ICANN
Transcription ICANN Kobe
GNSO ISPCP Meeting
Tuesday, 12 March 2019 at 15:15 JST

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Good afternoon. I would like to say, ladies and gentlemen. So in Kobe, we are here having our ISPCP meeting, the open meeting. And I would like to welcome everybody who sits behind the scenes to approach, you know, the desks here and then also then to, well to fill these desks here around so we'll have a closer discussion, yes, about our points here to make.

Let me just briefly go around with some introductions of the people and, (Abry), please may I ask you. Welcome to you, also - well you can come to the desk here if you'd like. Well also maybe you or your - from the auditions is not a problem, approach the desk here please. Take a seat here. So let's briefly go around the table and introduce yourselves and please go ahead starting with this gentleman on my right side.

(Noah Masamuri): My name is (Noah Masamuri), this is the - probably the 41 or second ICANN meeting for me I have participated about 40 times. I participated in ICANN meetings for probably 40 times until the (Car) meeting, that's 7.5 years ago. And this is the second time I wear this hat in ICANN meeting, the last time I was in ICANN Yokohama, at that time I was leading local team and in order

to people easily find me I put on this hat. I thought that was the way I can easily achieve my job.

So once upon a time - this is I think a good term to express my situation - I presented JPNIC in this ISP meeting. Thank you for today's chance to meet you again. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much, (Noah), and he will be a special guest of honor here, that you attend this meeting. So for people who don't know from the past, well, so we had a lot of engagement with him as well and a lot of fun as well, I have to add. So thank you for coming here.

Toshiaki Tateishi: My name is Toshiaki Tateishi, ISP Association in Japan.

Shin Yamasaki: My name is Shin Yamasaki from Japan Network Information Center. Thank you.

(Bastian Hoslings):   (Bastian Hoslings), here on behalf of AMS-IX, the Amsterdam Internet Exchange.

(Yoshi Obata):   (Yoshi Obata) from (JPAT).

Diana Middleton: Diana Middleton, ICANN staff.

Ajay Data: Ajay Data, Data Infosys. Member of ISPCP.

Tony Holmes: Tony Holmes, BT. And I'd just like to say how great it is to see you back, (Masa), and the hat as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben with DE-CIX.

Man: Hi, (unintelligible) from (Kavasa) Argentina. I want to share that last October I was elected as LACNIC Board member and what - now I am also ASO representative for LACNIC here in ICANN.

(Alec Lemone):   So (Alec Lemone) (unintelligible) the ISPCP and member also of the ISO Council for the RIPE Region.

Alain Bidron: Alain Bidron from ETNO, the European Telecommunication Network Operators' Association.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: You go ahead please.

Khalid Samara: Khalid Samara, I'm from Middle East Network Operators Group, MENOG. Thank you.

Christian Dawson: Christian Dawson with the Internet Infrastructure Coalition.

Lars Steffen: Lars Steffen with Eco Association of the Internet Industry.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much. And may I ask, encourage the gentlemen both - well also to approach the table so we have microphones as well available. And that's easy, well, to talk to each other please. Please come in front and introduce yourself please. Your colleague maybe?

Daniel Fink: Thank you. I'm Daniel Fink, ICANN staff based in Sao Paulo, Brazil.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much. Do we have people on the phone or (remote)?

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Phone, so may I ask the person on the phone to introduce her or himself please?

Andrea Glandon: Hi, Wolf-Ulrich. This is Andrea Glandon, I'm (supporting) remotely. I'm ICANN staff.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, great. Thank you very much. So let's - are there any statements of interest to be disclosed here? Any amendments to statements of interest? I don't see anything. Thank you.

So let's briefly go through the agenda which is displayed here on the screen. Are there any points to be made in addition? And let's talk about how we can organize that. Christian, please.

Christian Dawson: I have no additional items but I am - I do want to note for the record that there are a number of housekeeping items for the organization that I wish to cover during AOB.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, good, AOB, that means internal items.

Christian Dawson: Operational items that I'm seeking assistance from the community in assisting me in trying to address, things like our privacy policy.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Alain.

Alain Bidron: Yes, if you would allow me I would like to say a few words about the Nominating Committee.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. NomCom. Either we could do that following the Council update, yes, if there's time for that or under AOB we will do that, yes. Anything else? Tony, please.

Tony Holmes: Yes, one other addition, probably take it under AOB, we just came from our CSG session with the Board. And there was a discussion there regarding the engagement with governments and other SDOs. After the session ended I had a conversation with Matthew Shears which relates both to that discussion and also the discussion we had with Göran this morning on the same issue. So I'd like to propose a way forward on that. We can have some discussion around that point. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Shall we put that under AOB as well?

Tony Holmes: Yes please.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Okay thank you. So we have good agenda. So we are going to expect people from outside on time at four o'clock so the members of the GCSC, the Global Commission on the Stability of Cyberspace, we will have a half an hour presentation and exchange on that. So we should - I should manage the agenda that it happens well to fit that in on time.

Olaf Kolkman: I'm already here. This is - here - Olaf Kolkman.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh Olaf.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Good to see you. I think Wolfgang is also coming here yes, supposed to be here. Good, so we will be a little bit flexible with the agenda, yes? Okay good. Thank you. Yes, Lars, please.

Lars Steffen: Thank you. Can you please resend me your slides because they are obviously not working? Thank you very much. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay very helpful because Lars is the caretaker about, you know, the presentations are working here. Thank you. That, anything else with regards

to the agenda? No. Thank you. Then let me just finalize a little bit on internals here. I have the great honor to announce here officially that Ajay Data has been appointed the - elected the new Chair of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. Thank you.

And Ajay, we wish you all the best. And we do hope that you will find time enough to engage with us as well, yes, in the future. And - but that is really a good - I think it's really a good point because our constituency has deeply involved in, over the years, in the universal acceptance item as well. And we will come to that immediately.

So the next is well I will have to announce it was officially made in the course of our email exchange is that Tony Harris has stepped back from his Council activities. He already, in former times, stepped back from his engagement in the Auction Proceeds Working Group because of health reasons. So Tony is hoping that he could come back once. I would say we wish him the best for his health, yes, and we really hope that he will be available once again here.

And in course of this stepping back from the Council seat we had an election and Osvaldo Novoa was elected for interim filling the Council seat until the end of this period. Unfortunately at that time it was already clear - or it came up, you know, after this election came up and he couldn't participate in person here because of other business engagements before that. And so he may participate remotely if he can.

Those are the internals. And now let's dive in into the agenda directly. And the first part would be universal acceptance. I think as usual the caretaker in that group, Lars was the one who gave us an update on universal acceptance and I would invite you, Lars, well, to do that.

Christian Dawson: I'm happy to take the first part and then I'll turn it over to Lars. And I suggest that at the conclusion of our update we see if there's anything that the new

chair of the UAG wishes to add to what it is we'll - we want to update you on today.

So as most of the people here in the room likely know, the Universal Acceptance Steering Group was a group that was put together four years ago with a mandate to try and make it so that the systems of the world acknowledge the unique identifier system the same no matter whether it was a three character TLD, a non-Latin character set, or a long TLD.

So a lot of the older systems of the world certainly were not up to speed. Most of them certainly are not still up to speed to be able to reflect what is in the modern DNS. So our job is pretty big; we're trying to tell all the systems of the world that they need updating.

Learning how to approach that has been a difficult task over the past four years. Lars, if you want to advance to the next slide here? We have a current set of target audiences which take the - basically the world and try to bring it down into a viable scope to try to approach. So instead of trying to target everybody in the world we're trying to target a small pool.

I would suppose that this is not a very small pool but it's small as we've gotten so far. We are out there trying to target doers, people who can make this happen, developers and system architects, consultants and contracting firms. We're regularly in contact with many of these larger firms. CIOs of major Fortune 1000 corporations are a target, people who can direct this to happen, and the people that can influence this to happen so people in the C-Suite of these larger organizations, Board members.

Government officials is big, attempting to contact governments and see if we can get universal acceptance into their procurement process, for instance or take on universal acceptance projects within their own country's IT systems. Consultants, media and industry influencers, we have gone to a number of different people that are industry - like Gartner and Forrester and those types

of industry forecasters have attempted to interest them in the work that we are doing. We're not going after target consumers or registrants. Move on.

Right now we're focusing a lot of our attention on EAI or email address internationalization awareness, and we're working on documentation that advances EAI, that's something that Dr. Data has been very good at helping us with. We have been working on case studies because it is hard to get people to care and want to do it.

There are lots of things that people need to update in their systems and focusing attention on this is very difficult. But if we can show them success stories they'll want to be one of those success stories, so that's something that we've been working on.

