, two thirds to three quarters contained illegal content. So, yeah, a high percentage of positive images. And each of those images, just to emphasize, could contain images of multiple children, or either images or videos, and there could in some cases be multiple images or videos in a single report. So that's not 311,610 victims, that could be several million victims within those reports.

And because these are very abstract numbers in the round, again, just to make that harder, in the time I've been allocated for this presentation, roughly \$12.6 million worth of fraud will take place on the internet, and nine reports will have been confirmed as containing criminal content on the internet. Again, emphasizing each of those with potentially multiple children, multiple types of content in an individual report. So the question, really, from all of that, so why am I telling you this, is governments are under intense

and increasing pressure, governments and regulators, to do something about this in countries around the world.

And in my opinion, it really challenges the consensual multi-stakeholder model, of which I'm a fan. But under that sort of pressure from people in the countries, we're already seeing unilateral action being taken by governments around the world, and the pace of that is evidently increasing very rapidly. We've gone from the first social media ban to momentum behind smartphone bans for under-16s, mandatory age verification requirements, and even a movement towards technology-free schooling.

So if we do nothing, I think the pace of change in that direction is going to increase, and in my view, bodies like ICANN become increasingly irrelevant, because what's happening is moving outside of and despite ICANN. So the question to the room, really, is what can be done to make this community relevant to solving the problem, rather than just being a passenger as others take action, which may or may not be useful in addressing the problem. And I'll stop there.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, Andrew, and thanks for keeping the timing. Any questions for Andrew? I've got a couple, although they're very general and probably not the easiest one. I've got a sort of a general remark on this, is that CSAM is one of those things that are not, there's no question as to whether that's part or not of DNS

abuse. That's one of the few areas that is considered within scope of DNS abuse. With that in mind, do you have a sense of how leaving aside the CCs, but how gTLD-related policies on DLS abuse have helped, counter help, or is even effective, given the context that you've given in terms of this happening in real time?

Because on similar topics, I have a sense that one of the reasons why we have what you just described in terms of the national outrage and the impression that there has to be some sort of legal, national legal framework to tackle these things, is that there's the impression, on the other hand, that any global instrument is bound to fail. So I'd be curious as to whether you have some feedback on how, for example, compliance may help with this, given the extent of the problem.

ANDREW CAMPLING

Okay, so let me throw in two thoughts, and others obviously may have observations as well. First observation, as a community, we often default quite rapidly, or at least parts of the community, to, well before we act, let's do a human rights impact assessment, because we're concerned about potentially impinging on the privacy rights of a potential perpetrator, registrant, whatever it happens to be.

And dare I say it, I think we lose sight of the human rights impact assessment on the potential victims, and largely we focus on privacy as a, in my view, remind a qualified human right for getting the absolute human rights, again, of the victims, which ought to,

because they're usually absolute rights, rather than qualified rights, so they should take precedence.

So we often hide behind that. Where I see good things happening, though, to move to a positive, is, for example, and I'll give an IWF example, because I'm more familiar with that, with PIR, they're sponsoring an initiative so that registries and now registrars can leverage some of the knowledge that the IWF has amassed in terms of block lists to actively prevent access to sites that contain known illegal content.

And just, I should have said earlier, all of those assessments as to the category of whether something is illegal and what type of illegality, they're all done by humans and quality assured by humans. So this isn't some sort of AI thing that may have large volumes of false positives. This is done by trained assessors who unfortunately, their day job is looking at this material and categorizing it. So there shouldn't be any, so there should be zero false positives in the source material. So there should be no problems with blocking this stuff.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, Andrew. Any other questions? Oh, I'm sorry, I wasn't looking at the Zoom room. Yeah, sorry, go on.

NEIL PROWSE

Hi, Neil Prowse, Internet Watch Foundations. It's just a general observational comment, just to build on Andrew's comments

there. First and foremost, the child has rights as well, okay, to not have their indecent images distributed, traded online as well. So there is two sides to that counter, that countering against privacy and privacy.

Having said that, there are now privacy preserving tools available on the internet. For example, we've got a partnership with ExpressVPN. It's the first VPN supplier, but their unique selling is about privacy, right, online. So they now have a tool that protects the individual, but actually blocks the access to complicit websites. And this is what we're really talking about here.

It's those illegal criminal websites that are looking to commoditize the access to severe images and videos, high speed videos for child sexual abuse content. And that's why we work really closely with the registry sector. Those kinds of sites, we can give those alerts real time to them, so then they can take rapid action to stop these criminal sites actually being able to continue their behavior.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Prowse. Yeah, just, and I'll have a follow up to that, but I'll go to Anil first. Hi, Anil, over to you.

ANIL KUMAR JAIN

Thank you, Philippe. And wonderful presentation by Andrew. And it is a concern which is hidden right now, but it is impacting the future generation. So I have three questions slash suggestions. First is that ICANN has a body called GAC, because we feel that

government is the potential tool to handle these kinds of problems. So I request Andrew, in case this presentation can also be made to GAC, through which the message can go to the people.

The second is that the basic area where the children get impacted is a school, sometimes bullying by other students, or maybe the environment is getting created like this. So I suggest in case, especially for the third world countries and under those countries, if we can send some kind of help, maybe through ICANN or some other organization to help those schools to spread this particular information to the students and to the parents, this will help. And now my question is that what do you feel ISPCP as a constituency can do to mitigate these kinds of issues? Thank you.

