ICANN

Moderator: Nathalie Peregrine
March 14, 2017
7:45 am CT

Tony Holmes: Okay if we can start the recording. Thank you very much. And welcome to the ISPCP meeting. The agenda that we have is on the screen but we may reorder things slightly to get a better run through the meeting.

First of all let's make sure we have a round of introductions. Tony Holmes from BT, chair for three minutes, thirty seconds. So. Wolf?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Shall I say, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben from DE-CIX.

Lars Steffen: Lars Steffen from ECO Association.

Jen Taylor-Hodges: Jen Taylor-Hodges, BT.

Esteban Lescano: Esteban Lescano, CABASE.

Fiona Asonga: Fiona Asonga, TESPOC.

Christian Dawson:Christian Dawson, Internet Infrastructure Coalition.

Gonzalo Barajas: Gonzalo Barajas, Telefonica.

Shin Yamasaki: Shin Yamasaki, Japan Network Information Center.

(Peter Shian): (Peter Shian), student at University of Cambridge.

(Alexander Sanyan): (Alexander Sanyan), ICANN fellow and (unintelligible) Association.

Marie-Noemi Marques: Hello everyone. Marie-Noemi Marques from Orange.

Philippe Fouquart: Philippe Fouquart, Orange.

(Eric Hamar): (Eric Hamar), Orange also.

Alain Bidron: Alain Bidron, Alain Bidron. It's new.

Olivier Muron: Olivier Muron, Orange.

Osvaldo Novoa: Osvaldo Novoa, Antel.

Tony Holmes: Your turn, Tony.

Tony Harris: Tony Harris from CABASE, Argentina, also a member of the GNSO Council.

Tony Holmes: The people behind, please.

Emily Barabas: Emily Barabas, ICANN staff on the GNSO Policy Support Team. Thanks.

Tony Holmes: Thank you.

Terry Manderson: Terry Manderson, ICANN staff, Director of DNS Engineering, responsible for one of the root name servers, representative of the Australian Network Operators Group board and area director in the IETF.

Tony Holmes: Thank you very much and I didn't mean you to have to get up -- yet. Okay so the agenda's on the screen. In terms of running order, as I mentioned, we may change things around. But is there any addition or changes, comments on the agenda?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes Wolf-Ulrich speaking. I have slight additions. At the end under AOB it's just called I think on the AOB, but I would like to raise some points about the so-called bylaws drafting team, the work to be done there, and if possible if you have time, to come up with a public comment list in order to check just the ongoing public comments and ongoing work how they impact us, our work. And there's some housekeeping items as well. Thanks.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Thank you. So we'll add that on. The very first item on the agenda is the ISPCP elections. And we had an election for the ICANN chair and Wolf-Ulrich was kind of enough to stand and certainly at the full backing of the group to be our new chair. So I'd really like to welcome you. After many years of chairing this group, I know I couldn't leave it in better hands, Wolf. So I think it's excellent that we have to this stage and I would just like everyone to acknowledge as a vote of reclamation that Wolf is our new chair. I think we should welcome him. Thank you very much.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So Tony, if that is your handover, thank you very much. Thank you to all of you who elected me and who trust me that I could do the job. And this is - I think this is a specific step, as Tony mentioned, right now because he had the chairmanship of the ISPCP for well I don't know. Because when I started ten years ago, he was already there in that.

Tony Holmes: I had the seat for 12 and I'm not going any further.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So well the first thing I have to say is I don't see me in that post for this time, for this time period. So that's the first thing. Full stop. And I have to a little bit to say something about Tony. So especially for me personally, when I started here in the ISPCP constituency, I had no clue what is going on here. So not only in the constituency but just in the GNSO and in ICANN as a whole, and I had to learn a lot of things. So.

And there was some, a few persons, well, they helped me really. There was - I have to say the majority of them were female. There was on the one hand was Glen, you know here all, Glen DeSaintgery, and in addition there was also Marilyn Cade, very well know here. And she introduced me as well. And then there was Tony. This is specific for the ISP-related things and how to find out ways to discuss on the level of this our, let me say, father and sister constituencies in our stakeholder group and in our house and also to get seen on the relevant ICANN level, which is the board level, and then there others and then the ICANN executives.

So I have learned a lot from you in this respect and I thank you very much. And I do hope that you can not just lean back and say, "Okay that's my past, that was it," but just assist us at least for the future with your experience, with your knowledge, and with your (unintelligible) you have throughout ICANN. So I would like to thank you very, very much also not only personally but behalf of this constituency for the work you have done.

And so I think that is the reason why - one of the major reasons why we stand where we are. We are well known. We are seen on the executive level. We are seen with our requests. We are acknowledged because we have persons who

can really argument and not just cry, let me say in that way, and so that was - that is a lot of things you have done in the past. So thank you very much.

And last not least, we have a small let me say - it's kind of - you can see it's a gift or what, which will be popped up right now immediately to you that we can honor you in the future on our website here. And this is what it is. So this is just brand new on our website in remembrance of Tony Holmes. So I can just briefly read that. And thank you.

So Tony Holmes has served as chair of the ISPCP constituency for many years and has constantly performed his function with superior professional and diplomatic flair, good judgment, and a calm and amiable disposition, a born leader. The workload he has shouldered over this period of service to the constituency is certainly enormous.

Tony has now decided to step down as the chair but will continue to be active as a member of the ISPCP Executive Committee, and the ISPCP and wishes to publicly thank him for his invaluable contribution in leading the constituency and ensuring the ISP and connectivity providers industry has been well represented in ICANN.

So thank you very much, Tony.

Tony Holmes: Thank you very much. Well I'm quite touched by that. Thank you very much. And I will say that it's actually been a pleasure chairing this constituency. And the great thing about working with the ISP is it doesn't matter what the tests are that we've had or what the tribulations are. As a group, we have always worked very well. It's been a really good place to be, a very amicable bunch of ISPs, who can always put their differences aside and find a solution.

So to be honest, it's been an easy job working with you and you've made it that way. So I really appreciate that and I'm sure that we will all endeavor to continue to that with Wolf-Ulrich working in exactly the same way. And I certainly look forward to supporting you from the rear now. So thank you very much indeed. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thank you very much. So we have it also in stone within here so we can refer to that every time. Thanks very much.

So after that we go to work. And so we have an agenda here, as Tony said, the question is we have allocated some points to some people here in the room. For example Christian, I have to ask - and those people that are related to those points, are there any time constraints you have or - we can be flexible to allocate.

Christian Dawson: So Lars and I are going to be giving the universal acceptance update and I will be giving the update on the special use domain names. Actually my conflict is for the next 15 minutes starting now. So as long as we don't cover my points in the next 15 minutes, we're good.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. I think if I see number three point, well, normally…

Tony Holmes: There's another item before we get to three.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: There's also another item before we get three so that usually uses - consumes hours of time, you know, to talk about that. So it's okay. Thank you. There will be other items…

Tony Holmes: Yes just briefly to help Wolf-Ulrich through this agenda because we did this between us awhile ago, but under ISPCP elections, it wasn't just the fact that we welcome our new chair, it's also to just remind people that the election for the vice chair for this constituency is due and that will start on Monday. You will all as members be receiving the details from Chantelle. It will start with the two-week nomination period and then follow the process through. So just to make sure everyone is aware of that and to watch out for the e-mail. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Tony, for this reminder. That's very important. I think that the process takes us around two or three weeks, I think, according to the rules we have. So that will start in early next week. Thanks very much.

Yes let's go to number three, board seat elections. So some of you I'm sure who attended several meetings on the commercial stakeholder group level and maybe our closed meeting as well yesterday we had, they know already about that. So I would like briefly to summarize what it is about. So the Non-Contracted Parties House in the GNSO Council has to elect one board member, which is - who is going to take place in end of this year after the meeting in autumn.

And normally there is a process going on in advance to find out applicants and then also to get them elected. Now however this election procedure, the election, kind of election we are doing within our house is a little bit complicated as we are split up in the noncommercial side a commercial side of this house. And so the question is really how to get this board member then seated.

The board members you have to know is - needs eight votes from the council to be in place. In total this house has 13 votes and each part of the house has

six votes plus is there one appointee from the NomCom, who is also - who can also vote. So this is the procedure and we have still discussions about applications and about the process itself.

There are known three potential or - let me say that, two candidates are clear. They would like to apply for that. This is the one, the incumbent is Markus Kummer. The other one is Matthew Shears from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. And there is under discussion whether other candidates come up so within the Commercial Stakeholder Group where we belong to.

At the time being, there - we had found as a constituency a position that we are going to support Matthew Shears in the elections. However, we have to find a position within the - a common position within the Commercial Stakeholder Group and that is often not that easy.

So the situation is that tomorrow morning there is on the short term has been organized a meeting for the Commercial Stakeholder Group between 8 and 9 I think just in this room or the next room here next door and - where we will talk about this process again. And we have invited Matthew Shears here for a talk half an hour with us in order to get more better informed about his approach and, well, his application to the - as board member.

So that is what we are going to do. What I'm - what I have the question is, coming from the discussion we had already yesterday and the CSG discussion, whether there is any, let's say, any question mark to our position we have taken from yesterday in order to support Markus - Matthew and, well, under which conditions, are there any items, any thoughts about under which conditions that could be altered or could be, yes, could be changed. Are there any opinions on that?

I have Tony.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. Yes just on that particular point, I think some of that we will be considering a little bit further when we have the opportunity to meet with the other constituency, engage where they are a little better and also have the opportunity to talk with Matthew tomorrow. But certainly the steps you went through, Wolf-Ulrich, and the way you position that was my understanding. That was clearly the position of the constituency.

I just wanted to add that one of the things that I went to great lengths to try and point out in the latter or by an e-mail that we sent to the other CSG constituencies was the fact that we had discussed Heather's potential candidacy from the Intellectual Property Constituency and that both as a person and in terms of the way we thought she could operate on the board we had no doubt about her qualities there, but because of the situation we're in within the house, getting her elected we felt was a step too far. And certainly some of the conversations I had yesterday during the gala with various people I think underlined that.

As a result of that, this morning before we had the CSG session, briefly Chris from the BC and Greg and I also spoke with Heather and she has I believe concluded that she will not stand because of the reasons we said, getting her elected is really difficult. And she was given a pretty rough ride when she initially stood for vice chair and one of our concerns was that unless there was some chance of success, we didn't think it was appropriate to ask Heather to go through that sort of fierce interrogation that she had before.

So I think we're all on board but I think we are at the stage where currently there are only the two candidates, exactly you explained, Wolf-Ulrich, and

tomorrow we would be in a better position hopefully to come to some conclusions at the stakeholder group level.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Tony, for the explanation. Well I would encourage you as well if people in the room have contact to either Matthew or - Matthew as our preference candidate and would like to know more from him. I know him. He's open to any talk. So take this opportunity to learn about more if there are question marks behind whether we should support or not. So this is the best way, well, then to be prepared for this case when it comes to the election.