We have been going out to experts to get original research done that showcases - so far we've done some pretty good research on the attempted available market size of the opportunities that exist for a post-UA adoption market. And we have started digital engagement; we are constantly pushing out the materials that we have developed on our new Twitter and Facebook pages and LinkedIn pages. And we've also done targeted advertising using LinkedIn.

The documentation that we have been working on, see here, I'm going to very quickly basically say that we have basically generated a number of different things in the past three or four months since we last talked. I don't want to delve too much into this, but as usual we have a fairly thorough amount of written documentation that we push out through those channels.

One of those things is a case study program. And we just actually released a case study this week on RajMail. And perhaps Ajay, at the end of our presentation there you can tell us a little bit about what that is all about. Want to move onto the last slide real quick. Or do you want to do it now? You can - yes, please do.

Ajay Data: We can do later if you want.

Christian Dawson: Do it now.

Ajay Data: Okay. So that said, one of the very interesting project and there is a case study, actually, Lars, if we can get some copies and can you pass a message to (Jennifer) if she can get here? That will be great to distribute here, the case study if she can, by the end of the event.

Lars Steffen: I'd be happy to walk up and grab them. It'd take me two minutes.

Ajay Data: Whatever. So I think we can - so there's a case study which was done by UASG and this is an initiative taken by a government of Rajasthan, which is a state with 70 million population in India and where the native speakers are Hindi; Hindi is their native speaking language. And every citizen is provided with a free Hindi email address along with of course an English email address in the same mailbox.

                    And this is a project which was launched last year by the government. And there is a large population which is getting online which never saw an email address because they were never knowing English as a language. Now they have an email address in their own native language and communicate with the government and anybody else they want to.

                    Of course there are challenges to use this email address everywhere else because websites are in English and you can't go and - because they don't know English they can't go to and visit a website and look for a domain name, so an IDN (unintelligible) is another progress with the government is making in. But this has become a huge communication tool for government of Rajasthan to communicate with their citizens and citizens communicating with them by breaking the language barrier in between what was there before.

I think fair enough for right now so thank you.

Christian Dawson: Thank you. And I will try to get copies of the case studies. The next thing that I wanted to go over real briefly is about original research. I mentioned that that was extremely important. I want to talk about one particular piece of research that we have underway that's a research piece that we're working on with Wakefield Research is an update to something that we did before that's going to help us measure the results of the work that we are doing and that's going on on universal acceptance in things that we are not even touching.

In that basically we are surveying 500 CIOs, system admins and developers, at companies more than 100 employees in the target markets that we've chosen. And the goal is to attempt to determine UA awareness and attitudes around UA. This kind of work is where I'm focusing personally all of my attention in trying to figure out how we can validate our assumptions.

Here's the thing, most of the work that we need to do in this is marketing and the people who are in the UASG, they're very skilled but they're not marketing experts so bringing in marketing experts is important in figuring out what our message needs to be and who it needs to be for. That's what we are doing with these studies that allow us to take what we think is true and validate it. And once we have that data we can build better messaging which is our goal.

Lars, do you want to continue?

Lars Steffen: So thank you, Christian. Yes what we are doing, as Christian already mentioned, we are - we set up last year in our social media channels that we are currently using to give the opportunity that every time when we've got an announcement, we've got a new documentation, a new case study out there, that we can put them out on LinkedIn, Facebook and on Twitter and to make it as easy as possible to share them. So if you're interested in this and would

like to share this information with your community it's now very easy to share this via your own channels.

The other thing is that we are currently having a review of our website because over the years now, four years, since already gone since the UASG was established, we added a lot of material to this and now we take a look at it and to restructure it and that it's still easy for everybody who still doesn't know the UASG will find his way to the documentation and the information he needs.

So what do we have on our agenda for this year so far? So over the last years we participated in several M3AAWG meetings. We think that we are currently in a status that we raised the level of awareness in the M3AAWG community that we can achieve so we don't see much more potential to gain more attention there. This is the reason why we have no planning for this year to attend M3AAWG meetings but that doesn't mean that this is something that we wouldn't do again in the future.

In two weeks there's a CloudFest in Europa-Park (rust) so the weekend before the conference part starts there's a hack-a-thon, the UASG is one of the sponsors of this hack-a-thon and the intention is to get three projects on the plate that the developers there will - and work on. It's to get software like Plesk, cPanel, but also content management systems like WordPress on the plate that the developers can work on this to achieve more progress on getting this kind of software UA ready.

And the other intention is also to raise the awareness in those communities because each of the software packages has its own community, they've got their own conferences so that we can deliver our message to those stages and also to those communities.

In April there is the Certified Centers Alliance Summit in Cologne. The Certified Standards Alliance is a wide listing program for bulk email providers

so there is - there are two communities, the tech community and also the marketing community from those companies who are dealing with email. So after three years we will be there again to bring universal acceptance on the agenda to that audience.

And John Levine will, this time, have a technical approach to address universal acceptance. The last time we did this we talked to the marketing audience to let them know that there is this thing of universal acceptance, that there are new gTLDs, that there are now domain names and email addresses with different scripts. And three years ago for a lot of people in this audience this was still something that was new.

We also agreed upon in the UASG to reach out to Summer Schools on Internet governance so we will have a slot at the European Summer School of Internet Governance in July to talk about universal acceptance and we are already talking to other Summer Schools on Internet Governance to do this there as well.

Of course we will have our regular updates at future ICANN meetings, usually we don't speak at policy meetings but at the next general meeting we will have our regular workshop, our community forum update. And this year we have the IGF in Berlin so Eco is an association that's based in Germany, we're actively participating in this and we're also working on getting universal acceptance on the agenda of the IGF 2019.

When it comes to universal acceptance at this ICANN meeting, we have a Universal Acceptance Steering Group booth, so when you take your way to the (Pretopia) Hall there's the ICANN Engagement booth and left hand side of the ICANN Engagement booth and there you will find the Universal Acceptance Steering Group booth with also the case study of Ajay and his company.

We had our workshop on Friday. There were several presentations at the Tech Day yesterday. There was the ICANN Middle East space yesterday, oh sorry, sorry, on Monday. We have the community forum tomorrow. We have a panel with Ajay Data as the host at the ISPCP outreach event. Ajay would you like to give us a short introduction on that?

Ajay Data: Yes, this is actually I think I can just (unintelligible) that UASG community forum and this ISPCP outreach event tomorrow is I think if anybody is interested in UASG must attend events, both of them to be very content-rich and powerful. And I am joined by two Board members here, Akinori and Maarten. And (unintelligible) which you see on 13th March 4:10 -- 4:15. And here we are talking about how this IDN and UA is going to also address some of the security challenges in the coming future for Internet.

And that's very interesting (unintelligible) Internet which is going to be in the future. And this is what we are going to talk about tomorrow for this 40 minutes. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: If I may, sorry, just something because, you know, well I would like - wouldn't like not to encourage people to come but (unintelligible) but I have to say that this event tomorrow with JIPA together and with this panel is limited in attendance. So it may be - so if you are going to register for that as you linked to it, then you would be put on a waiting list. And it could happen that you can join afterwards but there is a waiting list, I'm sorry to say that.

Ajay Data: Can we share the link somewhere for people?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. We'll find out. Thank you.

Ajay Data: Yes, thank you.

Lars Steffen: Yes, we can put it on the chat. Then we have also tomorrow which will take place in parallel so if you don't make it to the list anymore you can still get

your portion of universal acceptance at the At Large, so there will be also a panel discussion. And on the last day, on Thursday, there will be the high interest cross community session on universal acceptance and IDNs which will be moderated by Christian and me.

Christian Dawson: One thing I'd like to - I look forward to that and I think everybody should come to the high interest topic session. In addition to all these things, if you went to the public forum, about half the questions in the public forum were with regards to universal acceptance; it was pretty amazing.

Lars Steffen: I think I don't have to spend much time on the region and focus because those are the regions that will be covered by the study that we are doing with…

Christian Dawson: Right. With Wakefield Research.

Lars Steffen: Wakefield, yes. Exactly. So what are we doing as well? So we've got a new technical marketing outreach team which is run by dotAsia. They are doing pretty much work to do outreach in the Asia Pacific region. We are having a very extensive list of trade associations we are reaching out to. If you're interested in that to check if there are already organizations and associations on the list that you think might be worth to reach out to we can share this link as well with you to have a look and feel free to add further organizations and associations that we should talk to.

We work more and more closer together with the Global Stakeholder Engagement Department at ICANN. We have a collaboration with the Dynamic Coalition on DNS Issues. This is something where we come again to the remit of the IGF. Every working group in the Universal Acceptance Steering Group, so we have a measurement working group, we have an EAI working group, we have a coordination working group and an outreach working group. All of us are still in the progress to give us own charters for every subgroup working group of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group.