ANDREW CAMPLING

Thank you for that. If anyone can help get a slot with GAC, I will happily give a presentation there. I'll answer your direct question. In terms of ISPCP, there are tools available to ISPs to filter in real time.

So, for example, if an ISP offers parental control type tools, it's relatively straightforward, and I'm glossing over lots of technical issues here, to append the block list from the IWF, for example, to that, similarly to scan the hash images of known CSAM to block those being uploaded or downloaded. Those are both technically quite possible and could be embraced by ISPs. Talk to Neil and Will

in the break if you want to discuss specifically how, but that's this community, in my view, could and absolutely should be doing.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, Andrew. We'll take that forward. One last question or suggestion. Mindful of the sort of series of PDPs that are being under development on DNS abuse, and speaking only personally, sharing your impression as to where the pendulum stands in terms of privacy versus the victims, maybe that would be a good idea.

If not to weighing within the PDP itself to talk with those that challenge that PDP with regard to, for example, the ADC, posing a risk of false positives, maybe that would be, I'm thinking about in principle that role is devoted to people that stand within the non-contracted party house within the NCSG, maybe that would be a good idea also to have a discussion with them as to how the interests of the victims could also be taken into account.

I'm just an observer, Anil is a participant, for example, on the PDP. I have the impression, and again, maybe that's just personal, but we talk a lot about the need, and rightly so, to preserve the need of the registrants and avoiding at all costs hitting those who may not be directly involved in this. But on the other hand, I think we need to bear in mind that in the first place, the reason why we're doing this, and I'm leaving the brand, the interests of the brand aside, but maybe that would be a good idea to have a chat with our neighbors

within the NCPH. And I'm happy to put you in touch with them, certainly.

Thank you, thank you, Andrew, that was really useful and an important topic, and we'll follow up on what nationally we can do as far as ISPs are concerned. Thank you.

So, moving back to our agenda, the second presentation is from Jan Aart Scholte, I apologize for my pronunciation of your surname, and that would be a totally somewhat different topic, but there are dependencies between those two to some extent, as to the potential leverage that multi-stakeholder models can have on the actual issues at hand, such as CSAM.

But Jan is in charge of a project that, among other things, compares the effectiveness of multi-stakeholder models in various organizations, one of which is ICANN, so that will be an interesting discussion, if only within the context of all the review of reviews and the accountability mechanisms that we have within ICANN for this. So, I'll leave it to you, Jan, to introduce yourself, the context of the project, as well as those models that you have studied.

JAN AART SCHOLTE

Okay, thank you very much, Philippe, and thanks very much for inviting me to be here. Yes, good morning, my name is Jan Scholte, I'm at Leiden University in the Netherlands now.

Some of you might, if you look past the grey hair and the balding hair, recall me as an accountability advisor to ICANN during the

IANA stewardship transition, so I'm afraid I've been around for a while too. I did a study on legitimacy in ICANN about six, seven years ago, and a number of you, I think, participated in the surveys that we did then, and we came out with some quite interesting results. And I seem not to be able to get enough of ICANN, so there's another current project now.

One of the things that came up for us was, ICANN is, when you're in the ICANN sphere, you tend to think you're in a very unique place, and the number of times you hear people say, ah, we invented the multi-stakeholder model, or we led the multi-stakeholder model, and people are very, but the interesting thing is, that historically we know that when a good idea is ripe, a number of people at the same time jump on it.

So, Darwin was only one of a number of people who was talking about the evolutionary theory in the mid-19th century, just had a better publisher than the others. And so, with multi-stakeholder global governance, we find that also. If we look around, we see that it has actually come up in all kinds of places and across all kinds of fields.

So, I thought it would be really interesting to look at how multi-stakeholder processes work in different policy fields and actually systematically to compare it, which, amazingly, no one has done. To me, it's a no-brainer waiting to be done. Anyway, so thankfully, the Dutch Research Council gave us a significant grant, which allows four of us to work on this for four years.

You don't need to be told, but just to remind for a moment, multi-stakeholder, what do we mean here in the broadest sense? It means that you deal with global problems not by bringing states together, multilateral, but you bring different parties who have a stake together. So, different parties who are affected by or affect a given problem. In your case, the internet, but other policy problems as well. Multi-stakeholder is also different from private governance, private global governance, which happens in a number of trade associations and the like. You see it in the financial field, for example, quite a lot.

Now, this is just a little historical look. The black, the solid line in the middle, is the development of growth of multilateral intergovernmental organizations over time. So, you can see in 1970, they were already the most prevalent form of global governance. They grew until the mid-1990s, and then it goes flat. There are numbers, there are staff numbers, there are budgets and everything. Nothing grows. Mandates basically stagnates. So, global problems become ever bigger. Multilateral responses to them are kind of stuck.

So, what happens? The dashed line below is the informal trans-governmental collaboration. So, this is when governments come together not under a treaty basis. So, like the G7 or the G20 are some of the really well-known examples. In international law, they don't actually exist, but we know that they do very much exist.

So, that's one thing that happens, but then there's the dotted line. And the dotted line is you. The dotted line is the growth of transnational, non-governmental, sometimes in partnership with government, but you can see that skyrockets. It's basically at zero in 1970. Well, there's a couple of instances. And then, especially in the 21st century, it becomes, in number terms, actually the more prevalent way of dealing with global problems.