Are there any other thoughts for this point? I don't see. So this is - I think we are a little bit exhausted from these talks about these procedural things here, so I'll leave it as it is and we will see tomorrow morning what's going to happen then.

So let's move on to the next item, which is an update on the preparations for the GNSO Council this week. So the GNSO Council shall have its open meeting on Wednesday morning, tomorrow morning at 11 o'clock. So usually we have a bunch of things to talk about. This time in this meeting there is only one thing to decide. This is upon the charter of the so-called Standing Selection Committee.

Actually there are two points to decide. The other one is the appointment of Erika Mann to the auction proceeds working group as a co-chair from the GNSO. But this is under - so I think this is under the consent agenda point tomorrow morning, because there was overall when we discussed that in the constituency there was also overall support for her.

So with regards to the Customer Standing Committee on - not Customer standing Committee, I'm looking at the list - I'm changing - the Standing

Committee on Selections, the Selection Standing Committee we have. It's called the SSC, not CSC, it's SSC. Sorry. So this is the question how this goes. Tomorrow there's a motion at the table to adopt a charter for this committee and still this motion contains two options, the one option to base the membership on the stakeholder group level and the other option is, well, to base it on the constituency level.

So we have - some formal discussion. We have discussed it here also. That we are in favor of a have a representation on constituency level. It was discussed already on the GNSO session on Sunday morning. There are still divided views from the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group side because they are a little bit differently organized as we are, and there may be a discussion tomorrow.

So I would like to open the floor if there are any ideas, any thoughts on that on our position still relying on the constituency level or any other ideas with regard to that charter. Anything you would like to add, Tony, for that?

Tony Holmes: Well just to reiterate that we think people who've been here a few days will remember that we raised this when we met with the registrars - sorry, with the registry constituency. And the idea that we would actually be able to engage in that group and express an opinion seemed to be acceptable to them, providing we didn't in any way - we didn't challenge the voting rights and the set up of the bicameral house.

And obviously their concern was that if we went into that with the same sort of voting approach, where we were constituencies then the number of votes on our side of the equation from our house would exceed the total votes that they had. And I believe we recognize that and stated that wasn't the case, that what we wanted to do is be able to channel through our views on the basis that

although we're together as a block in the GNSO, we are quite diverse constituencies. And time and time again, this comes to head and we always have to compromise down to the lowest common denominator when it comes to actually expressing a view at the stakeholder level.

That isn't good for anybody because there as some significant players in the ICANN ecosystem, particularly from the business side, who can't really be represented. So I would ask our councilors when this discussion takes place to emphasize that point that it's about getting a voice and it's about representation and nothing beyond that. Because it could become really difficult to actually engage effectively as a representative from three very diverse constituencies and actually do them any form of justice.

So that was the basis for our plea. I think if we make that case, I hope it will be considered in the right spirit that we're not trying to channel anything other than to be able to participate in the process and represent our particular stakeholders in the right way. I think it's really important that we stress that that's what we're after and nothing more than that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes okay. Thanks very much, Tony. This is - well it's important. It's the right argument for this. Well I expect we shall have a compromise solution tomorrow at the council meeting. It's not officially on the table but there are discussions behind the scenes and I do hope that we can find a solution because, you know, it's an urgent point to solve since all these committees are going to be established right now under the new bylaws.

We have the empowered community, is it called, or is just group, where we send also from the GNSO one - every SO and AC is sending somebody, as I'm representing this community to that group. You know, that James Bladel as council chair as just on an interim basis because we are not in a position right

now under these open points to find a final solution. So he's still on an interim basis there. This has be solved.

And we have also ongoing openings for - and settlements for the - for review teams. They have to be filled as well. And so I think we are a little bit under pressure and do hope that the council can find a solution tomorrow for that. Any further point, idea, question mark? Not yet. Thank you.

Let's move to the next point. It's including, you know, the next point means council update, yes, ongoing points of discussion within the council, and I refer to Tony Harris in this respect. Thanks, Tony.

Tony Harris: Yes Tony Harris here. There was a very interesting meeting on Saturday morning in the GNSO Council room. Many of you probably know for quite some time there's been a cross-constituency working group working on evaluating the rights protection mechanisms that are enforced in ICANN, particularly the performance of the trademark clearinghouse and the UDRP.

And there was a report presented by Deloitte, admittedly with some difficulty because they couldn't project it, so we all got it in our e-mail sitting around the table. But the interesting thing is that Deloitte did an analysis of everything that happened with the trademark clearinghouse, which was set up for the new round of gTLDs as a protection mechanism for property trademark property rights.

And the total number of trademarks that registered in the clearinghouse were 28,000, which doesn't seem like an awful lot. It's a worldwide - it was a worldwide complication to do this. And the total number of labels or domain names that went through the process was 57,000 compared to the fact that

there were 20 million new domains registered by the new - through the new gTLD launches.

And there was a round of people talking and sort of explaining why this happened, the fact that there were practically no defensive registrations. When they had the previous rounds some years ago and Dot-Asia came up for example, Dot-Asia had more than 200,000 defensive registrations, just that one TLD.

And this time that didn't happen. And the explanation given by a couple of people at the table was that domain name holders had such an influx of new options and new top level domains, they just decided well, you know, we won't bother about defensive registrations and do it on a case by case as problems may come up. I thought that was an interesting comment to bring to our meeting here because it did - it does seem rather a meager result for all the effort and money that was poured into setting this up.

Aside from that, I think, Wolf-Ulrich, you already mentioned the question with the auction proceeds, right, about Erika Mann?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes I mentioned that.

Tony Harris: Because I'm on that working group, which is the working group on auction proceeds has an amazing amount of people I've never heard of. There must be more than 100 people on the list, all anxious to spend other people's money, in other words to assign - we have in the pool I think like $350 million from auction. And the work of this drafting - not drafting, of this working group, will be to establish the procedures by which people or organizations can apply for some of this money to be applied to projects which will benefit supposedly the Internet or communities.

So this is an extremely active group. They - we have meetings every 10 or 15 days, and I'm meeting a lot of new people, which is very, very interesting. And this group will not come out with a selection of projects that have to be funded but they will just set up the guidelines by which after the group is finished you can apply and try and get some of this money for a project.

And aside from that, well not much else happening in our meeting tomorrow. There are some updates on thick Whois and also a request on the Internet - on the participation in the Internet governance forum. The council wants to see a proper charter to decide whether they continue participating or not. And I think that's - we don't have anything else very exciting going on tomorrow, unless I've forgotten something, Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Tony, please?

Tony Holmes: Thanks. Yes just to add to the list that now I'm not chair I can ask a few questions. So I think those that were in the session between the GNSO Council and the GAC at this meeting were left in little doubt about the strength of feeling that exists on the IGO-INGO issues from the GAC side of things.

And my question is what is the overall feeling now within the council as a group and is there anything that we would need to discuss at the constituency level with thoughts of moving ahead and how that's going to be resolved, if it's going to be resolved here or how it's going to move? And I just wonder if there's any discussions at the council level that we've not been a party to. Because I thought was a significant stance that the GAC took the other day and it would probably have led to some discussions, even if informally,

between the council members and I wonder if you could update us if that's the case.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Good question, Tony. This is a complicated thing and, you know, because of the issues between the GAC and the GNSO on this matter, there was - have been these two sessions with regards to the IGO-INGO and the Red Cross on the other side related issue, so-called board facilitated discussion between GAC and the GNSO.

So I was also asking people, you know, who are involved, deeply involved in this discussion and do we see after four years of discussion, so this is contentious after a four-year discussion on the matter still, do we see an end of this or how we are going to deal with that as council or council members. Well you get mixed answers from those people, from the lawyer side I would say. So they have this strict view. Well they saying well this is - if it comes to any issue with regards to that, people should go to court, not to ICANN to solve that.

So this is their position. Well on the other hand the GAC is saying well no, this is a thing which should be solved under our, let me say, stewardship, yes, more or less. So I cannot judge so how much time we still need to solve this, whether we come, even come to a solution to that or just leave it as it is and wait and see what's going to happen, whether they build a case which will be put on court and what's happening there.

So for me personally it's just a question if we leave it as a status quo, can we live with that. So is there something which hinders us, well, to act in a broader sense. I understood it's sometimes rare cases which are in discussion, not the entire problem. So most of the issues are solved but there are rare cases still

open and they are not - still not solvable. So that's what I get but I invite
others also. Christian?

Christian Dawson: So my understanding is that really ultimately there are governments that are
objecting to one very specific - so there's something called the Paris Accord or
Article 6ter of the Paris Convention, and there are governments that believe
that the way that - how it is we are recommending in the current version of the
PDP process. This is interpreted - it's too wide of an interpretation of 6ter and
it's not in alignment with how many governments, including the U.S.
government, view the Paris Convention.

The thing is, from my perspective, this is far bigger than any disagreement
between government and a PDP working group. This comes down to how the
GAC is going to interface with us in the policy development process. What I
seem to be hearing from the GAC is this is a government issue, don't have a
working group - don't have a PDP working group on this. Let us deal with
this. This is our issue.

There is a PDP working group though and if we allow there to be movement
on this in ways that don't go through the PDP process, it undermines what it is
we have built here in the multi-stakeholder model, which is not the thing we
want to do right after all of these accountability measures are put in place. So I
think there's actually a really important issue for us, not because I think any of
us really care specifically about IGO-INGO things but because we sort of
need to stand up for the idea that, you know, governments have an important
role at the table but the PDP processes how to interface and build policy
processes at ICANN.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Christian. Well that is exactly where we are, so - because from the
procedure point of view, well, we don't or wouldn't like to allow the GAC,

well, to sideline that, yes, and to bypass our PDPs. And then the other issue we have here is, and the question open is, the position of the board with regard to that. And the board just looks at this process as a facilitator, not one who takes a decision in that at the end. So because they know, the board members know exactly that, well, this contentious problem with the GAC, well, is also difficult to solve so from the board perspective, yes?

So that is where we are. So I understand that we should stay with our idea, well, to rely on the preference for a PDP and the outcome of the PDP. That is where we stay. And so it should not be bypassed by the GAC itself. Oh I'm sorry. Malcolm in next, yes.

Malcolm Hutty: Can you clarify where we stand in the PDP process on this? Has it concluded or is it still ongoing? Is it possible for the GAC input to be fed into that process or has that ship sailed?

Christian Dawson: We're in the public comment process for this PDP. This is Christian Dawson for the record. And so I don't understand why the solution is simply for the GAC to put in a public comment, and they very may well. In fact I believe that the U.S. government is putting in extensive public comments on this issue. But why the conversation needs to happen in other circles than that, that's what I don't understand.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: First Tony, then Osvaldo. Osvaldo, please.

Osvaldo Novoa: Does the GAC publish their comment on our - on the working group document and they are firmly against two measures. One of them was not to change the UDRP process because we, according to our studies, the working group studies, it's not needed. The IGOs are sufficiently, I would say, they

have sufficient possibilities to participate in that process. But - and there was another one, another position from the GAC.