Also we are working on sponsorship criteria so that we are more clear and transparent in the future on how we are sponsoring, why we are sponsoring and what is the outcome of the sponsoring. And as already mentioned a couple of slides before, we are currently updating our website.

Are there any questions regarding the work of the UASG?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Tony please.

Tony Holmes: Thank you. Well to start with I think you guys are doing a really great job on this and I think it's really good for our constituency that you're in there. I was just interested that the Wakefield study you listed was certain areas. What made you choose those and how does that relate back to what's coming out of the measurements group is a question I had. So why did you choose those particular markets there? Was that…

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: …get info or…

Christian Dawson:It's reflective of, if we want to go two slides back, it's reflective of - maybe not two, where is it? There is a slide on…

((Crosstalk))

Christian Dawson:Okay. So we have actually a regions in focus in our scoping plan. So again, the work that we are attempting to do we need to have - we need to take bite size pieces of outreach that allow us to basically make effective work of it because if we were just trying to basically take care of the world we wouldn't be able to solve anything.

So in one of our - I think this was - we confirmed this in our Washington DC session in January, we determined that China, the United States with a focus on California because of the Silicon Valley component, Canada, India, the European Union with a focus on the UK, Ireland and Germany and Russia were the areas in which we were going to focus. And it was after a long conversation, the factors that determined the ones that ended up on the initial focus list were either areas in which there was a very close need for the technology itself or ones in which the target companies that we need to persuade are based there.

Tony Holmes: So just a follow on question, Christian. With the measurements, I assume that some of the more diverse areas, for instance, Africa, South America, will you be looking at - is the plan to look at the - what comes out of the measurements group, does it cover those areas so that they'll come at a later phase or…

Christian Dawson: So, yes, they'll be coming up at a later phase. Now the reason that we had to do focus like this is because ultimately you are either trying to, in this initial stage, do one of two things. You're either trying to get to software providers who are - who you are going to ask them to make specific changes in their technology, or you are trying to find a specific non-Latin character set case study that you can make in order to build on the story that you've got so that you can take it global.

So these - all these things are a part of our 2019 focus, not a part of our long-term focus. Long-term we're trying to take the initial successes we have in either addressing people, technologists, or case studies, and build on that. Eventually we'll get to everyone.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking. So I have two observation and one point that is on the one hand, which is very good, so we have seen from the strategic session that UASG is a given a high priority, it's one of the bullet

points - the major bullet points in the strategic outline for next years, which is very good.

In addition I was attending a - the meeting of the Auction Proceeds CCWG and I learned that also on the list of the - the, let me say, the projects which would be funded, yes, through the auction proceeds, UASG or universal acceptance is also on that list.

And there is an ongoing discussion in that group with regards the question whether let me say, projects which are at the time being on the normal budget of ICANN, yes, should be - there should be money transferred from the auction proceeds to those projects or not. And there was also a basic question raised whether UASG is at all on the right scope of ICANN. And so my question is here, is this group following that, you know, and is there a need maybe in following this discussion well to make more detailed input on UASG activities related to those questions, the Auction Proceeds CCWG has?

Christian please.

Christian Dawson: I have some initial comments. I cannot address every part of the question but I'll address a couple different parts of it and hopefully other people can add. So first of all I think that with regards to the question of whether universal acceptance work is within scope, I think that it is clearly determined that - is that it is. And in fact it's one of the major focuses of the Board.

Personally I only have two specific asks of the Board with regards to universal acceptance that they have not already addressed by the resource that they've given us to date, because I'm not sure that the research and planning that we have done so far is sufficient for us to be able to use a lot more money than they've already given us. So the things that I want is I do want - they've given us a part time staff person, I want a full time staff person,

and we also have some procurement issues. We need to be nimble in how we spend that money.

And it's very difficult to put anybody that we bring on through a multi-month procurement process in order to even deal with us for a small, few hundred dollar project that we may need done in the UASG. UASG is supposed to do things that we need to do. I'm not personally tracking the auction proceeds' moneys so I can't really comment on whether I think that UASG should be a use of those funds, but I will make sure that I'm working so that by the time people are actually deciding those sorts of things we might have enough actual research done that we could use a significant pile of money by that time.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Christian. So my suggestion in this regard is you should get in contact with our representative on that team which is Marilyn Cade for the CSG. And then, well, because she's following these discussions and that would be the best way, well, to chime in and have a chat with her about that. Yes.

Ajay Data: So I wanted to add what's (unintelligible) covers almost everything, just for the - everybody's benefit that now we shall know that it's a top five strategic point as UA in the Board. And now the chair which has a focus which used to be named as IDN, now it is known as IDN and UA. So from the ICANN perspective that is very much in focus as Christian already said. Yes, and I think you (unintelligible) a great thing we should definitely get to the discussion what's going on and we - a few of us should subscribe to the mailing list and keep a watch on it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Lars, last point.

Lars Steffen: I just wanted to add that now every subgroup working group is having - or is currently getting its own charter that we have the sponsoring criteria document and things like that. This is one of the results due to the fact that

more and more people are having a closer eye on the UASG and that there was still potential to get better and to be more transparent to the community what we are actually doing and that we spend this money really in a wise way.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So thank you very much for that overview and the discussion about that. We are a little bit behind but I would suggest if you don't mind, Philippe is still not here because Philippe has to give, our Council member, has to give a presentation at the ccNSO, that helps us in the agenda because we can directly go into the next part here. Welcome to the members here available from the GCSC, the global Commission on stability in cyberspace, (unintelligible) if you like but also to join us on the table - at the table - not on the table.

((Crosstalk))

Olaf Kolkman: We've seen weirder things.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And Olaf Kolkman, thank you here, and Wolfgang Kleinwächter, welcome here. So we will have - see a presentation to be given by Olaf. I had a chance well to follow you 10 minutes or 15 minutes when you had this extensive exchange with ALAC. It sounds really interesting. So and then let me just introduce ourselves, you know, so we are the ISP representatives so and representing telco companies as well as Internet service providers from different regions.

So technically-oriented but also process-wise oriented we are very keen to hear from you. Thank you to be here. And I hand over to Olaf.

Olaf Kolkman: Yes, my name is Olaf Kolkman. I'm one of the commissioners of the global Commission on stability in cyberspace. I work for the Internet Society where I am the Chief Internet Technology Officer. And I have a bit of a background in technical standardization but in particular of the DNS. Previously I had a

software company and we developed DNS software. And so I've been following ICANN for quite a while, although not very actively participated.

Let me give Wolfgang the opportunity to introduce himself quickly.

Wolfgang Kleinwächter: Yes, my name is Wolfgang Kleinwächter. I'm a veteran in the ICANN process. I was also on the GNSO Council and as a representative of the Non Commercial User Constituency, one of your brother organizations in the Non Contracted House. I was also in the ICANN Board and served many years in the NomCom and I'm one of the commissioners. My background is more academic. I was teaching a course on Internet policy regulation at the University of Aarhus for more than 20 years.

Olaf Kolkman: Not a commissioner but supporting the Commission from the Secretariat, Alex, a few words.

Alex Klimburg: Hi, my name is Alexander Klimburg, I'm from the Hague Center for Strategic Studies. I'm the Director of the GCSC Secretariat and I support our commissioners wherever policy so I will be yielding the floor today for sure.

Olaf Kolkman: Thank you, Alex. So let me be clear, we're here with an ask. As always, you know, when you go into meeting and people walk out and you go like, what was the ask again? Let me just put it on the table. We would like to see ICANN endorse one or more of the norms that we have created. We believe that those norms are important and it's important for state and non-state actors to endorse those norms because they make the norms themselves a more powerful package. So that's the reason we're going around to constituencies. ICANN is a bottom up organization and we hope that you can cheer for us, so to speak.

So with that, what is - next slide. So let me give you a little bit of a background of the GCSC, it's a commission that was established in 2000 - what is it - 2017 now after a negotiation process by the - in the UN, the UN

First Committee about Stability in Cyberspace was on its head - on its way of being successful. There was the (GCCS) that had happened recently (unintelligible) and a number of people said we need to make sure that in order to get stability in cyberspace take a different approach than we have taken (for).

Stability in cyberspace is sort of a keyword. It's sort of the idea that actions by states do not escalate into growing kinetic weapons. That is the underlying motivation for us to do our work. Create norms for the actors that are involved in that so that stability is ensured and we don't get into situations where (unintelligible).