So, what do we say? People say multi-stakeholder constructions. It's probably part of the reason why you're in this room, that you think that they are more effective, maybe even caring, maybe democratic, less bureaucrats, more people, a fair and peaceful, sustainable way of governing global problems. But is this actually happening in practice? When and where? Under what conditions? So, that's what this project looks at.

So, put it most simply, how does multi-stakeholder global governance operate? Well, or to elaborate a little bit more, under what circumstances does multi-stakeholder global governance act? These three major examples of multi-stakeholder global governance. When does it attain capacity? So, when do you get resources, the means to do things? When does it gain effectiveness? So, actually being able to do something. And when does it gain legitimacy? So, approval, support and the like. And as I say, this is the first systematic comprehensive comparative analysis.

And we look at the Forest Stewardship Council. This one you've heard of. Look, if you've got a pad of paper or something, you may well see the FSC Forest Green Circle. The Forest Stewardship Council is aiming to have something like 300 million hectares of forests under management. And they bring together an economic chamber, an environmental chamber and a social chamber. Sometimes they have an indigenous chamber as well. Interesting thing about FSC, no government anywhere. No GAC, no Board seats for government, even advisory, not a state to be seen. So, this is real stateless multi-stakeholder global governance.

You may have heard of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria. Especially active in relation to AIDS, but also in relation to the others. Gates Foundation works with them a lot and the like. This one is based in Geneva. I should have said FSC has a staff that is similar in size to ICANN and so on. FSC though meets once every three years. So, where ICANN meets nine times, FSC meets once. Anyway, people have different ways of doing things. That's part of what we look at.

The Global Fund has governments largely in its Board and the governments are voting in the Board. So again, that's quite a different arrangement than what ICANN or FSC have. And then ICANN doesn't need any explanation to you. But what's interesting is, if you go across the different sectors and go to these different organizations, people don't actually know of each other. And we have an advisory Board for this project, which brings together senior people from the three organizations and they've never met

each other. So, one of the benefits one hopes from this study is that different multi-stakeholder global arrangements begin to know about each other, talk with each other, learn from each other.

Okay, our notion is that capacity feeds effectiveness, effectiveness feeds legitimacy, legitimacy feeds capacity and you get a nice virtuous circle. Or, if things are going badly, it actually goes downhill. I don't have time to go through all of these indicators. I just want to give you a sense that we do do something systematic. So, these are six different types of capacity that we look at. People is straightforward, numbers and quality of people, material, is there money and so on, mandates, organizational arrangements.

Maybe ideational capacity is a little bit more elusive to you, but different organizations can be more effective in deploying certain discourses or even emotional attachments. It's one of the surprise effects of our earlier interviews that we did with the ICANN sphere. We did 529 interviews in that earlier project. And the number of people who even dropped tears as they described their attachment to ICANN was really quite amazing.

And then you thought, actually, there's something going on here in the affective sphere. People have built their friendships, people build their commitments, their loyalties and they can become emotionally invested. And that sounds like something that's a little bit hard to measure, let alone prove a causal relationship. But we realized that really the capacities that ICANN and these bodies have ranges more than a bit of money and a couple of academic degrees.

Effectiveness, I mean, I think everyone talks about effectiveness, don't necessarily operationalize it very systematically. So this is the way that we're looking at that. Part of the effectiveness relates to the process of the policy-making process. Some of the effectiveness relates to whether anything comes out of it. You might talk for ages in a very accountable way, but not actually have any outputs.

So we look at the outputs as well. And then, of course, you might have outputs without implementing them. So we look at the implementation as well. And then you might implement really bad things, in which case you need to review it. So we look at review processes. And then at the end of the day, you have to ask, has it made any difference in the wider concrete world?

And then finally, in terms of legitimacy, legitimacy refers to whether people approve of a governance regime. Normally, you think about legitimacy in relation to a national government. But these days, you can think of legitimacy in relation to global regimes as well.

Because if people agree with you, if people approve of you, if people support you, then your chances of getting participation, of getting compliance, of making decisions, and so on, goes up. And you don't need any police to back you up. So legitimacy is really important in that way. And we have, in earlier work, identified various sources for that legitimacy. And we want, in this study, to see whether those drivers have stayed the same or moved.

Okay, already said the interrelations. Hopefully, the things support each other. Yeah, this is an academic detail that you don't want to know. This is how we have to sweat through our days to get the data. And then out of all of that, we hope that it's going to be helpful for you. That partly key concepts like effectiveness, like accountability, that they become more specific and meaningful for your ICANN processes. That we can provide data, also comparative data that you haven't otherwise been able to get through. I mean, ICANN has tons and tons and tons of data, but this is a different kind of data on the multi-stakeholder process. It's comparative, and hopefully, that helps.

And hopefully, all of it might, well, at least give you some ideas to discuss, if I come back in a couple of years and give you something concrete, and give you answers rather than research questions. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you again. Philippe, speaking here. Any questions? Yeah, and I may have a couple of questions myself, but let's start with mine. And I'm sure that those are the things that you are considering in the context of your project. But in light of what we know of ICANN, I'd be curious to know as to whether the following things would, how those would be accommodated within the other structures. For example, the funding mechanism. Although ICANN is the sort of global organization, the funding comes from a very limited number of players, stakeholders,

literally. And I'd be curious as to whether that maps onto the other structures as well. A.