The problem I see is that the GAC wants ICANN to establish procedure to go over what the national laws of different countries already give to the IGOs. So there is - I don't see why should we do it but the thing is since the GAC works that one position from one member of the GAC, if it's not opposed to the others, it's considered consensus. What are we are seeing are the position of some countries which are not opposed by others but it doesn't imply that it is supported by other countries.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Tony?

Tony Holmes: Yes, the comment I was going to make was that I agree with what Christian said when he set this out. And the point Osvaldo made is a critical one. But we are where we are on this and for the board it's a really difficult issue. They've got to find a way through this some way or the other. I don't think the answer is to go the courts particularly. But the one thing that needs to come out of this is an acceptance on both sides and probably the emphasis or more on the GAC than on the GNSO. We never want to be here again.

Because, to my mind and that's your best place to answer this, Osvaldo. But I think during the process we made a lot of attempts to engage the GAC and if they had actually been taken up in the right way at the right time, I don't think we'd have ended up where we are today. So this - even if it was to be resolved in a way that's outside of the way the PDP process should go, there has to be an acknowledgment that this can never happen again, and that seems to be an overriding message for me because we should never have got to this situation.

Malcolm Hutty: If we're still in -- Malcolm Hutty -- if we're still in public comment, have we even - I mean I understand what you're saying about you wouldn't want to get here again but actually have we even got there this time? If we're in public comment and the GAC is saying no we're not happy with what's been proposed to put out for public comment and it's making representations that this is not the right thing to do, fine. You know, that's what public comment is for, yes, and those can be taken into account.

I don't see - I mean we certainly need - I certainly think the idea of the board intervening now while the public comment is still open, I think our position there should surely be that there is no place for that, that this is - there is no requirement. This process should be allowed to play out. And actually with a bit of a good sense a wiliness to compromise all sides, we may well be able to accommodate at least some of the points the GAC are making, I mean, and thereby achieve exactly the bit which is really my only concern, which is what Christian said, (unintelligible).

Tony Holmes: If I can come back on that, Malcolm, I think we are in a place that we don't want to be because we must never be in a position where we have a PDP process and expect the GAC to use the public comment period just to suddenly put in a view. We're going to be here time and time and again if that's accepted as the process that the GAC could adopt. They are part of this. There's a liaison from the GAC that is kept to - or should have been kept aware of each stage, and I believe they were kept aware.

There's the opportunity for the GAC to come back as the PDP process is being developed. Let's not even think about waiting until we finally finish the PDP and then say here's a public comment period and by the way, GAC, this is your opportunity to comment. That's totally wrong.

Malcolm Hutty: If we're in a PDP public comment, if that's the correct understanding, I would
                 have thought that actually it's entirely proper for a government or anybody
                 else to say that they're not happy with that.

Tony Holmes: As an addition.

Malcolm Hutty: What I don't want to happen is - I mean it would have been better if they'd
                 engaged earlier on certainly but the real thing that I want to avoid is the PDP
                 concluding and then the GAC use the power to provide input on public policy
                 issues direct to the board after the conclusion of the PDP process. That's what
                 we really need to avoid.

Emily Barabas: Hi. Emily Barabas from ICANN staff. And I admit that I'm not personally
                 working on this project but I just did want to clarify that there are actually two
                 different PDP processes related to IGO-INGO and one of them has concluded
                 and one of them is in public comment now.

                 So I think that that may be the point of misunderstanding is that one of these
                 processes had completely concluded, the working group has disbanded
                 essentially because it had completed its work. There was partially conflicting
                 GAC advice and I think that's actually the issue that we are - that is most
                 acutely felt now is that there was this conflict. It's not that things can just be
                 sent back to the PDP working group because that working group doesn't really
                 exist anymore. So I think that's perhaps…

Malcolm Hutty: (Unintelligible) my first question (unintelligible).

Emily Barabas: Indeed. So I think that may clarify the point a little point. And I apologize that
                 I can't go into a great deal of the detail about the specifics of that but I think
                 that is actually the key issue that's kind of missing from this. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That's okay. Thanks very much for that clarification. So we have Osvaldo.

Christian Dawson: This is Christian. That was extremely helpful, thank you very much. I wanted to say that there - that this is not a unique issue. There is something systemic about the way that that has happened. In my brief time at ICANN I have seen that happen with the privacy and proxy working group, where, you know, they waited until the PDP working group process had completely concluded and six months later just completely eviscerated it.

And this is the type of activity that just can't stand, and really we - the bigger issue at hand is there somehow needs to get a message to the GAC about playing ball within our timelines and within the proper procedures for building policy.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Osvaldo, please, and state your name.

Osvaldo Novoa: Osvaldo Novoa. Yes the issue here is that from the beginning the GAC says that the IGO shouldn't be considered inside a PDP. They should be outside the normal procedure. They even had the small group. They formed a group with the board representatives, IGO representative and GAC representative to discuss this issue and we - the working group received what they - the result of that meeting that wasn't totally in line with what the work group was doing. So the work group required a lawyer, a specialist lawyer, report and the special - and the lawyer said that what the GAC asking hasn't - didn't have sufficient support in international law to be - to implement it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. That's helpful. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. And the - what you mentioned, Osvaldo, last it means these side talks, yes, between the GAC and board, these have been - have raised much concern in the community about

what's going on with regards to accepting a PDP or having additional talks on different levels in order to find a solution with which people from the other side would like to see. So we rely here on this, the incumbent processes, and we'll go for that for the future.

We have got one comment here from remotely. Lars, please.

Lars Steffen: This is Lars. One comment from Mark McFadden. The message has indeed gone to the GAC but individuals from the GAC can represent GAC. In addition, the GAC claims that they are unable to work within the constraints of the current PDP process.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. And this is always the discussion you have - you have to face when you have discussions with GAC members. We tried over the past years, well, to get closer between GAC and GNSO. So we - as it was mentioned here, so we installed a GNSO GAC liaison so we - who's on council as a liaison, well, to the GAC as well who can participate in GAC calls, yes. He doesn't have a voting right but he has - he can actively also participate in that. So and that is - that took us some years, well, to get to this point.

That helps a lot in order to engage, well, engage the GAC in what's going on from the first point of view when we start these PDPs. Engagement means, as we have heard from Mark as well, there is no real engagement because they are not permitted or they are not in a position to, well, to take any votes, well, in working groups or to contribute really to the working group. And that makes it really difficult for them.

But nevertheless, I think it's even better than we had years ago when we just had meetings at ICANN meetings with the GAC where it came to just

complaints about the processes and nobody understood. So it's even better at the time being. So. And I think it takes time, well, to understand each position. Anybody else? Christian?

Christian Dawson: Sorry, I'm continuing to harp on this situation. If - I don't fully understand why the GAC doesn't feel as though they can engage in the PDP process but that's fine. It is what it is. Perhaps somebody ought to take a look -- and this may not be the right forum to discuss it -- at the PDP creation process and to figure out a method of GAC engagement at the initiation of a PDP so that those things to come to a head at the end.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thanks, Christian. So we can close this point I think, so. And there is nothing else to be discussed under this item. So the council meeting is that - is not to take that much decisions tomorrow. Well, may I refer (unintelligible). Please?

Philippe Fouquart: Yes sorry, if you're finished on PDP. It's on a different point. It's on the GNSO Council but it's another point that Tony mentioned earlier but please do close your discussion on PDP.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes close that. If you have something else with regard to the council, please.

Philippe Fouquart: Yes thank you. It's more a question really. You referred to anecdotal evidence of defensive registration going down for new gTLDs. I was wondering whether that was just that, anecdotal evidence, or is there - the word was going out that was just, well, pretty much no use in endeavoring into creating new TLDs for that kind of use, the point being that that's really the sort of feedback we've received internally as the strategy for defining a brand, for

instance, whereby you would select the mainstream gTLDs and forget about all the others, considering the sheer number of TLDs that you have around.

And the common practice would seem to be that you concentrate on the main ones and the reason - the result being what you said that the defensive registrations would go down on the minor ones. So I was wondering whether that was just anecdotal or whether that's - might be something that could be taken into account for a possible second round for instance.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks for your question and don't forget to say your name next time you come up.

Philippe Fouquart: That was (Phil) from Orange.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much. Tony?

Christian Dawson: I didn't get the question. He speaks so lowly.

Tony Holmes: Maybe I can try and help. I think what Philippe was saying that is that, the figures you quoted, is it just anecdotal evidence or is there a real - is there real evidence? Please correct me if I'm wrong. Is there real evidence that the general approach now is that, as far as defensive registrations are concerned, you may think about in the major domains but in the other domains it will come in the stream. And there are many of them. Basically you wouldn't go for defensive registrations as a strategy. Is that correct, Philippe? Yes.

Tony Harris: I can answer that from another perspective also. I'm sorry I didn't quite hear your question because I'm also a registry. I have a new TLD and we had - we have a good (unintelligible). We had 120 defensive registrations and we were expecting maybe 5,000. So I think that that's going to go that way. It's a

decision being taken by trademark property holders. There are so many to attend to, let's just, you know, deal with a problem when we have one. That's the conclusion. I don't think it will change.

Tony Holmes: Just as a comment on that. Certainly within BT, the sort of strategy we've always adopted is don't do defensive registrations. Basically we - the process that we tend to go for is we send out notices, desist notices, and if that doesn't stop it, we sue them. And it seems to work pretty well. So we've never gone down that line of going for defensive registrations. I don't know whether there's any other views around the table.

I will add to that, there's one problem with that that we have experienced, but hopefully we're fixing that, and that is you need a good Whois to make it work.

Philippe Fouquart: Sorry, (Phil) from (Castle Orange). There were two points. First you need a good Whois and then second, it might be just be a strategy but in practice that's interesting to have the feedback from the registries because a lot of brand owners would say that they would just do that, wouldn't do defensive registrations while, in practice, they would actually do that. So I'm interested in the feedback from the registry industry as opposed to hearing theoretical strategies. But your - I think we agree. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Philippe for this question and this point. Well, is that a point to be discussed also in the new gTLD round discussion? So because it would be experience coming from, you know, from the last round with this type of registrations and so I can refer you. I think there are some meetings as well here over the - during the ICANN meeting. Yes, Tony?

Tony Harris: There is a group - I wasn't able to go the sessions here because we were engaged in other commitments, but there is a working group on subsequent rounds which has actually gone quite far in reviewing what happened with this round. There are even some, let's say, public comments still open on that where you can see what the comments are and put in your own if you want.

And I think there will be some changes to the applicant guidebook because things - problems have surfaced particularly with the retail chain, which has been a negative factor for new applications. The registrars have - the big registrars have gone to cherry picking and have closed out, you know, any participating into a large number of new TLDs, mine is one of them. And as far as will this be considered in the new guidelines for subsequent rounds, the question of the trademark clearing house, I think that will continue because it's something which is used by a number of trademarks and it also gives a halo of, let's say, legal resource to the proceedings for a trademark holder.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, Tony. Thanks very much. Any further question with regards to the council activities? Not yet. Thanks very much. We have originally planned, well, to have a small break at this time after this item. So we could do that, well, actually well I have a question with regards to number five, universal acceptance update. Do we expect an update coming from people, from - in addition or is it your turn, Christian?