So the Commission was put together essentially by the Dutch government, the Dutch government and several partners. The French and Singapore government, Microsoft is a partner in this, the Internet Society, my employer, is a partner in this (unintelligible) joined, and the Secretariat is by - headed by two think thanks, the Hague Center for strategic Studies of which Alex is an employee, and the East West Institute.

We have commissioners, 26 of them. Those commissioners come from the east, the west, the north and the south and they also have a variety of backgrounds, academic, technical, people with law - international law experience, diplomats, ex foreign ministers and we even have - if I may say so, a spook in our midst. If you say that you are…

Alex Klimburg: Quite a few actually.

Olaf Kolkman: Quite a few. But if you say on the website that you were head of the Chinese Station, then I think that is quite clear. What we've been doing is we have been negotiating among ourselves a number of norms. But let's first go to the mission statement. Next slide please.

So our mission statement is to engage the full range of stakeholders to develop a proposal for norms and policies to enhance international security and stability and create responsible and non-state behavior in cyberspace. So it's not only states that we believe are responsible for maintaining a stable cyberspace, it's also non state actors that have their roles. And of course there is the interaction between states and state actors.

One of the first things that we developed, we took quite some time, is our first norm, which is on the next slide, which is the call to protect the public core of the Internet. The norm reads, "Without prejudice to the rights and obligations, state and non-state actors should not conduct or knowingly allow activity that intentionally and substantially damages the general availability or integrity of the public core of the Internet and therefore the stability of cyberspace."

Now, go ahead.

Lars Steffen: We've got one comment from the room that we should try the other microphone that - because that one is obviously not…

Olaf Kolkman: If I'm a little bit closer, does that work? Okay, I'll keep this close then. Sorry for that people in remote here. The public core there is a word that was sort of invented because we didn't want to use things like critical infrastructure. They have a very specific meaning if you talk about this issue. So the public core comes with a footnote and the footnote initially said, "The naming, routing and numbering system and the certificate infrastructure, encryption infrastructure and cable systems."

We have given a little bit broader definition but I think that it is important to understand that the naming, numbering, routing system is what makes the Internet the Internet. The number system, the naming system, the naming system clearly within the scope of ICANN, what we mean by that is the whole set of root servers, the provisioning of the naming system, the protocols and

the logic. So it's not only tangible assets, it's also procedures and ideas and the - sort of the data that keeps the thing flowing.

Specifically also the standardization processes are mentioned in our definition of what that public core is. So it's not only cables, it's not only machines, it's not only data centers, it is actually much more of infrastructure that we call to protect. And I think that is - that this is in particular the norm that we would like to see underwritten by the ICANN community as well.

The next norm is a little bit at the other side of the spectrum. It's the call to protect the electro-infrastructure, state and non-state actors should not pursue, support or allow cyber operations intended to disrupt the technical infrastructure essential to elections, referendas and - I never know how to pronounce that but (platisifieds), yes. Thank you for whispering that in my ear.

The - that is a norm that is on the other end of the spectrum. We looked at quite a spectrum of say digital and ICT activities. What is in particularly out of scope here is fake news and so on so forth, we are trying to touch - not touch content as such.

We have six other norms that I will quickly go over. The norm to avoid tamping, the norm to avoid tampering is really prevent interference in production change, prevent the insertion of calling home features in devices, prevented the tampering standards and processes for instance the tampering of elliptic curve parameters, something that has happened before, those type of things.

Once deployed, we have a norm for - against the commandeering of ICT devices into botnets. So the use of IoT, of ICT devices, this was inspired basically by the Mirai botnet attack, what if that would have been a military attack? And in fact, why does it matter that a botnet is used by either military

forces or by nonmilitary forces? So again, state and non-state actors should not commandeer others ICT research for use as botnets or similar purposes.

Now what is important here is that there is a notion of proportionality here. We're a very diverse Commission and we want our norms to be adopted by states. If it is the case that you say no use of ICT devices at all, then that might be something that says to states, well you cannot do targeted police operation for instance, or law enforcement operation. And that would be a dead on arrival type of norms. So that is why we say "commandeering" which is - which has a sense of proportionality.

Then next norm for states to create vulnerability equity processes. We know that some states maintain a vulnerability (unintelligible) that they find for their own use either for law enforcement or for military purposes. That is not likely to happen - not likely to change.

However, we feel that it is important that there should be a process that has been debated by politics, by governments with due influence on how to assess which bugs are in and out and then with the different presumption to favor disclosure. So if bugs are found favor disclosure in a way in a responsible way so that they find their way back and are fixed and make the overall system - our overall ICT system more safe.

Next set of norms, norm to reduce and mitigate significant vulnerabilities. Now this is a norm that is specifically not targeted to state actors but much more to producers and people that deploy infrastructure. I'm not going to read it out, it's quite a lengthy text, but it's basically take your responsibility and secure your product or your services to basic standards.

Same is the next one, norm on basic cyber hygiene as a foundational defense. That is basically asking states to use the instruments at their disposal to create a basic level - to enforce a basic level of cyber hygiene.

And finally the norm against offensive cyber operations by non-state actors, non-state actors should not engage in offensive cyber operation and non-state actors should - and state actors should prevent and respond to such activities if they occur. This is hack back. This is basically say thou shall not hack back and if you do that then the state where you're in should actually take measures to prevent that.

So that is the set of norms. Now I don't know exactly what our next slide is because my screen - oh yes. So this is the work that we have presented so far. We are in our third year. The idea is that the Commission finalizes its work by end 2019, beginning 2020 with a report. That report would have a number of principles that are the basis for our work. We're doing that a little bit backwards, we have first set out a number of norms and we're now thinking, okay, what were the principles that informed us, but in the final report of course the order will be in a more logical description.

And we have created a stability definition, a cyber stability definition. That definition is here on the screen. We've been trying - we've been looking at the various definitions of stability and we figured that one of the things that we do not want is a stability definition that fixes everything in time. ICT, the Internet, is evolving every day and every minute, I would say. So the stability definition should take that natural order of change into account. And so we've been trying carefully to word it that way.

Finally, the package will create - will have some recommendations and the recommendations will be intended, and we're still discussing what those will be, but the recommendations are really intended to make sure that the norms will go somewhere, that they are adapted in international processes, that it is understand whether they are adapted and that it is understood when the norms are violated and so that there is some accountability and transparency in the end around the practices that may cause cyber instability.

So that is roughly the work of the Commission. We're going around, we're asking nation states and non-state actors to adopt our norms. The call to protect the public core of the Internet is incorporated for instance by the Paris Peace Call of November last year to which about 60 governments have signed up. The call to protect the public core is also part of European legislation passed by the European Parliament.

Further, the Tech Accord has favorably looked at - so that's the Tech Accord is an initiative by several businesses have also favorably looked at our work. Again, the ask is have a look, please, at mainly the public core for the Internet but there might also be other norms that you say oh those are very interested and we think that it is very important for our community to endorse these. Take them back home, but also in the context of this constituency and the context of the ICANN, perhaps recommend the endorsement of one or more.

The package of norms is in that sense severable, it's a menu, a buffet of norms, so to speak. And I think with that, Wolfgang, do you have anything to add?

Wolfgang Kleinwächter: At this the commenter understand the context, you know, the Commission started in 2017 when the group of governmental experts in the First Committee of the United Nations Assembly failed to reach consensus. So but the issue did not go away from the table and it's now back. That means in this year there are two new bodies in the United Nations started discuss cybersecurity issues.

There is another group of governmental experts based on a resolution introduced by the United States of America. And there is a second so-called Open Ended Working Group which negotiate the same things which was introduced by the Russian Federation. And this groups which are discussing international norms for cybersecurity could touch the - not only the public core of the Internet but a lot of other elements.

And insofar, you know, we think it's extremely helpful to bring the knowledge from the technical community and from the broader multistakeholder community to this negotiation table because people, the diplomats negotiating in these groups are rather dis-linked from debates which are taking place in this service. And there is one point which is very helpful because the two groups are obliged to have consultations with non-state actors.

And if we raise a voice from the non-state actors community including like big players like ICANN, then it will be difficult for the diplomats in New York to ignore this and to let's say to design or to come to conclusions which are in line with the reality and the technical needs. So that means that's a little bit also the plan to raise the bar rather high that the diplomats do not come to conclusions which have negative effects on the functioning of the Internet.

Olaf Kolkman: Yes, ironically it is the case that the Open Ended Working Group established by the Russian Federation actually calls out for multi non state actor input while the GGE will only go to regional bodies which are basically state groups, rather ironic.

Part of the work - part of the message that we want to concur with our work is that the Internet in particular cyber, but the Internet in particular is an infrastructure that is maintained by a very large and diverse group of stakeholders, network operators, 60,000 of them. They have to deal with the day to day defenses of their own network. In this environment, the defense is really on the private sector while offense is often in the public - by states, so to speak, or state-sponsored actors.