B, it's one thing to define a stakeholder model. It's to call a particular substructure the ISP constituency. And it's another to make sure that the members of that constituency is actually a good reflection of the interests of that community at large. And I'm wondering how, and it's all you can look at a structure and consider that it's a good representation. But to make sure that you have that, you have to look into what is the actual reality of that representation through the membership.

And the third question is more on the accountability mechanisms of all those structures in the context of, for example, the review of the ruse effort that we put in place. And in the particular example of the structural review that a number of people within this constituency are very conscious about.

And the fact that, for example, the very structure of that multi-stakeholder model has been frozen for 25 years. And whether over time those structures, how they consider revising their own structure to make sure it is a good reflection of the ecosystem. In our case, that's the internet ecosystem. It obviously depends on the structure at hand, but that's crucial to make sure that the policies that we develop are actually not only relevant to that ecosystem, but also that the various interests are accommodating in the policymaking process.

So those are off the top of my head, there's other sort of questions that come to mind to see whether that organization even matters for the ecosystem. I think that to me, they're crucial. And then it's not only the point I'm trying to make is that it's not only a structure on paper, calling a particular structure something doesn't mean that you've got the good members, the members that would be in a position to convey the interest, but it's all the practice of making sure that, for example, you have as little overlapping between the structures, parts, I guess, because otherwise it's sort of if everything is in anything, it sort of defeats the very principle of having a multi-stakeholder model, if you see what I mean.

So I'd be curious to know, well, obviously not now, it's work in progress, but from a purely practical standpoint, that is one of the conditions that some of these things are the condition as to whether that model can be effective.

JAN AART SCHOLTE

Yeah, thank you, Philippe. A lot there and touching on many of the issues that we try to address, maybe of interest for people here, if you look at these three organizations, ICANN and the Forest Stewardship Council are self-funding in the sense that they have what you might loosely call taxation regime.

So in ICANN's case, there's a taxation of the registrars and registries, and that more or less, well, the CCs give a little bit on the side, but mainly it's a tax. Forest Stewardship Council does the same, it's a certification scheme, a bit like you're certifying

registrars and registries, the FSC is certifying the foresters and they pay for that. So that's where they get their money.

So FSC gets about 110 million out of all of that per year and ICANN gets about 150 million out of that per year. So it's a bit kind of comparable. The Global Fund gets contributions from governments. So it's much more vulnerable. And when one particular unnamed government on the other side of the pond decides that it doesn't want to give so much money anymore, it sends a panic wave through the organization and they have to retrench. So that's what's happening at the moment at the Global Fund. So on the finance part, you count yourself, well, depending on what you want to say, but count yourselves relatively lucky in ICANN and FSC that you're not dependent on external actors so much for the funding.

Whether the constituency is adequately represented within the structures, that's of course a big, big, big question. I think in most of the cases, the three organizations are fairly confident that they've got the stakeholder groups right. In other words, they don't say, oh, we're missing a stakeholder group. We need another AC besides SSAC and GAC and so on. But whether within those groups there's adequate representation across regions, across genders, across classes, across expertise and so on, there there's much more debate.

In the previous study that we did, we asked people, you might remember if you took the survey, we asked people, are you

concerned about, and we named five different inequalities, about language, about gender, about ethnicity, race, about the region, and about, okay, five.

And everybody said, oh, these are really problem, these are, yes, I perceive there are these inequalities at ICANN. And everyone said, oh, yes, and they're really problematic, everyone, on balance. So it didn't matter whether you were male or female or other, you saw a gender inequality and you thought it was problematic. If you were from the global north or the global south, you said, oh, there's an inequality problem and you thought it was problematic.

So there was a large feeling that, no, the system is not adequately representing the people who are affected. Then we looked at the relationship to legitimacy beliefs, almost none. So people saw that there were inequalities, they felt that they were problematic, but it did not affect whether they believed in the system, apart from the north-south.

So on north-south inequality, people said, it exists, it's problematic, and it affects my feeling of legitimacy towards ICANN. ICANN needs to do something about that if they want me to believe in the organization. But in areas of language, race, gender, age was the other one, sorry. Everyone says, oh, more young people should be involved. Oh, it's problematic, we don't have more young people. But then if you said, does this undermine your belief in ICANN? No, it would be nuts.

So it's a long answer, but it's a really important point. Accountability mechanisms, yes. All three of these bodies are constantly talking about reviews and consultancies and etc. It goes on and on and on all the time. And I think it's because, indeed, people don't take for granted that they are legitimate. So people see a national government or they see the United Nations. Okay, maybe these days a little bit less. But people have a sort of feeling that, yes, in principle, these bodies have the right to rule. ICANN has the right to rule the global internet. ICANN has the right to say to Ukraine, no, we're not taking Russia off the internet. I mean, then people have some, okay.

So then there's a much more greater demand for constant accountability reviews. But in that sense, I find it interesting that ICANN is now having this review of reviews, and the Board is saying we don't need to have as many reviews. I know at the level of day-to-day procedure, a lot of you are either upset or whatever about this.