Christian Dawson: Lars and I are going to give the update ourselves.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. So let's go through - not allocated a specific time to that timeslot. Yes okay. So we need some time, well, to load this presentation and all these things. I suggest we have a ten-minute break right now and then we come back here at 3, yes? So we'll be back in a minute.

So could we start the recording? It never stopped. It never stopped, yes? It never stopped.

Man: It never stopped, is okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you. Thanks. So please take your seats, so we would like to continue with our agenda. The next item on the agenda is an update on universal acceptance and I think this item is going to be shared by Christian and Lars. I don't know who is going to start. Christian, you are the one.

Christian Dawson: Thank you very much. We'll go ahead and get started. We are - we're briefing you today on universal acceptance at TLDs. This is an issue that the ISPs have had a great deal of leadership on. And so I'm proud to bring you an update on the things that we have achieved since the last meeting.

Tony Harris was one of the first people who was championing the cause of universal acceptance for a long time before it started being picked up and we built an organization around it. Now within the ISPCP we have Lars and I both as co-chairs of the outreach committee of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group.

So a lot of what we're going to give you today is focused on the outreach activities that Lars and I have been directly managing as part of our process. So I wanted to - and I wanted to thank Lars for his sort of newly anointed vice chairmanship in this organization and turn it over to Lars to walk you through some of the outreach goals that we've achieved since the last time we spoke to you and gave you an update.

Lars Steffen: This is Lars. Thank you, Christian. We had a workshop on Sunday for the Universal Acceptance Steering Group and this is the slide deck from (Andrew

Robertson). (Andrew Robertson) is from (Edelman), the agency that helps us with our community outreach of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. And I will walk you through the slides.

This is the umbrella message that never changed since our last presentation at the ISPCP. So universal acceptance is essential for the continued expansion of the Internet. It ensures that new domain extensions and e-mail addresses can be used by all Internet-enabled applications, devices and systems. Then we still have also the same supporting messages. I won't walk through all in detail.

We have a specific target audience we are now talking to. So we are looking for people who can make UA readiness happen, so we are looking for developers and system architect that really make software and applications and to introduce universal acceptance to those products. We are looking for people who direct to make this happen. Those are the CIOs. And we are looking for influencers. So we are looking for people on the C-level in any position, we are looking for board members, governmental officials, consultants, media, and also we are looking for industry influences.

There are some progress we made since the last ICANN meeting. So together with (Edelman) we reached out to several media and analyst channels. So we are looking for - we reached out to several channels on the CIO level and media that is reaching out to those audiences. We have set up a role of blog posts and articles that we spread through several associations.

You see there are (unintelligible) the Domain Name Association, there are several parts of the (Eurispa) so (Edelman) reached out to all those subgroups of (Eurispa) and the members. There are the (Bitmee), just one example of the small and medium businesses in Germany in the IT sector. So they are all - we

reached out to them. We sent them articles and blog posts they spread out in their communities and among the membership. We set up a program to add UA-relevant posts to LinkedIn groups that are CIO related, and we had a row of media posts, and we have got a row of studies that we did with (APNIC), with (THNIC) and several other partners.

So our top priorities right now are the case study programs. So we are still looking for especially ISPs to do case studies. If they think that they are UA ready, we are more than keen to get in touch with them and do case studies with them. We are still working to broaden our base of content that we can put on our website, where we can redirect and refer to if people are looking for more information about universal acceptance. We keep growing our engagement with associations, the analysts, and the LinkedIn groups that I just mentioned. And we are also currently updating our website and posting social media posts.

The case study program. We currently have a number of case studies already published, those made with (APNIC), with (THNIC), ICANN, and (Exgen). And there's one in development with (Sensar). So as I already mentioned, if you are aware of any activities that are worth adding to this list and if you are - know somebody who is engaging in this and where you think it's worth to make a case study, please let us know.

So here you have a row of documents that we recently added to the documentation list on our website. It's UASG.tech. There you have one sub site where you have all the documents listed. So there's one outreach document that we also translated into several more languages. There's another one that's still in development, and also one document about programming language hacks that's still in development. And in the UA block you find several updates with the dates that I mentioned on the slide.

So also as I already mentioned we have an association engagement. I wouldn't - don't want to go too much into detail on this slide. It says that we are reaching out to several target groups where we identified a number of associations that we use as a multiplier for our message, especially (Edelman) is still in contact with a row of analysts. The idea behind it is also to do case studies with them and to enable them to be key influences for our message so that we can get those people stepping into the role to be one of our influencers and ambassadors to regularly inform and engage their target audience about universal acceptance.

Here you see a number of - or a list of LinkedIn groups where we posted CIO-relevant universal acceptance posts, together with (Edelman). One point that Mr. (Robertson) also pointed to was when you are aware that in several regions those media platforms next to LinkedIn that are maybe relevant to you and therefore our target audience, you don't have to stick to LinkedIn. So in the German-speaking community we are, for example, we do have a platform that's called (Sing). That's exactly the same like LinkedIn but it's basically German speaking and it's still ahead of LinkedIn in popularity. So just be aware that you don't have to stick to LinkedIn.

So our key activities in the future is to build and develop our information base, especially when it comes to regional outreach. We would like to have more documentation and material in Russian, Chinese, and Indian languages. So if there are volunteers for translations, they are more than welcome. And we are still working on, as you can see, also to get to larger media channels like CNN, Time, and (unintelligible).

This is sort of a timeline for those activities. And in two weeks, we've got one large initiative that will take place at the WHD Global. So there's one forum at

the WHD that's called the Night Talk so every night when the regular agenda is already over and people are start to socializing, WHD is having a night format that's only starting at 10 o'clock in the evening for those that are still keen on content and input and what's going in the industry. And that's the so-called Night Talk.

And I've been asked by several people in the UASG what's this Night Talk, I've never been there. So I digged (sic) out some pictures from our archive to - just to give you a rough idea of what's going on there. So it's in Europa-Park. It's the second largest theme park in Europa and Europe. And the whole WHD if you are not aware of the WHD, it's the world's largest event on hosting and cloud service providers with roughly 6,500 attendees and it takes four days, yes, around - five days. Yes, exactly.

So at the Night Talk I would say roughly 100, 150 people are gathering so it's a nice audience. This is one picture of last year's Night - no, two years ago, the Night Talk with Open-Xchange. But this is the usual setting and Christian also drafted a nice header for this one. So where will your next billion users come from is the title of this universal acceptance talk at WHD, just to reach out to all those ISPs that are part of this event and to let them know that universal acceptance is something they should have an eye because maybe they are missing a few future customers if they are not really UA-ready.

So who do we have on the panel? We are very glad that we have Ram Mohan on the panel. So Ram Mohan is the chair of the UASG but also executive vice president of Afilias and a member of the ICANN board. We have Blake Irving, the CEO of GoDaddy. We have Michele Neylon. He's the Blacknight. And one small change on the agenda is that not (Erin Phillips) will join us, it will be Rafael Laguna, the CEO of Open-Xchange. And Christian and me will be the moderators of this nice little Night Talk.

One additional document we are working on is the CIO's guide to UA readiness. It's a document that is especially written in a way that it should attract CIOs of ISPs to let them know why it is worth for them to be universal acceptance ready. The main part of this, or the most interesting part, due to our feedback we receive from a few guys we sent this document is the appendix of industry software.

So we put together a huge list of software that's commonly used in the industry but it's far from being complete. Maybe it will never be complete but we are especially looking for examples of software we would like to add to this list we are not aware of that's maybe just used in certain parts of the world or regions but where people this that this is important, this software or the pieces of software should be UA-ready and that we can gives some guidance to take a look at your own inventory if the software is part of your infrastructure.

So we will send it out in the next few days for comments and review and we will be more than happy to get, especially for this list, more input and comments that we can add to this list and spread out to the CIOs. So this is the update from my side on universal acceptance of the work of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group and will hand over to Christian and ask which slide deck he would like to continue.

Christian Dawson: Okay. Well thank you very much. I think that that's - we won't go exhaustively through the other two slide decks that I want to just briefly touch on. Let's go ahead and pull up the Analysis Mason slide deck. I'm only going to have us take a look at couple of them, a couple slides. But first I wanted to explain why, for those of you who are new to this subject, why the ISPs have gravitated towards trying to take a leadership role in this area.

And it really centers on the idea that when things aren't working on the Internet, we're the ones that get the calls telling people - telling us that there are problems and that we're supposed to fix them. And in this case, it's really hard to fix this particular issue because this particular issue has to do with how the software of the world works.

So we have to go around and figure out how to target basically the systems of the world to make sure that they're compliant with the way that the modern Internet works. I feel as though this is a really good example, perhaps the best example, of why it's important for ISPs to be involved in ICANN. Because as the DNS grows it affects our organizations deeply. And this is a example of how decisions that are made to affect - to change the DNS have directly affected our users and our systems.

So with that in mind, we have this big charge to go ahead and explain to everybody how they can update their systems, and we spent the past year or so working on guides that show people how to technically get things moving forward. We showed you those in the past two updates that we've given this group.

Now we're working on a couple of different things to try and convince business people, CIOs, CTOs, CEOs that they should invest time and resources into this. So if you want to advance just two slides, I can show that this is a paper that we have hired a group called Analysis Mason to do. The goal is to go out there and find effective case studies of organizations that have been doing UA testing and building in UA readiness, start to explain why they are doing that.

And we do that in the context of trying to come up with some verifiable numbers for the financial benefits of doing so. So that's sort of the basis for wanting to put this paper forward, getting it in simple terms into the hands of CIOs, CEOs, and CTOs. If you want to skip forward two more slides, real briefly, you make the case for the increasing but still relatively small demand for gTLDs. But then you go ahead, and if you advance to the next two slides from now, you talk about what happens as this continues. Sorry, actually two slides from now is simply a overview of one of the case studies that we're working on with (Bairn). It's the next slide that I'm interested in.

That starts to forecast some of the eventual financial benefit of the increasing adoption of the gTLD program and the estimated per annum benefit of UA for particularly IDNs, taking a look at the size of the markets in - for Vietnamese, Russian, Arabic, Chinese, and Indian languages to showcase that you are leaving a lot of money and resources on the table if you are not enabling your systems to be ready for this.

There's - the next slide goes into a little bit of methodology, which is interesting if you want to get a copy of this, just explaining where it came up with its numbers. But by and large, we just wanted you to know that we're building corroborating information to show people that this is important and should be addressed. And we're trying to take this to Fortune 500s and enterprises to convince them to do something about UA.