And if you realize that that is the situation then you immediately understand that those stakeholders need to be at the table and an understanding of that environment needs to be included in the decision making. Now that's also something that by having the Commission constituted as it is, we try to convey.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much, Olaf. And, Alex, you would like to add some words, please. And before we go into discussion afterwards, well, I will open for discussion afterwards and then Alex, first.

Alex Klimburg: Very quickly just wanted to - Alex Klimburg for the record, just wanted to follow on the point that was just made because it's rather important. We deal with norms that are crafted within primarily intergovernmental environments but we accept that norms of course have been created outside of this environment, particularly within the technical environment.

And our objective is partially to ensure that those norms have been created in, for instance, your communities are also imported into the more diplomatic communities where very often they invent things that have also been invented elsewhere, not necessarily reinventing the wheel, as always, not necessarily made it better. So part of this is also an appeal to also provide us with input that we can help communicate to our government stakeholders and effectively help advance this dialogue. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So thanks very much for this. And the - I think so I take a list, the first was Christian and then Tony, then Thomas, so Ajay, so please, Christian, go ahead.

Christian Dawson:Thank you, Christian Dawson for the record. The first that I want to - can I be heard? Here. Okay. The first thing that I want to do is make sure that I get your card that we can exchange cards because I have a tremendous amount to say and communicate with you guys, more than I can fit into a small interjection.

I'm very excited about the work that you are doing. To first just quickly address the specific ask that you're making of us, I would have no problem with ICANN examining the norms that you're bringing to the table. And I think

the proper process for that to do is maybe to ask the SSAC or RSAC to take a look at the norms and give recommendations to the community at large.

But the thing that excites me is not necessarily just that but the fact that you guys are a multistakeholder group that's focused on cybersecurity, I'm a firm believer that multistakeholder-ism is the way that we need to continue to deal with issues on the Internet, and this is an area where obviously you're not going to get it done in a state actor environment. So that's really exciting.

The one thing that I would say is that as you have acknowledged, there are a number of groups who have put forward norms. You take a look at multistakeholder environments out there that have been successful and most of them have a stake for the multistakeholder community to gather around. At ICANN we have the management of the global root, in the RIRs you have the management of the numbers space, at IETF you've got what may have just been started out as just an idea of norms, has become the RFC system we heavily relied upon, right?

And so I would love to talk to you about what yours could be because I've got some ideas.

Olaf Kolkman: Yes, I would like to talk too. So the big question is what is next for us. So first you're preaching to the choir, you know, I'm an IETF guy, that's my history. And multistakeholder approaches to this I think are bound to be most successful. This is a difficult environment though. This is about state - interstate behavior and since ages that has been a diplomatic game with very strange rules so to speak.

One of the questions that we have, and that we're working on in the recommendations is what are the next steps? How are we going to track the implementation of these norms because it's not clear whether all, you know, 200 plus nations will actually accept these norms. Will the most important states, namely those with capabilities, accept these norms? It is not very

important if a nation state that doesn't have capabilities accepts the norms because that doesn't really make sense.

So those are all questions that we have on the table. But I do believe that if we create a body of multiple stakeholders that all say hey, this is a good thing that you create a carried norm in the general debate, and that might actually make a difference here.

So for instance if this language gets into the G20, for instance if this language through the Paris Peace Call already is adopted by several nations, for instance if there are security groups that go for it, but also if outlier groups like ICANN say hey, this is actually something that is important and by the way, we as non-state actors also will adopt this norm, easy enough because we will not mess with the public core, then you get a more strengthened place.

I would like - let's have that beer so to speak.

Christian Dawson: That sounds good because I'd like to figure out why we couldn't go past norms and have you for instance take over the management of the NIST CSF.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Tony next please.

Tony Holmes: Yes. Thank you. You sort of said one of the questions I had which was I wasn't quite sure what your plans were for measuring success of this and tracking it. And I assume you'll have different levels of success on that. So you sort of answered that.

But one of the follow on questions was that from work I do in other forums outside of here that are impacted by some of this, there, dare I say, there are often indications that people sign up to norms and things but don't actually honor them. How are you going to track that element when you look at how successful this has been?

Olaf Kolkman: Again, how to track that I really don't have a good answer yet; this is a conversation that we're having. One of the - so there are several initiatives currently going on that could become a landing place for this. Microsoft has this Cyber Peace Institute initiative that could be a landing place for tracking the implementation of norms. That might be other places.

The point that you just made about, you know, people still use landmines; that is a fact of life. But what my personal hope is I think in the end the - this - these type of norms might evolve into international humanitarian law by which if something happens people can be held to account in the ways that you - all states into account. It might be the case that these norms give sufficient backing for nation states, for instance, to have economic sanctions or do other things, because if those norms are accepted.

But this is how norms evolve to international law and understanding, multilateral agreements and so on so forth, and that's, frankly, not my background. So I come from this technical - this is the fascinating thing about the Commission is that there are people who understand these type of trajectories and they say the way to do this is get broad acceptance, once you have this broad acceptance you might go to the next step. Wolfgang?

Wolfgang Kleinwächter: Yes, just so in addition, naming and shaming is still a strong instrument. And to have a norm (what) mechanism in the 2020s could be a good idea, how to develop this, this is the open question. We will make some proposals but the next generation of activists have to settle this.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks. Thomas, first Thomas and then we have another guy. Sorry, and then you.

Alex Klimburg: Shall we take a few questions in a row and then answer them all at once?

Thomas Rickert: I'll give you a few questions, no worries. Thanks very much, Wolf-Ulrich, and hello to the three of you. Thanks so much for the interesting presentation for the work that you're doing on this important and challenging matter. Now, I have a general question that I hope you will not perceive as criticism or, you know, other sort of concern.

But many of us around this table will have vivid but not necessarily fond memories of the NetMundial Initiative. And whilst ICANN at the time has put an awful lot of resources and money into this initiative, that caused the ICANN community to establish particular safeguards against ICANN to go beyond its mission. And Malcolm will remember this because we've been in this - spent many, many hours working on revisions and amendments to ICANN's mission to ensure that ICANN sticks to its limited technical mandate.

And my question to you is, whether you have given any thought to a way to ICANN - for ICANN to even endorse only a subset of your recommendations without overstepping the boundaries of its mission and potentially causing the ICANN community to invoke its community powers against the Board for breach of ICANN's mission.

Wolfgang Kleinwächter: Okay, I can take this and Thomas, you can be assured that I and the Commission, you know, understand fully the limited mandate of ICANN and, you know, did not support any idea to pull ICANN beyond its mission. But if you go to the ICANN Bylaws this guarantee of the stability and the security of the Internet is core value for ICANN.

And insofar, you know, when we discussed, you know, what are the options for cooperation with ICANN, we see we are - come from two different corners but there is a field of overlapping where we can from different perspectives, you know, support at least one or two norms, probably the public core norm is the key of it, where ICANN with this limited technical mandate says, you know, this is helpful for us that we can fulfill our mandate we have as an organization.

But we live in a political environment where we have also to be aware and to contribute that not a situation emerges which will fire back or to undermine the functioning of the Internet. And I think one issue we discussed also with the Board yesterday was it's the better way to bring this technical and political elements in a reasonable way together not to go top down but a bottom up via the various constituencies.

We had a good meeting with the Security and Stability Advisory Committee and said okay, because this is one of the core mission of the SSAC to deal with this issue. I had this morning also a good discussion with the Root Server System Advisory Committee, they have in the RSAC 37, they have a list of 12 principles, and if you go through the principles there is, for instance, you know, one principle, I think it's 11, for the root server operators that say should be impartial and neutral.

So and I think - don't touch the root server operators. This is like the protection of the public core. So that means what happen if one of the root servers, for instance, in Russia now there are four AnyCast root servers in Russia, you know, if the government, you know, ignores the principle that the operators should be neutral and impartial, so they would also violate the norm of the public core.

I think here you have really from - coming from different corners a common interest and I think to mobilize this and to tell the negotiators, be careful, these are things you have to, you know, to respect, to take into consideration; don't touch this. I think this is the way where we can - where ICANN can remain in its limits not to become over politicized, but, you know, has an eye on what's going on in the political environment and can make a contribution within the limits of its bylaws. I hope this will - is reasonable.

Olaf Kolkman: I'm going to give a slightly different twist on this. This was the convincing set of arguments why we think this is aligned. However, I'm very sensitive to

ICANN sticking to its mandate. And that's why we're here. It's not our decision to make for ICANN to adopt a certain stance; that's your decision. That's your advice, that is your point.