From a more structural, long-term perspective, I kind of wonder, is this ICANN testing whether they've got actually enough legitimacy that they don't need to play quite so many accountability games and can get away with it? I know that's not the explicit script, but that's what I kind of see underneath it. Jan, I could go on.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Sure. Thank you, Jan. That's very helpful. I'm sure we could touch base down the road on your progress, because that's, in the context

of the review of reviews and the discussions that we'll no doubt have here, it's interesting to compare what we're doing with what others are doing. And I think that from what you said, and given your presentation, there's a lot of commonalities between at least the concepts in these multi-stakeholder models. So we'd be curious to know as to whether the sort of changes that we contemplate actually map onto things that those people may have done in the past.

JAN AART SCHOLTE

That'd be great. If I can add one last note, any of those of you who paid particular attention to the graph at the end would have noted that the dotted line leveled off at the top, and the data finishes six years ago. So I'm begging my relevant colleagues to tell me what's happened over the last six years. So some of these questions are also about whether that dotted line is going to keep going up or whether it's actually seen its peak and going down. Let's find out.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

I could have my bed, but yeah, thank you. Good questions. Okay. Okay. Let's go back to our agenda. And maybe we'll keep, eventually we'll keep item four, having a look at the other items that we've got on the screen, and mindful that the update on Council may be a short one, given that when the agenda was published, there isn't, well, there's one item that's up for a vote, but

it's a non-controversial one. So I think we have time for the discussion on AI and DNS. So let's do that first.

Let's go to item four then with Houda and Tinuade. So that's sort of an introduction to the impact of AI, including agentic AI on the DNS. An introduction to this before our session, is it this afternoon? I think. And a number of us feel that there's, and we've always already mentioned that during the first presentation, that there's a huge impact on this. So over to you, Houda, for item four. Here's your mic. We would like us to use your mic first, and then yes, you can go through this.

HOUDA CHIH

Okay. Thank you so much. Hello, everyone. Thank you so much for joining our session and for this opportunity. Thank you so much, Philippe, for the introduction.

So today's presentation will be about dealing about the importance of agentic AI and its role with, or let's say its impact with DNS infrastructure. What is the role of ISP and ICANN? So today with me, and next slide, please, to me and my friend Tinuade, we'll discuss about the motivation, what is the importance, and what is the importance of this transition from human-centric to agentic-centric. I leave, my friend, I give the chance to my colleague Tinuade to present the motivation after I will join you with the problem and solution.

TINUADE OGUNTUYI

Okay. Thank you very much, everyone. As we see in the introduction, over the decades, the internet was likely built for human interaction, but as we go by, we see that agents and machines are now utilizing these resources, and that also autonomously. And the reason for this session is actually to deep dive into the role of agentic AI now with the DNS, which is actually one of the major remit of ICANN itself. Over to you, Houda.

HOUDA CHIH

Okay. Thank you so much. Next slide, please. So in general, let's understand what is the issue with agentic AI. So today, we don't speak only with traditional human-centric internet. When we keep going and typing the browser and let the DNS do the job. But today, we find that agentic AI keep sending queries and keep generating in continuous way queries. So here, we find ourselves in two angles. Is it legitimate or authorized to do this, or it is a kind of abuse? Here, we have to rise the role of ICANN, because ICANN have to put some policies behind these continuous queries, and in particular, that is the role of RSAC.

A second challenge is if we let agentic AI send in continuous way queries, it is open doors for abuse and security challenges. So here, the role of RSAC to find us a solution for this. For the role of ISP is to keep upgrading the infrastructure. Unfortunately, they don't have much role, but what they can do, and I will in the next slide explain this more, they will go to DNSSEC, they keep upgrading the

infrastructure and keep coordinating with ICANN and AI community. Okay, so Tinuade, over to you.

TINUADE OGUNTUYI

Okay, thank you. Next slide. Okay, here we see the numbers. Next slide, please. Next slide. Okay, the new versus the old. It's very important that we also back this with data, not to just look at it from the angle of we're just getting worried about agentic AI. Queries per minute is one of the metrics we want to look at as individuals. If you sit and you just want to get a lot of things on your browser or surf, you do 1 to 10, but for the agent, sorry, for the typo, you have in thousands.

What about the unique domains per day? Maybe approximately 50 for an individual human, and we're seeing in thousands also for the AI agents. What about the traffic pattern? Recently, I had a discussion with somebody from the ISPN in Nigeria, that's Internet Exchange Point, and they were trying to tell me how they are seeing different flows, even on traffic recently. It's session-based for us, because when we go online, we know what exactly true URL that we want to do. But for AI agents, honestly, it's busy and chaotic, because now it's a combination of so many things at the same time, as the APIs are called, the URLs are called, and so many things are also called.

What about the catch-it ratio? We have a 70 to 90% for human browser, but we have this measure in better, less than 30% when we talk of the catch rate. The active hours, most times, for people

that do maybe ration times for their work, humans normally will do daytime and just go, if I work maybe nine to five, I'm done with it, and maybe extra two hours. But for AI agents globally, it's two for seven, and that is what we are seeing in numbers.

HOUDA CHIH

Thank you. Next slide, please. I can say that here, that we speak now, following the previous presenter's table, that there is the rise of new KPIs that AI can should focus in, because we see that, from the table and the data that we learn from the agentic AI that keep interacting with the road, so we speak about time to leave expiration, or let's say, a churn, so we need new standards regarding time to leave, so ICANN responsibility is to keep the DNS secure and without any kind of abuse.