Now let's quickly flip over to the other deck. In previous meetings, we have -- and go to slide number six -- in previous meetings we have had (Ashwin), who is the CTO of ICANN, come in and explain to us the efforts that he has put it into try and bring ICANN up to speed with UA readiness. And it's not an easy task. So we had ICANN come and give us a briefing as to where they are in the process, and you can tell that they are still not there.

So if you go ahead and look to this slide, slide eight, I'm sorry, you can see that where they're at right now is they're 39% complete with the off-the-shelf software that they use for business-directed services, 40% of off-the-shelf software. There are 21 that need contract updates and 18, only 18, that are UA compliant. With custom services, there are 25 systems that need to be tested and fixed, and only 15 that are UA compliant. And you're talking about ICANN itself.

I mean granted it's a large organization but after working on this thing for two years they've still got a significant way to go. So that just shows the scope of the problem and how much we - work we still need to do to not only point people in the right direction of how to fix this issue but now spend time convincing them to focus on that issue. So I'll stop there and see if there are any questions.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much, Christian and Lars, for these comprehensive presentations here. First question, can we have these slides as copies?

Christian Dawson: Lars, can you send them to the group?

Lars Steffen: Yes ill do so.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thanks, thanks very much. On the other hand there are some stickers here floating around so you can put here or wherever you like, you know. If you've proven UA proven, so that's great to see. Well thank you. Well this is a bunch of activities which is done there. I wish you best success for all of these activities.

And my only question is then to that is, well, let me phrase it this way. Can you - how can you measure success on that? Is it just, well, you get people - that you can see, okay, these kind of meetings are bumped with people who are interested in that, that's a great thing to see? And in areas where - which are very remote to us for example, how you can reach those areas and get also a reaction from their side? So that's my only question. And then for the next question I'll leave it with Tony. But, Christian.

Christian Dawson: This is Christian for the record. So each discrete project has established metrics for success. On a grander scale, we are still working on how to determine big-picture metrics for success. We've - we are leveraging a reporting tool that we'll be starting to use and so there are some discussions about whether, you know, an increase or decrease in reporting of UA problems can be a metric that we utilize to measure big-picture success.

The other thing that of course we can look at is if you are - right now if we're targeting Fortune 500 companies, we can sort of go the brute force method and do our testing of Fortune 500 systems to see if they seem to be by and large more UA ready over time, and that can be an indication of success. But for now, without those big-picture metrics, we're simply focusing on discrete goals for individual projects and making sure that each one has its own distinct metric for success.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. First, Tony Holmes and then is a question from remote and then Tony Harris.

Tony Holmes: Tony Holmes. In fact my question was going down the same line as Wolf-Ulrich because we had some discussion about metrics when this project started and I think that's absolutely essential that that is something that we

really keep an eye on because that is the only measure of success here. And it was interesting listening to your response.

The other question I was going to ask was, was that the reason that suddenly we got along the path of involving others, Analysis Mason for instance? Was that driven by metrics that you got previously? I gather that isn't the case now. But I would suggest that one of the things you could add on to their approach would be to have some feedback on appropriate metrics and how they can be built into this project.

Because if you haven't gotten a good feel for metrics we're really sort of floundering in the dark. I've sure you've done a really good job, and I follow the mailing list so I know a lot of effort's gone into this in various ways, but it's always, as we found before as ISPs, it's the bits that you don't reach that really come back to bite you. So metrics seems absolutely essential.

Christian Dawson: This is Christian. I would definitely agree with that. And I will carry that message from the ISPs into the two-day UA leadership summit that we're going to be having in Seattle next month.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So next question from remote. Lars, please.

Lars Steffen: Yes this is Lars here. The question from Mark McFadden pointed to the same direction. He said I wonder if there's any update on the measurement and monitoring project group in the UASG. I get why the outreach part is so important but having data metrics about acceptance is really necessary to tell if the UASG is making any progress. So it goes into the same direction and I guess we already answered that.

I can add to this as I talked to (Don Hollinder) this morning about this that is would be nice to have at least some more metrics and data about the ones we already set up just to have a comparison where the progress is after one year. Thank you.

Christian Dawson: I will add just one last comment and that's that we have also seen - we've also asked (Mark Sponzarek) from Microsoft to come and update us I think three meetings ago and (Mark) I think has within the scope of the work that he is directing within the UASG to pick up more measurement and monitoring projects for the group.

I'll have to query him as to where he is with that. He directed the group in the creation of the CTO guide, which is now out, and it's fantastic and I think that he was distracted from, not distracted but he took as his primary focus the generation of the how-to guide before the measuring and monitoring, but I'm hoping that that comes next.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Christian. So we have Tony. Please say your name.

Tony Harris: Yes a couple of things, comments and questions. First I think I'd like to propose we recognize Mark McFadden's contribution also to universal acceptance. I don't think we did that today. Mark was a very important factor in getting this going. And then I have a question and a comment. The question is are you sufficiently - is the UASG sufficiently funded by ICANN? And the comment is - actually it's a second question. You should maybe mention the elections for vice chair because some people here might like to vote for you. I would definitely. And that's my two questions.

Christian Dawson: Thank you very much. I am standing for reelection as vice chair and so we could pass around the ballots if you'd like and if - okay, I'll send it to the list.

Is the program sufficiently funded? To meet our current scope, yes, the program is sufficiently funded. Once we get to the point where we have built all the materials that we need and feel like a wider advertising, wider - a wider mouthpiece for what it is we've built is required, there may come a point in which the answer is no, but for right now the answer is yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Tony, please, yes.

Tony Harris: Might I make a suggestion then in that case, I've always felt that the funds that would derive from the auctions from the new gTLD process that a percentage of those funds should be dedicated to this because that's money that is being taken from applicants. There are applicants that are having trouble with the domain names being resolved. What better application for that money could there be than solving this? And once you have all the materials in place, you've got to get out to an awful lot of people out there in the world and that's going to be expensive.

So I mean if I say this, it'll be lost in a public forum, but as, let's say, as the working group, if you suggest something on these lines, they might sort of keep 5% of the 350 million or instead of giving it all away keep some for that. But I'm just suggesting this might be something you might consider within the group.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: The next one on the list is here, Philippe and then Tony, if you can please. Philippe, please.

Philippe Fouquart: Thank you. It is more of a question really. When you reach out to ISPs, I seem to remember that there were a few test e-mail addresses that we could use, also domain names. Have you gotten like - I mean I guess for the smaller ISPs the first question that we'll ask is what is it that I'm going to have to do to test

out what I should be doing? Is there comprehensive like test for it or things that they can use directly to work and figure out whether they comply or not?

I know by experience that leaving aside the IDNs and all the those cryptic outlets even for simpler new gTLDs, I had a lot of difficulty internally even figuring out whether some ten-letter new gTLD was supported by some of our customers in some airports in a form that was meant to support all gTLDs and then which were not in practice. So is there like documentation that we can use to do just that? Thank you.

Christian Dawson: So - this is Christian. Yes and no. We have a document called the UA quick guide, which is at UASG.tech. And it shows you what a properly operating UA environment should look like. And so when you compare that to your systems, you say well does my system function like this and you can determine whether you are UA ready by contextually using - utilizing your system and seeing if you get the right output. But we don't have some automated test system at this point.

Philippe Fouquart: Philippe, just to follow up on this one. It's - I know the guide and it's quite high level, let's put it this way, and from a practical perspective it's probably not enough I would say. I'm coming back to the point that you made earlier as to where you were and whether you were properly funded. I think there's still a lot more work to do to sketch out some of the practical tests maybe that people will have to do. Just a thought. Thank you.

Christian Dawson: That's good feedback. We'll take all this back to Seattle in a couple weeks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: It's okay. I still have Tony Holmes here for one comment and are there others to chime in? Not yet. So, Tony, please.

Tony Holmes: Tony Holmes. Having listened to the questions that have come in, Christian, and the feedback and Tony's point about point about possible proceeds being used for that, it seems to me more and more that it's such a critical piece that you have to do that analysis somehow and certainly get some feedback on how it's actually progressing. The only way to do that is to really have some form of data that you can collect on this. And that needs to be pretty extensive so you can cut it various ways.

I mean you can - it needs to be done I would suggest geographically. It needs to be done in terms of certain implementations, e-mail and applications and all of that. IDNs is another cut. So it's not a quick or easy thing to do but it's absolutely essential because without that you are running a bit blind despite the great efforts you put into it.

And I think it's a good suggestion to actually make that point maybe in a public forum, where I believe it would be acceptable even to say that we discussed this within the ISPCP meeting and it's certainly a feeling from the ISP industry that it would be a good thing to try and do that. It's an essential part of the puzzle.

And if you were able to maybe use some of the funding from that base, then you'd be able to do it in a much more professional and much more complete manner than you can otherwise and see what sort of response you get. Because it seems that it's a proposal that is really responsive to support everyone, all of us involved in new gTLDs should benefit from that work and it's a great to have a measure, if you can do that.

Christian Dawson: This is Christian. My one comment there is I agree with you. We also made that specific statement. We stood before the board as the ISPCP and said

exactly that in Marrakesh, and we did get a response and they said engage through the process, which you're doing, Tony. You're…

Tony Holmes: My answer to that is -- and I remember that -- but my answer to that if you're going to use that and it's going to be effective, it need to be expedited and the process, I believe, Tony's better to comment on that than me, but then they're coming to no quick conclusions. All you're asking is for a small slice to make sure the whole thing works. So it does need to be said again and I think trying to expedite it is worth a slot anyway.

Christian Dawson: I definitely support the sentiment. What I'd like to consider is perhaps a greater message if Lars and I can bring it back to the group and engineer it based on feedback that we've received from the ISPs who've been helping lead this project, a message and perhaps even letter coming the UASG proper if it comes to the same conclusions in a letter form might even have more resonance.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Tony Holmes: With that I would suggest that it would be really good if you do that. Maybe the ISPCP could also put in a letter to the board supporting that as well. So (unintelligible) might be helpful.

Christian Dawson: Absolutely.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, well, you will understand -- Wolf-Ulrich speaking here -- Christian and Tony, that's a great idea to do, so how is it going to be managed? Who is going first? Is it UASG or should we do something together here with regards to a letter or - and how shall we proceed?

Christian Dawson: Well I don't want to speak for Lars but my idea was that the two of us could go before the UASG and suggest that the UASG make a statement to the board requesting that. If the rest of the group is willing to put that forward, then we would go back to the ISPs and loop them in and we would either do two letters or, depending on whether there's interest from the UASG, have us sign on to theirs. But certainly make sure that the ISPs are well represented in that process. If the UASG does not wish to move forward, that doesn't mean that the ISPs can't.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Great. Okay. Did we cover this point? Yes. Thank you very much. Thank you very much for your activities. There is still one remote question or remark? Please, Lars.

Lars Steffen: Yes this is Lars. One comment from Mark McFadden. Wouldn't SSAC possibly join in?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Do you have contact to SSAC, specific contact with regards to that?