So I'm actually a little bit interested in where for you the rub is, where you think taking a position in this might rub against the mandate of ICANN.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, yes, I would say. Do we have still Thomas? We have then Ajay and (Jane)…

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Are there others who would like to chime in here?

Thomas Rickert: I guess I see the risk primarily with the ICANN community that's been very careful in crafting the revised ICANN Bylaws and that has been very vocal in ensuring that adherence to ICANN's bylaws is backed up by community powers that can ultimately lead to kicking out the entire Board, right? So I'm - and I think that this is sort of unprecedented, that ICANN as an organization would endorse a political suggestions or suggestions for law makers.

So I see this not understanding enough about it on the brink of potential not sticking to the technical mandate but I would need to learn more about that. So that's one thing, so I want to avoid that the ICANN community goes after the Board if they did something.

And then the other question is how can ICANN endorse that? Are you looking for an endorsement from ICANN Org? Are you looking for an endorsement from the ICANN community? Would we need - would that be a policy or are we asking for SSAC to include that in one of their recommendations? You know, so I think there are multiple avenues that could be looked at. And maybe it would be enlightening for everyone to - which type of endorsement you're looking for. I mean, Christian mentioned SSAC, maybe RSAC?

Olaf Kolkman: Yes, we have been talking to SSAC, a statement from the Board would be something that could be in that space. But I do appreciate the - and the Board is very careful not to commit to anything at this moment. So and exactly for the reason that you say, there is a very narrow mandate. And I think that one of the things that we are trying to figure out and mainly - this is Wolfgang-driven - driving this with a long, long history of ICANN expertise so to speak, whether there is space within ICANN to do something because again, this is about state and non-state behavior and essentially also behavior for our own community, for our good. That's how I see it but that's personal opinion, yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you, Olaf. So I think we shall follow up also internally with the discussion on that. Thank you. The next is Ajay.

Ajay Data: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well let me follow up with that later on. I think that is an issue, an item to be discussed, that we can discuss for longer time. You should come back to that in between so let Ajay.

Ajay Data: Actually my query is answered a bit so I will pass on right now and give to Mr. (Jane), then I will come back in the end. My query is already answered.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Please.

(Rajesh Jane):   (Rajesh Jane). In my personal capacity I live in New Delhi, India. So what you have explained makes extreme sense, but the question which remains is (unintelligible) the idea which is still ideal. We have ISOC, which is - and when I read their mission, this appears to be similar. But the question which I see and which you also presented that maybe we're looking at this, somebody will (unintelligible) one of their rules. So how does one (unintelligible).

Olaf Kolkman: …Commission was at the previous IGF and I know that there is a - what is it, a special interest - what's the name…

((Crosstalk))

Olaf Kolkman: Best practice for BPF that on cybersecurity that in the next IGF will also take the norms up. Now, that still doesn't answer your question of what happens if the norms are violated. Again, our Commission stops in 2020, that's when we dissolve.

There must or there should be another process, and it's part of our recommendations, to - another process or another institute or another house preferably something that is existing, that would take up the work of monitoring the norms and giving it teeth. How do you make violators of the norms, how do you hold them accountable? How do you do transparency? How do you do retribution, all those type of things, that is really a next step. These are not short processes.

(Rajesh Jane):   Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much for that. Malcolm, please.

Malcolm Hutty: Thank you. I actually wanted to address your question to us about where we saw the rub as being on the mission issue.

Olaf Kolkman: Yes.

Malcolm Hutty: I think mostly it's because you got in there first and so you're treading on virgin soil which ICANN hasn't yet fully worked out how it deals with things. I mean, at first blush, looking at your norms, my instinctive reaction, and I won't give it any great status on that, but my instinctive reaction is that your norm related to non-acting to damage the core Internet is absolutely within ICANN's scope. That's not necessarily to say that everything that might be

done is supposed to give effect to that norm it's within ICANN's scope but at least some things might be. Yes.

But your norm relating to electoral infrastructure strikes me as wholly beyond ICANN's scope…

Olaf Kolkman: Me too…

((Crosstalk))

Malcolm Hutty: Which raises the question then, how does ICANN engage with something when some of the things are within scope and others are not? Yes?

Olaf Kolkman: So.

Malcolm Hutty: And that will be a thing to do. So if I may? Now…

((Crosstalk))

Olaf Kolkman: Just to answer that point, we are very specific about the severability of the set of norms. It is a buffet. You can say we like this, we don't care about the rest, or we don't even like the rest, that's perfectly fine, yes.

Malcolm Hutty: Yes. I mean, Wolfgang, you referred to the reference to security in the bylaws. And reference to security is in the Commitments which is actually an even higher set of core values than the core values. But the Commitments do not define the scope of ICANN's mission, they decide - or describe how ICANN must approach its mission, but its mission is described in a separate section, which is the mission which describes the things that it does. The Commitments describe what it cares about in that and security is one of those things.

And what that means is that security, ICANN's role in security relates to those areas that impact the things that are within ICANN's scope. But saying that something is security cannot bring it within ICANN's scope. And there was a real sensitivity around that because the concept of security generally is an extremely broad one.

And if we said it were otherwise and that merely saying that this promoted the security of the Internet brought it within ICANN's scope, then ICANN's limited mission would actually be extremely broad. And so especially since ICANN has never dealt with that distinction before, ensuring that ICANN when it does turn to it feels that it's in the way that we anticipated and would consider appropriate, is the area of where the rub lies that you're asking.

Wolfgang Kleinwächter: Can I make a very brief comment because I have to go to another meeting. That's why we came here or in the preparatory process for this meeting here to listen and to start to kick start the conversation to find out what we - where it makes sense and where it makes no sense.

Malcolm Hutty: Thank you for doing so, it's very much appreciated.

Wolfgang Kleinwächter: And insofar, you know, we have more or else a timeline, so we would be happy because our report, as Olaf has said, has to be finished at the end of the year.

So by Marrakesh probably to have another conversation in Montréal and to say here we could have a half page statement on the public all together with the Security Stability Advisory Committee, here we could have, you know, a half page statement with the RSAC, or, you know, the ALAC, (Atlas) 3 in Montréal and from a user perspective they have also an interest and I think this is the way the bottom up DNA of ICANN not to have a joint statement with the ICANN Board, this would be the politicization which has to be avoided.

But, you know, to come with the very specific communities and say this is the point of importance, this is the point of importance, and then to send a message to the negotiator in the United Nations and this could have a much higher effect than a big political statement which would then - counterproductive side effects which would then fire back to ICANN. And so you can be assured that this is what I want to avoid. But I think the whole Commission understands this.

That's why, you know, this decentralized approach here in Kobe was a good kick start. This is open what will be the outcome. If we realize that, you know, we cannot find together, that's okay so that means nothing is predetermined.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So thanks. Thanks very much. So I understand so it could be helpful also for you, well, for example if you get a statement from the ISPCP community regarding several parts of the norms, so it could be positive or negative or what else, yes, this is some comments, so let's do that in a follow up so internally to talk about how we could manage that. So as a next step and I understand so you may come back as well in Marrakesh or at least Wolfgang, so and so that could be done in that way.

So thank you very much for that presentation and for the discussion. I think it helped us also to understand what you are doing. And we know how we can deal with that. Thank you very much. Any last comment on that…

Olaf Kolkman: Yes, we have some brochures and material on the table over there. Feel free to pick as long as it lasts and otherwise there is the cyberstability.org website.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much. So we are a little bit behind of our agenda. We moved, you know, the Council part, you know, we are waiting for you. But I think it doesn't mean - so we don't need really 20 minutes for that because as I understood from the Council side there is nothing - not too much to be voted. But I would say we go to that point right now and let report - Philippe

on that. And then afterwards dive immediately in the EPDP discussion and what we would like to talk about Whois data access requirements.

Okay, Philippe, please.

Philippe Fouquart: Thank you. Philippe Fouquart. Now indeed for tomorrow's Council, most of the - the only motions that are up for a vote are on the consent agenda. We talked about the CSC Effectiveness Review. I think it should be fine, we - I just made the presentation at the ccNSO. We've only had good feedback from the community so should be - it should be okay. And the other points are for discussion so and certainly on the EPDP there's going to be significant discussion as well. So let's leave it as-is and use the time as efficiently as possible.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Philippe Fouquart: Unless there are questions.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Philippe. So I also understood there shall be no specific meeting tonight, yes, because of that situation so we don't have contentious item around that. Are there any questions here from the floor to Philippe? Not yet. Thank you very much.