So, as I said before, we need some guidance from ICANN regarding this kind of abuse of keep using route servers. In particular, as I said before, it is the role of RSAC, together with SSAC, in order to set new frameworks, new policies, because there is a policy gap, and it's not at all a technical problem, because here we speak about keep in continuous way, there is no standard, there is no policies that govern or limit AI agent to interact with route servers, and there is a high chance to provide new attacks, and so here, you find is the role of SSAC to find new guidance and advice. Tinuade.

TINUADE OGUNTUYI

Okay, thank you. Next slide. Agent DNS, the next frontier, we see that different AI agents now are building their own DNS. That's caused to ICANN's attention, which should be very immediate, just like Houda mentioned. The AI community is also building its own DNS, and we have some examples by virtue of this presentation. The agent DNS, an academic root system that is doing agent discovery, and that, of course, poses a lot of questions to the ICANN community as well, because somebody definitely has to manage this root.

We also have the DNS-AID, supported by Linus Foundation, and is also backed by Cloudflare. These are companies, organizations, that are well to do with when it comes to reputation, and exactly what they do. And we see bodies like GoDaddy, and all of that, would definitely now want to latch on on this, which is also another question, who will manage this new DNS record. So these are failures in multiple phases, that we have seen, that we are anticipating, or is already even happening. More catcher misses, more boss fights, and of course, more state pressure on the DNS architecture. Thank you.

HOUDA CHIH

Okay, so next slide, please. Okay, so we have, as we said, we have said before about the abuse, I think it's better to move to the next slide, because you will repeat the same thing here. It's better to mention the importance of reachability of ICANN to AI community, because we highlighted before that AI agents, and there is different

initiatives from academia and software organization, they're building their own DNS related to AI agents, so ICANN should be careful here, and state new policies, it has to reach AI community, and collaborate with ITF also to know about the different protocols going behind these new initiatives. This is also, I can present some recommendation in next slide, please.

TINUADE OGUNTUYI

Okay, so quickly, we look at the AI augmented DNS operations that we are also trying to bring to the fore. As part of the solution, the operational benefits would be anomaly detection, capacity for custom, which is very, very important, because this is infrastructure at the end of the day that we are looking at. Threat identification, and definitely faster incident reports, we know there are a lot of things attributed with AI and even DNS abuse, largely discussed even in ICANN forums lately. So now it is human and AI collaboration.

Recently, I hear people saying that even human resource managers, we don't only manage resources again, but they'll begin to manage both humans and intelligent systems. So this collaboration is something we cannot ignore, and we really need to face this reality. So what AI brings to the table is speed, skill, and pattern recognition. And the human side, of course, because we are very, very unique when we take judgments, we can take oversight functions, and of course, build the guardrails in form of governance, so that AI systems or autonomous systems don't just

take over. And the future operational models, automation, analysis, and of course, is not going to minus human expertise. Thank you.

HOUDA CHIH

Okay, thank you, Tinuade. Please go to the next slide.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Just a time check. We have one or two minutes.

HOUDA CHIH

Okay, thank you. To sum up and to be in time, so the recommendation for both ISP and ICANN community, which is very important to consider for ISP, the DNSSEC validation is important, infrastructure scaling, telemetry enhancement, AI-assisted operation. The role of ICANN community is to promote DNS trust, DNS abuse coordination, calling both RSAC and SSAC to the table, and to highlight and to raise all the discussed issues.

Next slide, please, to be in time. The future outlook, our emerging trends, maybe we can think about, or it's time for ICANN to think about building new working groups, which deals about all of these issues, because it's a serious problem that should be discussed. And our role from ISPCP may be to raise awareness and to discuss with the leadership or Board members of ICANN, because it's important to keep ICANN's role to secure the DNS. And that's it.

TINUADE OGUNTUYI

Okay, so I'll do this in 30 seconds, possibly. Next slide, please. So, conclusion, before we take the questions, AI is definitely creating new service discovery and DNS consumption patterns. DNS is becoming a critical trust layer for autonomous system. Collaboration across ISPs, DNS operators registry and all of that, even the ICANN community is now very important as we build a resilient, agentic Internet. DNS remains the foundation that enables trust, security, and connectivity for everyone and every use.

So, the mandate of ICANN still remains, ensure secure, stable, resilient DNS ecosystem for both humans and now machines. ICANN must also engage the AI community now. And the proposed cross-community working groups to really tackle it on this thing we're seeing or this emergence is very important in the circle of AI and DNS. Thank you very much.

HOUDA CHIH

Okay, so we are just closing, don't worry. It's just I want to mention here that the importance of cross-collaboration with different stakeholders, in particular ISPs, so ICANN community and AI community. And that's it from our side. Thank you for your attention. Hope that you enjoyed our talk.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Houda. Thank you, Tinuade. Maybe we'll take a minute or two for questions. And as the ambition of this was really to have

an introduction on the topic in light of the discussions that we will have this afternoon and certainly within the next few months. Any questions? I have one comment and one general question.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER

Yes. Thank you, Houda. Thank you, Tinuade. It's a very thought-provoking presentation. I'd like to know what would happen when quantum computing will come.