Christian Dawson: When we had spoken to the SSAC previously they had pointed us to the documents that they have produced on the subject. And I get the perspective that they feel as though their work is done. Ram Mohan is both a board member and an SSAC member and he's our chair. So if somebody is going to push them further, it would probably be him and I don't have enough SSAC institutional knowledge to know whether their work really is done or not, depending on their scope.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Tony, last word.

Tony Holmes: Yes. Thanks. I'm unsure of Mark's question and he's online so perhaps he'll come in. I thought he was suggesting that SSAC may support the push for a

small slice of funding to be diverted towards resolving the metrics issue. So Mark, maybe you can answer that question. It may be my reading was wrong. Oh he's just come through and said yes that's the case. So I think he is suggesting that you approach SSAC to see if they'll support that thrust to help get the metrics underway.

Christian Dawson: I see. Okay. We can take that note as well to the - into Seattle.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thanks very much for this presentation and the discussion. So before we move to the next point, which is (unintelligible), I would like to come back, well, to the introduction because I saw some new faces here at the table and maybe behind me and I welcome here these four in this round so I would like not to introductions to you but ask you to introduce yourself please.

Lise Fuhr: Well thank you very much. I'm Lise Fuhr. I'm the general director of ETNO. ETNO is the European Telco Association. We have a lot of the biggest telcos as members in Europe. So that's well Orange, BT, it's Deutsche Telecom, it's Telefonica, a lot of the big telcos.

Before that I worked seven years for the Danish registry, DK Hostmaster, so I've been around the ICANN world for that long and of course I was co-chairing the IANA stewardship together with Jonathan Robinson. So now I'm an interim PTI board member and I will apply for a second go for that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much. Your specific liaisons to this community are very well received. Thank you very much. Do we have other people here? I saw in the background if I can speak for you. (Yulf), so he's (Yulf) from Finland. He is also on the GNSO Council and he's one from the NomCom appointed members of GNSO Council and allocated to the so-called Non-Contracted

Parties House. So we - I'm very happy that you are here, (Yulf). Thanks very much.

So let's move to the next point, which is DOA and the best who could - wants to dive in and explain what's going on with regards to ICANN on this subject is Tony Holmes. Please.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. Tony Holmes. Just before I launch into this, can I just have an indication of who was in the presentations this morning that was given as part of the technical string? Right. So not everyone but a fair spread. Okay.

So the background to this is that from the ISP perspective, we had some discussion about DOA on the call because a number of - or on our calls, because a number of us had been engaged in some of the difficult discussions around DOA that were taking place, in particular in the ITU. And it was apparent that it was also getting discussed here, not on the agenda but outside of the agenda, even to the point where we heard people proposing this is a great new technology and ICANN should take it up and support it because it's the thing of the future, which raised a lot of alarm bells for us.

And we ended up, because of that, agreeing to write a letter to the board suggesting that they should stay away from the politics of this but make sure that the stakeholder community had a good understanding of what this was because rumors appear to be rife and a lot of misinformation was out there.

We have just received a letter back from the board today that's -- yes very timely, it's on our mailing list so people can look at that -- acknowledging that they need to do something. They also pointed towards the presentation that was given earlier today, and those that were in the room I think were left in

little doubt how contentious it is, although you don't get the full feeling for how great it is in the ITU.

There was a strong push at the World Telecommunications Standardization Conference from the ITU, which sets their agenda for the next four years to work on this. And that push came from certain parts of the world, certain governments, namely the ones that were driving it. I'm quite happy to say here it was the Arab states and Russia and China, fiercely opposed by the U.S., Europe, U.K., Canada and Australia. So there was no agreement at WTS whether it should be included in the work program or not.

What's happened since is that there's been a series of first meetings of various ITU study groups and sure enough there's lots of stuff going in, trying to drive the DOA work. So the argument really has just moved from one forum to the next.

As for ICANN's role, it clearly isn't to engage in any of that stuff at all but to make sure that the knowledge was out there. And I did have some concerns prior to the presentations today because I wasn't quite sure why ICANN were providing a platform for these people to actually promote their technology at a time when, as ISPs, who probably have the greatest concern about infrastructure in the ICANN community weren't able to attend. I think that was just a hiccup. However, most of us made it for the latter part of that presentation and a lot of questions were asked around that.

As a follow up and even acknowledging the letter from the board, I did make the point during that session that we would encourage the CTO to consider their analysis. And what I'd like to propose here and ask if I can get support from you to do is to write a follow-up note to the board basically making three

points. And those three points are to request that the CTO undertake three actions.

The first is that they continue with the technical analysis of the other technologies that were presented at that session. So it wasn't just about Blockchain, there were - Bitcoin was there and Blockchain, call it what you want. But the analysis that had - that was presented by (Alan Durand) at the end of that session only covered DOA. I believe it would be helpful to have a similar analysis of those other technologies that were presented there as well. So the first bullet is to request that.

The second one is to pick up on a point that he made during his presentation as representing ICANN CTO and that was the possibility of undertaking a full risk analysis of each of the technologies that were being discussed. And we're in a phase now where ICANN just can't decide what they're going to do and what they can't do. They need some support from the community. So making this request will make it much easier for them to think about doing that work than if we just leave it there as a suggestion that was thrown out by them.

And the third part of that request should be that the CTO also consider how the DNS may be impacted by the aims and ambitions proposed by the proponents of those technologies. In other words they will all potentially, if you listen to what was - and I think Malcolm asked quite a good question, it was why are you doing this, what was the reason for this, not just the technology side of things.

So if you listen to those answers then potentially it will have an impact on the DNS. So the third part of that request I think should be for them to study the potential impact, acknowledging what their stated aims are and the way that

this can go. So look at some of the use cases would be a way to do that. And with your support, I'd like to write a note requesting those three things.

I know that some of our compatriots, stakeholder group colleagues in the BC for instance, also have an interest in that. I don't know whether they would also suggest that ICANN goes down that path. The more support to do that the better. It's something we could raise with them. They're probably more appropriate to support us than asking the IPC that have a different focus. So my request is would you support that action? Can we do that?

And at the same time, I'm happy to answer any other questions that may arise. The politics of this came out I think quite vividly in that room, particularly when I heard the reference to the last question describing the ITU as snake oil. I think that really got the elephant in the room out there. And there is a big political push on this as well. But getting ICANN not to exceed its remit but to just do some analysis so that they really can help our community, the ICANN multi-stakeholder community, understand what these technologies are about and potentially how they fit with the DNS, I think that would be a really useful step.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thanks, Tony, for this summary. And before we go to the questions round and try to answer your question here, thanks very much for your effort. And I think that should help us also to trigger awareness on the board level more. I had also talked to some of the board members. They've - interested in that. You know, they're all coming more from the technical side and I understood this item to be dealt with.

Well are there any comments from the - around that or - Philippe and - well, Philippe, please.

Philippe Fouquart: Philippe Fouquart from Orange. One comment and a question. My apologies if the way to phrase this is actually ITU terminology. Yes the comment is on the approach in general, I would certainly support this. The question is the following. You - on the third point I think you mentioned the impact on DNS, and the question is whether for example should there be an impact on Whois for instance? That's not DNS. Would that be out of scope or strictly speaking it's out of scope, but I'm not sure that's your intent, whether that's DNS per se or whether that goes beyond that. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Tony Holmes. That's a really going point, Philippe, because my intent certainly wasn't to rule it out of scope but the terminology using - that I was proposing to use you could suggest that it doesn't include that. I'd have to think of a way of making that clear that it is a much broader assessment rather than just DNS infrastructure. So yes, thank you for that. That needs to be included.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Good point. Thank you. So is there anything else or we in common view the Tony should do that what he has suggested, that means to draft a letter? So let us know though, a follow-up notice to the board with those points. I think there's agreement on that. So. And then, Tony, please put that as an action item to our list. Thanks very much.

Let's move to the next point then, which is Christian again, yes, special use domain names. And please let us know what it is.

Christian Dawson: Yes I'll go ahead and hopefully make it relatively brief so we can move on to outreach, which I'll also contribute to. Well so Mark McFadden is still on deck here because we're going to be talking about something that is IANA related and as a former IANA employee, I'm eager for him to tell me where I'm wrong.

So we're going to talk about something that the ISPCP is making sure we are on top of. A couple of months ago a problem statement was issued out of IETF that focused attention in the post-IANA transition era on the fact that there are two bodies, not one, that ultimately add TLDs to the group. You've got responsibilities that exist both within ICANN and within IETF. IETF designated TLDs for technical purposes.

An example of this is .local, which is used for any cache DNS, and the most recent addition to the IETF technical additions to the document - the DNS root is .onion, which is used for onion (wrapping). Both the IETF and ICANN have MOUs with IANA in order to populate the DNS root zone file.

There is no coordination between the two organizations, which leaves the possibility of sort of new potential instances of the types of things that we spent a lot of time discussing a couple of years ago surrounding name collisions or conflicting paths that can end up with, you know, us for instance starting a new round of gTLDs not knowing that there are certain things under consideration for having a technical purpose and simply being counterproductive exercises because there are not formal effective pathways to communication.

And so the problem set doesn't really figure out how to address that and it specifically says IANA's fine, there's nothing really that needs to change in IANA but it may make sense for there to be more of a coordinating procedure between what is happening at IETF and what is happening at ICANN. That's what's being suggested now. And where this goes is anybody's guess but we, as ISPs, who have something to do with this can certainly put in our two cents as to what should happen and what frame it should take should those two groups start to sort of coordinate as a path forward.

That's the issue as I understand it and I'd be happy to hear any comments or questions.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Christian. So we have, first, this colleague here. Oh then, you, please. Please introduce yourself and then please come around and make a comment.

(Alan Durand): My name is (Alan Durand). I'm from the office of the CTO. I'm the one who made this presentation on - this morning. I apologize for interrupting but I would like to bring a little precision to your comment. The names that are reserved by the IETF in this process that has been operating for awhile now do not appear in the root zone. That's the entire point. But they are reserved if you want as negative values that they will not be vendors and so as such they do not instruct IANA to put them in the root zone. They instruct IANA to put them in a registry of things that should not be delegated.

So the actual conflict that could happen is if ICANN were to delegate a name that has been reserved by the IETF and it could happen - it cannot really happen now because we are in a locked phase. We're finishing round one of the gTLD, but if there's a new round there could be a phase where the name is being considered by both organizations. And at that point, there is potential for overlap and that's where the coordination will be needed.

Christian Dawson: Thank you for that clarification. That was extremely helpful.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. So we have Philippe first and then Mark on the chat. Yes please?

Philippe Fouquart: Philippe Fouquart from Orange. Yes just a general comment. Personally I'm not sure there's an element of risk with regard to the IETF versus ICANN. I am - I would be more concerned about the visibility of that potential list beyond ICANN as far as potential candidates for instance, if you see what I mean. Even though the ICANN community might be aware of TLDs being discussed within the IETF, I'm sure that there are people around, even if it's informal coordination, I'm sure that there would be some coordination.