So then let's go into the discussion on EPDP and further Whois data access requirements. The reason why I put that this way and added "Whois data access requirements," are mainly well because we had - we heard more and more from different parts of the community asking us towards the ISP community what are your real requirements with regards to Whois data access? You must have a big interest, you know, in that, well, to get as much as possible data from an operational, from a business point of view, from security point of view maybe.

Even when we had a talk with Göran on the phone, you know, Göran is doing with the leadership of any - of every constituency - talks before each ICANN meeting, so he also raised that question that he was asking, well, why you guys from the ISP side don't hammer on requirements with regards to Whois data access.

So I would like to bring that up here this point and go around and asking for comments here from the floor, from the different participants, on that whether we missed something here for example, in the past with regards to that point; or do we have to discuss that internally, do we have prepare and say kind of statement with regard to these items? Or are we satisfied how it the discussion is going on on the EPDP team and are we satisfied as we are represented at the time being on the EPDP team with the output of our representatives towards the team?

So that's the broader scope, you know, of this item. And I would be happy well to get some reactions on that. Unfortunately right now Thomas left the room so but maybe he's just in talk outside. Are there right now - does direct comments on that, otherwise I could also reflect a little bit on what was discussed so far on EPDP, you know, with the Board, these things.

But if there are comments, you know, with regard to that, that would be helpful to start discussing. Is any comment with regards to the EPDP activities here, we have, you know, and you would like to see improved and what could be done from our side? Tony first.

Tony Holmes: Just to comment, it's hard for us to determine the way forward without knowing whether the current people are even willing to do that. So but I don't know what the situation is there. This might be something we need to follow up after the meeting unless you're aware, Wolf-Ulrich. And it's also really difficult for us at this stage to know as a constituency how we're going to handle Phase 2 because there's so many unknowns about it at the moment in terms of timeframe, running order of what they're going to do.

We've got a good idea of what should be in and what should be out of that but it's a bit of a mystery part of that at the moment, so probably I think the details of this will come down to future calls, constituency calls. But getting an idea of those who represented us so far and how they feel about this would be probably the first step.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay so let's also wait for Thomas in that. What I would like also to outline is we were talking about yesterday already on the panel and today with the Board about improvements related - compared to Phase 1, improvements in Phase 2 of the EPDP. And it turned out well, that one of the major issues, and we have seen that also in the past in Phase 1, is the big workload for the members on the team.

And there was also, understood, really the reason from Esteban, well, to step back so in that regard. And we are all struggling, all the members, are struggling well to cope with the workload on the EPDP team. The - however, I would say also it's not possible for everybody, you know, to take part in each meeting. The willingness and the volunteerism well is great, I would say.

On the other hand, so if we have only one member taking part in these meetings also, so we should also -w e should give him, let me say, the feeling that he has got the support of our group here. So that he has the support, he's going - if he reports back as well and we could - every time we could chime in and comment on the parts where we think we have to comment on and we have to give some input for more - for specific items. I think that support is necessary.

In order to avoid situations where people, where members, are going to get frustrated, well, in a sense that they got the feelings they doing the feedback or if they don't get a feedback they don't get - they got a feeling that they don't get support from the group. So it must be clear to these people that they have the support as long there is no feedback. So and if there is - no negative

feedback. If there is no feedback, then there is - you can accept there is support. But if there is contradictory or other feedback you should take that into consideration. I think that's essential for the work especially for Phase 2 as well.

Okay, so Thomas must be occupied by others. So why not then - well we have - oh he's coming back. Thomas, I just would start the break here but we were just starting well to talk about the EPDP and the further support for the EPDP 2 phase. And the questions how we can more give support to the EPDP members in their work, who are committed well, to do so. I have heard, you know, I have asked the question for commitments for the Phase 2 and you gave us commitment, personally. Fiona yesterday also responded positively. Suman as well responded positively.

It is - the question is well how to - for you how to cope with the workload and how to - the work is going to be organized without a lot in preparation of the Phase 2 that many things depend on the chairmanship and will depend on the chairmanship in future as well, how it's going to work. So you have to take an eye on that, how it's going to work on that. But in addition so if there are other points, well, to make from your side how you can get more - a better feeling of support from the community, please, go ahead.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much, Wolf-Ulrich. Now that Phase 1 is done and dusted, hopefully with a positive resolution from the Board, we have to look forward and look at Phase 2. However, I think that in retrospect there's one thing that I would ask and that is that there should be - or I would encourage more participation from the entire ISPCP and also more active interaction with the - with Fiona and with you as an alternate.

Other stakeholder groups and constituencies actually have their alternates participating in the other AC room all the time. They have teams behind them that would help them review documents so that a position can be formed. And if you look at the statistics on participation, which is published with our

report, you will spot that the weight was primarily on my shoulders to get everything done. Right? And that's not meant to be a complaint, but I think we will be able to make our voice heard more effectively if there were, you know, a robust and continuous participation from two people from our group always.

For most of the calls I've been the only representative of the ISPCP. And I was asked by other constituencies and ICANN staff whether, you know, whether there are more people that could help with the process. So I think in terms of substance but also in terms of the looks of this entire thing it would be good to have a team that's working on this.

And I think there will be a lot to read. There will be a lot to discuss. And, you know, if there are any volunteers in this group to sort to form a core team of - that can monitor the progress on a regular basis and help form position for the ISPs that would be appreciated.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Thomas. And Esteban, please.

Esteban Lescano: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Introduce yourself.

Esteban Lescano: Esteban Lescano. Well I want to congratulating in public to Thomas that his work was amazing and really the workload and the dedication was terrible. In my case, and for experience, was like impossible to follow.

That was a setback. I agree with Thomas that it's important to work as a team and a team that is maybe bigger than the team with the two participants and an alternate because also with the two full participants I think that will be difficult to follow the train of the, I don't know, Phase 2 is at least the same workload that Phase 1, I think that will be very hard to follow and is not - that's why that it's not fair to Thomas to put all the responsibility and all the workload on you.

That's why I also suggest to have maybe a bigger team, some more people from the constituency working with Thomas as head or as leader of the team and try to support him and to help feedback from the members of the constituency.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Esteban. Well let me try to frame it that way. So as you could see, so we have different interests on the CSG level. So you could see on BC, IPC level compared with our level. That's one point to make. So that means there are more legal oriented reasons why IPC and BC may put more effort on that experience than we can do so as people representing their companies or associations. That is one point.

The other point is if that is the case, if we cannot put more effort on that, so personally from our members' point of views, then at least you should know, Thomas, that if you are, you know, if you take the major load of that work, that you have support of the constituency in doing so as long there are no comments coming - if there are - I know that, you know, if you ask people and for comments or an idea for this and that and there is nothing coming back for whatever reason, you know, then it might be frustrating, but you should be sure that nobody is against what you are suggesting to do so.

And that shouldn't happen that afterwards then we will have a discussion, well, coming back to the first point saying no, this couldn't be accepted because of this and that. So usually if somebody reports back and asks for an opinion and there is nothing going to be happen, you should be clear from that point of view that we are with you; we are with you in cause of this work.

You know it doesn't happen every time, you know, you know that because for example on the team - on the team's level itself you have this problem which was raised this morning with the data protection officer, you never know what's going on with them in the end, yes. But I wanted to avoid such a situation on our constituency level as well. Thomas - Tony please.

Tony Holmes: Yes, I appreciate the difficulties Thomas must have had in the last phase of that. And we need to do it differently. It was always my original perception of some of the early discussions was that there was going to be much more interaction at the CSG level on this. Now, the way things turned out that may not have been workable anyway.

But I don't think it's good enough just say as issues come up if there's no comments, you know, that's fine, everyone's behind because one of the things I think we should get better at is making sure everyone is aware of when issues come up and when input is required.

So I would suggest it would be helpful quite often not just to receive an email saying, can you look at this 20-page document or whatever, at this stage, but I'm sure if at each stage where there was part of the decision making process in terms of giving input, I'm sure a call probably no more than half an hour, maybe not even half an hour, half an hour with Thomas or Suman or whoever is there to give us the background to that probably would get a much more engaged and faster result than just putting something out on the email list for comments.

So but I would suggest we need to go down that path of not just relying on a once a month ISPCP call but where there are decision points along the process that if we could have a call beforehand where Thomas or whoever can set out what the issues are and then we can provide the feedback, that would be a much better way of doing it.

And hopefully this process will be at a pace that would help facilitate that whereas I think Phase 1 it was at times just really difficult for everyone to keep up with it particularly if you weren't in a position where you could put in six hours more a week; it was just crazy. So hopefully it would help with that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thomas, please.

Thomas Rickert: When you said "six hours" I thought you were talking days not weeks because that's at least been the amount that I had to put into it. So two quick responses, regarding the CSG discussion, I mean, it's not all documented but I have been in regular contact with Alex Deacon, for example, with Diane Plaut, with Marc. Both collectively we had joint dinners with the CSG folks to discuss things. So there has been quite a lot of interaction at the CSG level.