TINUADE OGUNTUYI

Tinuade, for the record again. Honestly, maybe we skip that in this slide, especially because of the DNSSEC. I remember one of the roadshows we had back in my own country in Nigeria, and we discussed this extensively that post-quantum computing will definitely now make plain test of most of this cryptography.

And I think it's also something that ICANN community needs to pay attention to, honestly. I see it. I wanted to do a plenary session with At-Large to really talk about this because it's also a concern, honestly. And it's something that should be brought into this subject topic. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. So food for thought for this afternoon, then. I have essentially two comments, really, not so much questions. We can take that on. Can you hear me? It was on, but yes, this is Philippe Fouquart speaking. Just two brief comments.

I think on the slide where you refer to infrastructures that would pose a challenge to ICANN, I'm not familiar with the first one, but the one that was initiated by Cloudflare and GoDaddy, I believe that's under the Linux Foundation and MCP. I'm somewhat familiar with that. I think it sits within the ICANN model. It's not a separate route. I'm not saying that it's not going to pose challenges in terms of policy, but certainly not in terms of infrastructure, I think.

And sort of general question, note, I would say, beyond these sort of technical, potentially technical impacts, I think there's also an overarching question as to the relevance of domain names when you use LLMs and agents in particular. It refers back to a discussion we had with the Board at the last meeting, I think, as opposed to our usual 20th century surfing the web thing. When you use an LLM, sometimes domain names are just not visible anymore.

So, maybe that's also sort of an existential question, not something that we can fix with a technical solution, but probably something to think about if domain names in the magnitude that you highlighted are no longer used by the user, him or herself. Andrew, to this point.

ANDREW CAMPLING

I'll be real brief, but thank you; Andrew Campling, for the record. Yeah, on the relevance still, for what it's worth, I think for agentic AI, it's really about the root of trust rather than a human readable name. So it's, if you like, same mechanism, but solving a different problem. In terms of where the stresses are going to be, I'll be

proven famously wrong probably, but for what it's worth, I think there's not a problem in terms of the volume of queries, because there's a lot of redundancy in the system, at least in the short to medium term.

I think the biggest problem is elsewhere in the ecosystem, because if we're moving from, what, 300 odd million domain names currently, depending on which projection, anything up to a billion to five billion domain names for agentic AI by 2030, I think the biggest stresses in the system will be more, dare I say, in the registration area. Will the system fall over if suddenly it's got, like, potentially 10 times the volume it currently deals with? So, I think it might be in the more mundane bits of the ecosystem rather than the base protocols and that bit. I think that's got so much redundancy, it's probably okay. The registration might fall over first.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thanks, Andrew. It's probably something to look into in terms of where the bottlenecks are moving forward. The good news, though, is that as far as ICANN's budget is concerned, maybe that's going to be a positive move, but just saying as an aside. So, thanks very much for the presentation. We'll bear that in mind for this afternoon's session. I think that was useful.

Let's go through, very quickly, through the more policy-related items, some of which we can review, as I said, very quickly. Let's go to Council first, maybe, Susan, if you could just update us on what's

going to happen on Wednesday, is it, and what happened yesterday? Sure.

SUSAN MOHR

Yeah, this is Susan Mohr, for the record. I guess a couple of things, maybe starting with yesterday, there was a special GNSO Council meeting to address a petition that was submitted by ALAC that essentially rebuked, or took a negative view on the Board approach to the review process. And so, following our vote, we were, I think it ultimately ended up being 100% of the votes went to rejecting. I don't think there was anyone that abstained or voted in favor. And so, the ALAC petition did fail.

We do have a GNSO Council meeting coming up on the 10th. We can go through the slides really quickly. The first thing that we're going to talk about is two commemorative motions that will require a vote today to recognize a couple of our colleagues who've passed away recently, Arinola Akinyemi and Alan Barrett. So, I think that is on the consent agenda. That's pretty straightforward.

I just wanted to note that the BC, if you'd, hopefully everyone saw the email Philippe shared, BC will be having a remembrance book available both during their meeting on the 9th and during the GNSO Council meeting on the 10th. So, if you want to sign that, be sure to do that. There will also be a memorial on June 10th.

The next slide is with respect to the SPIRT program. The registries have an issue that they want to refute, I'm sorry, refer to SPIRT, which is the Standing Predictability Implementation Review Team.

In short, the issue is that applicants have to go through a structured evaluation and registry system testing before they can sign a registry contract, but there's a paperwork mismatch between what they get tested on and what's actually required, and that is with respect to what they call the extensible provisioning protocol, the EPP, that was previously removed out of the contract. And so, this is really just saying, hey, we need to solve this problem. And so, I think that's a pretty straightforward support as well. And so, maybe the next slide, Devan.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Sorry, but for the record, you're not going to be voting on this. Is it a discussion? I think it's a discussion, isn't it? On EPP. Is it a vote? Okay.

SUSAN MOHR

I think it's a vote. So, this is a vote.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Okay.

SUSAN MOHR

Yeah. And so, do you agree?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART I personally agree, but I just want to make sure that people understand. I thought it was only on the consent agenda, but you're saying that this is going to be a vote.

SUSAN MOHR I believe the commemorative motions are on the consent agenda. I think this is a vote.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART Okay. Okay. So, just for the record, anyone against supporting this? Okay. Good.