But I think there would be benefit in having that coordination informally to provide visibility outside ICANN to the potential applicants for a new round, if you see what I mean. So the interest is not only within the ICANN community but also beyond that to those potential applicants.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thanks, Philippe. A comment from remote.

Lars Steffen: Yes this is Lars. I've got one comment from Mark McFadden. The IETF has a very flawed standard of special use domain names. It's RFC6761. It's recently used that process to put .onion in the special use registry. That's RFC7686. However, it's well understood a special use domain name process is deeply flawed. It's worth remember that ICANN itself used the applicant guidebook to create its own list of reserved top level domains.

So it's not always evident who and under what circumstances gets to specify a special use domain. However, it's clear to the IETF that there's a real problem. As Christian mentioned, there's an Internet draft called the Special Use Domain Name Problem Statement that attempts to describe the problem but it does not identify a solution. In particular, it fails to address the circumstance where the IETF and ICANN have shared interest and responsibilities in this area.

This affects the operations of the Internet, as we was with the name collisions, and policy, as law enforcement will tell you about .onion. I think that the ISP community should bring this issue back to the board and possibly involve the CTO's office. They're already informally involved in that DNSOP working group in the IETF. This also needs to be part of one of the work streams in the subsequent procedures working group. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Any additional comment to that, Christian, please.

Christian Dawson: I was just going to say yay, Mark. That's fantastic. That all seems sensible to me.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Christian. And, Tony, please.

Tony Holmes: Just -- Tony Holmes -- just a question on that. Is Mark suggesting that as ISPs we need to raise the flag on that? Because if so, there's a follow-on action there, isn't there, as well to raise that. Obviously when we get to subsequent rounds then we need to make sure that that hole is plugged, but I'm unsure whether Mark was suggesting we do that now or whether it's something we do in the future.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That's not Mark.

Tony Holmes: So maybe, Mark, I'm sure you're online. Maybe you could clarify whether we're doing that - we should do that now or wait. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I think he did. So I see in the chat he was responding. Yes I'm suggesting that the ISP should be acting on this. So we should find a way to think about, you know, how to act on this. Tony?

Tony Holmes: I've got a great solution there. Being such a good friend of Mark's, I'd like to suggest we ask him to draft a note that we could think about. But that's your decision, Wolf, not mine.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I see him already typing. I'm willing. Yes, he's willing. Thanks very much. He got it.

Christian Dawson: He says I'm willing to have Tony work on this for more detail.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thanks very much. And is there a comment to that? Not yet. So we're waiting for Mark's input here. Thanks very much. And so let's move forward to next item then, yes? It is - I appointed Christian again so really I have to laugh here because so this is my first meeting so I took an eye more on the transition rather than what's behind the transition so that's the agenda here. So I say for the future we need a little bit more diversity with regards to who is responsible for items, for agenda items. But nevertheless, I like it, Christian, your engagement and I really appreciate it and thank you very much. Please start.

Christian Dawson: Sure. And I'm not the only person who's been doing things in outreach. So I'm happy to start us off but I'm certainly not going to be the only one contributing here. But I'm all for diversity moving forward in how we move - how we take the meeting agenda from here. I have been managing the CROPP program and we have been working on potential engagements in a couple of different areas, some of which are still pending so I won't get into them until we've fully decided to move forward on them.

But I did want to give one exciting report from just this past weekend, which was actually the reason why I was not here over the past - on Saturday and Sunday for a two-day event. And that is because I was representing the ISPCP

at South by Southwest in Austin, Texas, where we participated in a session called Is There Really an Internet Kill Switch?

And - is there really an Internet kill switch, yes, which is an evocative title that was designed to get people to fill the room, and it worked. We had about 250 people in the room. It was filled. We had reporters. In fact, well, the good news is that a number of reporters wrote about it, including NBC News. NBC News talked about our session. That bad news is they neither mentioned the ISPCP nor ICANN in their coverage. Yes. But the people in the room certainly heard it.

We did some targeted outreach to ISPs to make sure that they were in the room and I passed out a series of cards a collected a few. I expect at least two to three direct signups as a result of us being there. We'll go into - I'll very briefly go into the thesis of the talk because I think it was an interesting angle for this particular crowd.

We went over some of the things that have brought down parts of the Internet over the past couple of months, a failure in Amazon S2 that had been customer - largely customer affecting, and the Mirai botnet, which affected dine that brought down a large section of the Internet.

And the angle to start talking about involvement in specifically in the ISPCP but also brought more broadly ICANN and Internet governance organizations was first of all the concept that in each one of those individual circumstances what happens when you have a major issue like the Mirai botnet is not only does the individual company get more resilient, they go and they figure out how to address issue and make sure that it doesn't happen ago, but the whole ecosystem gets more resilient because will diversify their portfolio of

technologies that they use, rely less on one system and overall the ecosystem gets better over time.

There are new vectors that come in and try to negatively affect the system but that also makes the system stronger in the long run. We spent some time then talking about previous Internet shutdowns in places like Egypt and Kamerun, and in doing so started talk about how the real risk may end up being a policy risk and how engaging - really it ends coming down to the people more than technology when it comes down to risk. And so getting involved in organizations like ours to help shape policy globally will help mitigate the risk of the Internet shutdowns, which right now do not exist at a global level. So that was the thesis that we went in with and it was well received.

I would like to then turn it over to other people that are engaged in ISPCP projects. Perhaps Wolf-Ulrich, you could tell us a little bit about MENOG and what's being planned there.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much, Christian. So. And well I wanted to focus on MENOG but just mention that this event that's just taken place in the Middle East and organized by MENOG, Middle East Network Operators Group, yes, so will take place in my - in May. So we were thinking about we'll offer to make us visible in order to advertise for the ISPCP requirement there.

So we shall have a call with a person, well, in the area from the association, especially from D6, and he is anyway at this conference and will deliver a speech, so he can assist us with his presence there in order to support our interests there. So this is one further event where we will be in place.

But let me summarize what happened over the last year a little bit so you know. I think we had much support in our outreach efforts over the last years I

would say and especially when you remember Hyderabad and the special conference, the special event, which we had with the Indian side, and the response from interested ISPs, parties or associations around that was very encouraging.

So we had a good number of new applications for our group here and that would help us to get even more visible in this environment But there is a but, and this is one point I would like to raise in this context is there is further work to be done with regards to make this effort reliable, so sustainable.

That means that these groups, these people, these companies, associations are not just showing up interest coming in and are very interested because they are excited from the events, the outreach events we are organizing or we are attending rather than they are really coming to us here to ICANN and give us support and dive in to the, let me say, daily work of the ISP constituency here.

So this is a focus which we should put on the next time as well in order to see what's going to happen. Otherwise we will fail. We will be happy for a certain duration of time but it doesn't help us really. And this is something we should discuss for the future about how to follow up. I know that Chris Mondini's team is aware of this fact as well and this is issue and they are really supportive to us.

So if you come with ideas to them on how to do that in order to make it more reliable, they will be ready, well, to support us. So just internal. Any - the floor's open please if there are any comments, questions with regard to these activities. Tony Holmes.

Tony Holmes: Thank you, Wolf. Tony Holmes. That was a great introduction in I think you're setting the scene, Wolf-Ulrich, for what we anticipate are the benefits

from that type of outreach. And I just wanted to mention that I had the pleasure, which you will have the pleasure of now, of presenting to the fellows at ICANN meetings, and one of the benefits of doing that is that we get to talk to - people come in through the fellowship who come from our part of the ecosystem, and I did have that pleasure.

And one of those people, one of those persons I met is here and I apologize for putting you on the spot but I've wanted to add that in terms of outreach I'm already talking with Chris and Christian about involvement in (ENOG 13) and with that I'd very much ask, Wolf-Ulrich if we can give the floor to one of our new participants here, (Alexander), to actually explain that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sure. I saw him already raising his voice at the public forum meeting I think, so welcome. Please.

(Alexander):   Well thank you very much. Well actually I have the greatest experience at ISP, about 20 years, and actually I'm meeting people here and joining events I see there a lot of place for classical ISPs here at ICANN. Because from a Russian point of view from our media we can see and now (unintelligible) is kind of ccTLD things only and many new gTLDs just added. So I was excited to see that there is a place for classical ISPs to join policies. And I think that the problem of getting this information, the existence of such working groups inside ICANN will be very interesting.

So I'm invited to a conference (unintelligible) program committee. Actually it's not dangerous, even it's in Russia because one of (unintelligible) spinoff conference. It's like MENOG. So if you don't beware going to MENOG, you are welcome to (ENOG). Also this conference is very well known to (Datex). They've even sponsored the meeting one or two times. So I think even the chair could attend it. You are welcome. Please know there are different parts

of the world who does not know about your existence. Please present yourself. Thank you. You're welcome.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much. Great to have you here. Thank you. Any further - Tony Harris, please.

Tony Harris: Tony Harris. Yes I'd like to support what Wolf-Ulrich was proposing and his concern for the future because we do tend to attract people to our meetings and the challenge is how do we maintain this engagement. And I mean from my perspective, I'll be quite honest, I think sometimes people who come to meetings and we year after year we're telling everybody in the meeting about a new conflict with Whois between the Intellectual Property Constituency and the Non-Commercial Constituency, they find it a little hard to relate to their daily activities. And so perhaps it's not something that attracts them so much to be continuing with us.

And I think we did a useful exercise in India, which we all, the group of us that had helped organize this, we all contributed some good ideas. But what I think worked well is we packaged the outreach meeting in India, which was attended by 130, in such a manner that the panels involved were people - by companies who actually were from India. It was their event. And we put on the agenda subjects such as Internet of Things and Internet exchanges and then factored in how that relates to ICANN. So the entire package was attractive and meaningful for them.

As a result we've had two or three very large associations from India become members, which I found very encouraging. So I think that packing what we do with overarching subjects, such as Internet of Things or Internet exchanges or DOA is something we discussed now, is one of way of helping to engage people. And when they come to a meeting and sit in our meeting specifically,

at least some of the subjects will have - they will feel - have a relationship to their daily activities.

Oh and by the way, I did three outreach events last year. I went to Sao Paulo, where we had a booth at a meeting with 4,000 ISPs, which is amazing. I went to a meeting in Santa Domingo, and I survived a meeting in Havana, Cuba.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh good. Thanks, Tony. You're still alive. Thanks. And, well, let me just finally add to that because I had also chance last Friday I think to talk to (Sally Costerton), who is the executive person on ICANN in charge of the stakeholder engagement program and she's also keen on - to hear from us ideas, you know, how we can make this process and these ongoing activities make it a continuing and reliable process. And she is really supportive to us. So the doors to ICANN are really open, so we should keep - take this opportunity and continue to discuss that how we step forward.

So thanks very much for that. We have almost reached to - come to the end of our agenda with AOBs. And I put three items to the AOBs. One is with regards to the so-called bylaws drafting team, just to explain what this about. That is a team within the GNSO which was established in order to investigate the impact of the new bylaws on the GNSO and to make recommendations with regards to that, what activities should be taken, what actions should be taken within the GNSO.

The bylaws drafting team has made a report and there was also then commented and discussed on council. Nowadays, so the bylaws drafting team is more or less a standby team, I understood, I used to be a member of that, in order to answer questions if necessary.

So there are some questions which have been filed by staff with regards, as I understood, to more related open items with regards to shall we, for example, go more in detail to - with regards to some processes in, for example, if a, what was it, if a petition is going to be raised, it shall be more outlined in detail what kind of petition, how it is going to be - shall we develop a form for that or whatever. Those kind of questions came up from staff and we are - and this drafting team is supposed to work on that I think in the meeting tomorrow.

My question to that is since I would like to have awareness to these facts from a lot of people who have been dealing with the draft of the bylaws that these people have a look to these questions from staff as well. And if there are ideas, if there are question marks or comments from their side, please let me know or even you could join us, this meeting tomorrow morning.

I especially point to Malcolm if we he would be available for that because he's the one who was very much engaged in this development as well and that is - it could be helpful. Anyway, Malcolm, commenting by e-mail or being present, yes, if you have any comment right now to that or not. So just make you aware of that.

The next one is the - well some duties here, public comment list. I don't know whether you have that on your screen, public comment list. I was asking Chantelle if she could make it available. So we should briefly go through whether there are some public comments at the time period, comment periods we are affected and who is - who could do what.

So that is the total public comment list I think. Let me just check. Or is it some specific things. These are the public comments they are - you can see when they are going to be closed, yes? Yes. Do we have - let me just go

through that. Okay as you can see, there's GNSO initial report on IGO-INGO, which we discussed. So if there are comments, well, to be taken from our constituencies, well, let's talk about it. Do we have anything, well, to, as a constituency, to comment on that specific PDP? This is number two of the piece here in public comment, the GNSO initial report on the IGO-INGO access for curative rights protection mechanism policy development process.

I wonder if - Osvaldo I think you have been engaged a little bit. Is there anything which…

Osvaldo Novoa: I don't remember right now anything in the report that we could - we can support the report if you want but I don't have any…

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Christian, please.

Christian Dawson: So in an effort to encourage governments to use the table properly, you know, come to the table and engage in our process, my recommendation would be that, you know, from what I've seen through my lens, not being a, you know, international law expert specifically in this area, you know, I can tell you it looks good from perspective but I would reserve judgment and say pending the completion of the completed - pending completion of the process where additional comments are taken into consideration, we look forward to the point in which we can accept this PDP and move it forward. So a little bit of a reserved statement asking for voices at the table. Does that make sense?

A little bit - so here's basically what I'm saying is, I do think that if there are things that need to get worked out, there are two options at this point with this particular PDP, either the governments come forward and they submit their comments and they tell us where they think we've got it wrong or they don't accept that the final PDP and they try to go and to and end round afterwards.

Us saying that we support it bar none sort of misses the picture here, which is, you know, we support this being the process by which this is done. And so saying, you know, pending the successful resolution of notes received through the comment period, we look forward to accepting all results and moving this forward.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Tony, please.

Tony Holmes: I may be misinterpreting what you're saying. It may be my misunderstanding, Christian. But listening to what you said, I was left with the impression that now we're sort of wedding ourselves to an outcome that we don't understand what that outcome will be. Is that…?

Christian Dawson: I see what you're saying. In that we look forward to supporting the final report but we're waiting, right? Yes. That's a good point. It can't be worded like that. Here's the thing, there's really no reason why we need to comment on this particular issue unless we are using it as an opportunity to focus on the bigger-picture issue.

And I guess that's my point. I don't necessarily think - we haven't been engaged in this process and don't have enough institution knowledge to say yes we agree with all outcomes. But we do know that whatever outcomes are generated from this process, should come through this and that's worth saying.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Christian. Well if I may, well, you know, just for the understanding, so how it's going to be done, so this going through a public comment period right now. So with regards to the content of this PDP and what's in the PDP, the question whether this PDP goes through or not, well, is still open, I admit, yes. It's still open, but this is going the same way as it is

with other PDPs as well, you never know what's going to happen. So if you go that path and every time you put a comment on that, well, depending on the outcome, then I could or I could not accept things, it doesn't make sense to me.

Christian Dawson: That was a completely valid point and a poor word choice on my part.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Tony?

Tony Holmes: If I can just comment on that. I think, forgive me, I think Osvaldo put in considerably less on our behalf on the development of this issue. Is that right, Osvaldo? So I would certainly support any proposal that we at least acknowledge the PDP as a result of that substantial effort. I mean we can recognize as part of that that there's still issues that need to be resolved and we look to play our part in that, but I don't think we should commit more than that.

But I do think it would be helpful at this stage just publicly to express some sort for the PDP because we did work pretty hard on that, certainly Osvaldo did, and I think we shouldn't miss the opportunity to make that point that a lot of effort has gone into that. It may not have provided a full answer but we should look towards being a party to the solution, as we did a lot of the ground work. But, Osvaldo, maybe you want to comment on that.

Christian Dawson: I was simply going to say I agree with all that. I wasn't intending to denigrate the hard work of the PDP process. In fact I was ultimately just drawing our attention to the comments from before about the struggles for - struggles against GAC doing it and around and simply wanted to make sure that as we, you know, however we wish to word our involvement and support of the PDP

process, that we don't lose site of the bigger picture that however outcomes are determined, they should be determined through this process.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So that's good, Christian. That's a way. I think we could file a short comment with support of that and then also pointing to the process we are going to support the incumbent PDP process we have here and sort of make it clear, so. And I think that's it for the time being. I understand we are supporting from the content side and the policy side as well. Let's do that. Okay? Thanks.

Osvaldo Novoa: Just a small note, there is a letter of the GAC regarding the IGO worry, how do you say, it states that there are several points of the recommendation they don't support. Basically they are - keep maintaining their position. They want a separate treatment of the IGOs I know. But there is already an answer from the GAC to the report.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, Osvaldo. You draft the note. Thanks. Any - do we have others, I cannot recall, through the public comments? Is that - improve ICANN transparency. Anybody - oh yes, please, Emily.

Emily Barabas: Thanks. This is Emily Barabas from staff. This won't be on your list but coming up, it should be opening right after ICANN 58 is the new gTLD subsequent procedures PDP. It has community comment two, which covers 20 pages or so of questions on a very wide variety of topics, not all of which will be relevant to this group.

But for those who are interested, Work Track 4 specifically focuses on security and stability, name collisions, universal acceptance, IDNs and a couple of other issues. So it might be worthwhile to just take a look at some of those questions, and feel free to be selective about what you answer because it

can be quite overwhelming but it might be of interest. And that'll be open for about 40 days and will likely open in the next week or so. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much, Emily. Any - so just going quickly through that. So the cross-community working group on user - that's not of interest of us. The next one is the accountability guidelines for good faith. I think accountability if I hear that, Malcolm is aware of that. Okay good. Thanks. Next one is - Tony Harris has a comment on that.

Tony Harris: Yes. Tony Harris. I was just thinking that on subsequent rounds of new TLDs, it would be important to make a comment and I would volunteer to circulate a draft that people can read and maybe if we have concerns this week, we can make a comment as a constituency.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thanks very much. On to the action item list. So then we have competition consumer trust. Yes operating plan (unintelligible). I think that's one we should comment on, yes, as well. Is - yes. So is it already on - open because I see two dates. Yes it's from 8 of March it opened, yes. Okay. It's still open.

So we shall have this budget plan meeting tonight. We will also raise all fingers with regard to that but we should also put officially this comment to the budget plan, yes? Tony, I think we both could work on that, yes? Okay.

Tony Holmes: Yes, happy to do that. I need to discuss it with you though because we have got a conflict tonight. We've got a couple of sessions we need to cover.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So please introduce yourself.

(Saro):   Hello. I'm (Saro), first time fellow from India. I have question. Like how does IXP become a part of ISPCP?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: IXP?

(Saro):   Yes.

Christian Dawson: Can I answer that?

Man: There's a rush to the mic.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: No, no go ahead. Sorry. Fiona. Fiona hasn't had a chance to speak. Go ahead.

Fiona Asonga: For you to be a member of the - if you're an exchange point and you want to be member of the ISPCP constituency, all you need to do is what you've done, come in for the meeting and express your interest. And then you shall you give your contact information to the chairman and our support staff and they shall get in touch with you and let you know when the calls happen. And yes, you'll be vetted for the next call.

(Saro):   Okay. Can I present myself individual or with an organization?

Fiona Asonga: Organization.

(Saro):   Okay.

Fiona Asonga: ISPs are organizations, not individuals through our exchange point.

(Saro):   Okay. Thank you so much.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Welcome. You'll see your application form. Thanks. So we have the very last one. The draft 2016 African domain name system market study is on public comment as well. I can point to Fiona is this something which is of interest to you to comment?

Fiona Asonga: When the study was done, we thought it was completed much earlier last year so I'm actually surprised that it was going for public comments at this time but it is something that you can all look at. But it pretty much looks as it's a TLD environment and what challenges the ccTLDs are facing as well the registrars because there's been a challenge in trying to address and achieve a substantial registrar participation within ICANN from the African region. So in that, there are some recommendations that we may actually rely on as an ISP constituency in terms of outreach and awareness in that particular region.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. I think we got through the list of public comments and took note of that. My very last point is about how to go organize future calls. I had in advance of this meeting a little bit of housekeeping items, exchanged ideas with Chantelle, our secretary support from ICANN staff. So she will send out a doodle poll for - with regards to the question whether we should have a regular date, let me say a regular date for our call, for our monthly calls.

We discussed that might be difficult to arrange that. In the past we did it call by call. But I think it would be also good to know for people a little bit in advance, well, to know what's going on and when we should have calls. Nevertheless we could start that - it would be my suggestion to start with that to have a kind of a doodle for this year for regular calls maybe saying Thursday in the month or what else.

And in addition, then call by call at the end of call ask people is it convenient still to you because it comes closer to the next call then and you may be - it may be more convenient to you and it may be more clear to you which dates obligations you may have at that time elsewhere. So this is a suggestion from my side here to do so.

We could order that and any time we would like - we have to also take into consideration time zones with regards to that so - between the East Asia and Europe and America. So it's I think in any group here we have the same problems with that. But this is what we are going to do in order to find a fixed date and be - we could stay as flexible as possible also, well, to arrange it and call by call. Is there any comment to that or any specific request with exclusions of specific times?

Around New Year's I know that the New Year is slow at least between the 1st of January and Chinese New Year. What else? (Unintelligible) and so this is not the best time and so - but we can also have a follow up on the list with regard to that. Okay. Everybody happy with that? Good.

So my very last comment is thank you very much for attending. Thank you very much for helping me to get through that meeting and I'm looking forward to seeing you around. Thank you very much.

Tony Harris: I would ask for another round of applause for our departing chairman, I mean departing from the function, not from the constituency.

                                  END