SUSAN MOHR And maybe in the interest of time, I've shared the deck, and so if everyone wants to look at the rest of the content of the deck, you're welcome to do that, and we'll move on to the other discussion points. Is that okay with you?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART It is, yes. We'll circulate this on the list. And by the way, as Susan said, just to emphasize this, on the SPIRT and the fact that Council refers this to SPIRT, there's no judgment on substance. It's just a matter of making that decision that this has to be on substance reviewed by the SPIRT, but there's no pre-decision on what the decision will be by the SPIRT.

SUSAN MOHR

Thanks, Philippe. This is Susan Moore, again, for the record. I agree, and it seems like a very logical thing to do that you've got a mismatch between what's in the contract and what's required, so I feel like this will not be controversial.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you. Thank you, Susan. Okay. Moving back to our agenda, I think we're good with the timing. I'll leave it to you, Lars, as to whether you'd like to take seven and eight together. So, we will have an outreach on Wednesday for ISPs. We've got two topics, and we've had a series of webinars that a number of you have attended, and a number of other people have attended as well, including on topics that were really interesting, one of which was DNS blocking. So, Lars, over to you for an update on those two things, maybe.

LARS STEFFEN

Yes. So, this is Lars speaking. So, we continued with a webinar series that we started last year. Last year, we had a total of six webinars and also hands-on lab sessions at the respective ICANN meetings. This year, we already had three webinars, and now we will have a summer break, so to say, and then we plan to continue with a webinar series starting from September again. The exact dates and topics, we still need to discuss in detail with the SSAC during this meeting, but we already have topics and speakers

suggested on the list, so I think we are in a good position to put the next dates on the agenda quite soon.

Just as a brief recap, so the last three webinars that we had on emerging DNS abuse trends, on the new gTLD program, and also on doing DNS blocking responsibly, it was quite interesting to see that the average number of attendees is nearly half of what we have seen last year, but maybe also due to the fact that last year we had two webinars that had very high peaks in attendance rates, so maybe this is just the glitch in the metrics, taking a look at the numbers, because all the other webinars are at the same average level of attendance rates.

So, long story short, I'm still working with Nico because I still have one attendee list missing to do the in-depth analysis for the webinars so far, to do individual outreach to those participants, again to approach them about the ISPCP, maybe also asking them to become members, and built on that, we will continue our outreach activities after the summer break. That's on the webinars.

The other one is on the outreach session that we will have on Wednesday afternoon. So, Wednesday afternoon, we will discuss privacy in the context of mitigating DNS abuse. This will be started by an introductory presentation by Thomas Rickert. So, Thomas Rickert will provide the legal framework, so to say, that we are dealing with, and in the context of the ISPCP, he will not only focus on registrant data, but also several other data elements that are relevant for ISPs.

And then we will have a panel discussion organized by the SSAC, which is led by, I received the slides this morning. So, Tara Whalen will discuss with Sarah Wyld from the Registrar Stakeholder Group, and with Gautam Akiwate from the SSAC, those elements that have been introduced by Thomas in the presentation before the panel discussion. And we are looking forward to it, and hope that we will see you in the room as well. And yeah, if you know anyone who would like to participate, please spread the word, and yeah, looking forward to see you on Wednesday in the afternoon.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Thank you, Lars. And just to reiterate what you just said, I think the cooperation with SSAC on this is really good. We try and convene those that are within our network, and they provide the material, and I think the discussion, the question time of those presentations are really good. So, the cadence is really good as well, so it works great.

LARS STEFFEN

Yes, absolutely. I mean, we reached out to SSAC based on the fact that those webinars last year that always had a strong security focus were the ones best attended, so this is why we shifted the focus to security-related topics and reached out to SSAC, and so far I think it's a very fruitful

PHILIPPE FOUQUART

Yeah, we're talking like between 80 and 130 maybe at some point participants, so it's really well attended. So, thanks for this. We've got 10 minutes to go. So, I think we're in good shape. If there are no other questions, let's have a look. Well,

I'll just pass item nine. This is for your reference, the project management page where you can find the ongoing policy work within the GNSO and things that will sooner or later end up on Council on which we will have to have a position, so be prepared.

Let's have a look at the public comments page very quickly, and hopefully we can adjourn early. We'll not take a decision at this point, but just for people to be aware of what's, again, what's coming. There's one open that's related to IDN. Let's go to the upcoming proceedings, and by the way, if there are people who feel strongly about that IDN related report, please shout, and we may convene a group to provide our comments on this.

And as far as the upcoming proceedings, you will see that the review of reviews draft report will be put to comments. We have a quote-unquote position on this which is posted on our website, I think, and that will be used as an input by our representative to the group.

There is, just as we speak, a session, conflicting session, which is why Oswaldo, our representative to the group, is not with us. We have a number of participants within the ISPCP have issues with the timeline and the cadence of the structural review element of the review of reviews, so we reflected that in the paper. And we'll

discuss this with the leadership of that cross-community group, and moving forward, we may even consider reusing this for an input to this draft report.

Okay. Thank you. Seeing no hand and no comment, let's go back to the final item, which is AOB. We've got nothing there at the moment. Anything else that people would like to discuss? Okay. Seeing no hand, thanks very much to the speakers. Thanks, everyone, for showing up, and have a very productive ICANN meeting, and see you sometime at the latest at our outreach session on Wednesday. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]