But there have been a couple of points in the report, and ultimately it's only two of our recommendations where the BC and IPC has voted now. So I think we've - if you compare that to the outset of our discussions we have been able to reconcile a lot of differences and bridge the gaps but there were a couple of points where we just, you know, were confronted with requests that in our view couldn't be made legally compliant.

And I guess that's the threshold that should be the minimum standard for us. And I can assure you that we could analyze their interventions, both written as well as oral, I mean, it's all documented in the archives of the Phase 1 work. I'd say that more than 90% of everything that I contributed was purely focused on compliance and not on the policy aspect of things.

And the policy aspect I guess can be boiled down to a couple of very simple themes which we have discussed in this group and that is do we want fragmentation or do we want the unique or uniform approach at the global level? And that would include things like having the same standards for registrants regardless of where they come from.

It boils down to points like if a set of data is collected, should it be the same data set from registrar to registrar or can that vary? That's the tech C debate, right, where we now have this unfortunate position in there which says the registrant can optionally provide some data for a tech C but then it's also optional for the registrar to offer the tech C function.

So that's something that we didn't win, right, but that's also one of the points that we've discussed where I think Wolf-Ulrich said, well, our disagreement is not strong enough to vote down the recommendation. So I think we compromised with our position both in the direction of the IPC and BC, so we didn't object against Purpose 2, although I think it was flawed.

But on the other hand we didn't object to some of the positions that the contracted parties favored. So I think you know, we were sort of sitting - we got our way for most of the aspects that we discussed but not for all of them. Nonetheless I think that more interaction is key. I think it is understandable that you did not want to be confronted with lengthy documents with short notice to comment on.

But my experience was that the length of the summaries that I wrote didn't much impact the overall volume of feedback that we got. So maybe it's the written form of communication as such that makes it difficult to engage. So I'm all for having a time slot per week where we discuss things, where I give - I or Suman for that matter give quick introductions to the topics that we have at hand at that given point in time, and then discuss. So I think Tony, that's an excellent idea of yours.

And also, if I may, I have suggested to the EPDP team, and I'm not sure whether it's getting sufficient traction but it's getting traction, for example, by Steve DelBianco. I've discussed this with him and others and Alex Deacon and Brian King from the IPC. I would hope that we can have three different work streams that will work on in parallel. One would be a work stream dealing with the remaining questions out of Phase 1. So there have been some questions that we pushed over the line because we couldn't do it in the timeframe given, that would be natural versus legal, geographic coverage and stuff like that.

Another work stream dealing with how to respond to disclosure requests that relate to the pursuit of civil claims, that would be the IPC interests or the BC

interests, trademark infringement, stuff like that. And the third area would be responses to disclosure requests coming from public authorities, law enforcement requests, that's the toughest nut to crack in my view.

And in order to help particularly the interests of our fellow CSG members, I've suggested that we would rotate meetings on the various work tracks but weigh them so that if civil claims disclosure was Work Track 1, and the other two were 2 and 3, we would have our Tuesday meeting dealing with 1, our Thursday meeting dealing with 2, our next Tuesday meeting dealing with 1 again, and then with 3 so that would have more meetings where the interests of our CSG fellows are so we would give that more weight and hopefully get to a result quicker.

And it would also have the beauty that we would not discuss the same topic twice in a week and that would give us at least seven days to get back to our constituencies and consult. I mean, this has been a lot of work. I hope that it makes sense. But this is what I've been advocating for in order to make it easier for everyone to digest what we've discussed and reach out to their fellow constituency members and at the same time allow for a swift progress with individual items.

Tony Holmes: Yes, so we weren't quite on the same track, I think, when I referred to CSG originally there were some discussion about having more let's say combined feedback rather than the dialogue. I wasn't referring to our dialogue with our partners in the CSG but more of a combined feedback operation. I think things took off so fast that it didn't help that.

In terms of calls, I think to get the traction we need maybe we should look at probably once every two weeks unless there's a real need to have something in between those times. And that - part of that could be our monthly call as well for one of those; we could - even if need be we could expand the time to add that on.

In terms of the issues you raised as well, Thomas, on that I think we're going to have to have some discussion around some of those issues that are in Phase 2 because I don't think we're probably all on the same wavelength on how we respond back on those and the issue of some of the trademark protection actions that are required that you refer to. I know, for instance, that most telcos also operate on that basis as well as ISPs, they need access to that information as much as the trademark guys.

So I think we'd need to have some discussion around that. And also the interest in the law enforcement side, we're going to have to have some discussion around those issues. So there is a need for a much better dialogue, I fully agree with you on the second phase and we need to make that work. Yes, sure.

Thomas Rickert: I guess, one point that's often forgotten in this entire discussion, your point about telcos is an excellent one. I guess we have two things to bear in mind when discussing disclosure. Telcos, ISPs, cloud service providers, whatever you might call the core players in the Internet infrastructure scene these days, they have been fighting against being the deputies of law enforcement for decades to pass on information or take action by taking down websites or otherwise without a robust legal basis for their actions.

And this is what I'm trying to achieve here that we're not in a legal vacuum but that whatever is being required by infrastructure providers has a solid legal foundation that's being operated under. At the moment if you are, and I think I've used this example in this forum at one of the earlier meetings, if there is an issue and then - and local law enforcement approaches us then they approach the operator and the operator would disclose data based on national laws. That is still possible; that's possible for registries and registrars. And that system works so far.

It works at the national level, and when it is border crossing disclosure requests, they need to go through mutual assistance. We are now working on

a system that's going to be entirely reversing this concept because it's going to be enforced by ICANN contractually to do certain things, or at least that's the plan. That's not the case for telco so that adds pressures on the infrastructure providers.

And also it shall make possible the disclosure of data without mutual assistance, without having a legal basis for such in the jurisdiction of the contracted party. So I would just say that, you know, this is far more complex than what the challenges that telcos are confronted with. I totally agree that the challenges are comparable because ISPs also want to take action when it comes to malicious activities on their networks.

But we have to stand absolutely firm that everything that's done there is done based on the sound legal basis so that the infrastructure providers don't run the risk of being sanctioned.

Tony Holmes: Yes, totally agree. And there's different layers on that, there's the application of policies for what you describe as telco customers and then the activities that they would want to take as organizations. Those things are obviously not the same either. So I think it's that layering discussion that we need to have as well as this goes forward.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Very helpful. Thank you. It's Wolf-Ulrich speaking. This discussion about - so if that is viable, Thomas, well I understand in the working method of EPDP 2 is not yet fixed then because depending on how the team is going to be constructed, yes, and looks way forward. But if that is helpful I'm open for all of that, well, to have biweekly calls on that specific item for example.

Or if it's necessary even at some point because you are under time pressure, you know, from the team that we should have a call on that. So to offer that to our community here and whoever has - feels well to chime in we should participate to that. So I think - and the way you have outlined that how you would see the working methods is very rationale I would say so and would

help the community really then to chime in to different points as well. That's great.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: For that - I would like to come back also to the Whois data access requirements, you know, point which is also on that agenda. Is that a different point or…

Thomas Rickert: So I have a different question and that is sort of a follow up on the discussions that took place between the CSG and the Board today. I heard Chris - I heard Steve DelBianco ask the Board to not implement or resolve on, my words, not him, on the divergent recommendations in the final report. No?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I'm sorry, I took that - I took that in different way. So he was not asking not to agree to that rather than to take that into consideration and they are going to form their motion. That's where I came back also to that…

((Crosstalk))

Thomas Rickert: Okay. But there seems to be some confusion around that request. And I think that we should form a position on how we want to deal with this. In my view, our EPDP team has come up with a set of recommendations and we have supported the set of recommendations. The GNSO Council has resolved on the set of recommendations, i.e. the report in its entirety.

And I would find it most unfortunate if the Board did follow a suggestion from those who didn't get their way in the report and slice and dice the report and resolve on individual recommendations only. So I think we should clarify in whatever form is appropriate for that that the ISP's commitment to supporting the Phase 1 report was on the package and not on the isolated recommendations.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Thomas, well to raise this point. Well I sort of had - meant that part clear when I - when it was on our side, well, to comment on the EPDP before. Well I said that we, our constituency, is satisfied with Part 1, so and we have seen that the Council has been agreeing to that. And we are confident that the Board is going, well, to take all the comments into consideration in an appropriate way. So we cannot prejudge what the Board is going to do so. But to take that into consideration and to find an appropriate motion to that.

So well so we never would go that way so what I understand to support in saying, well, there are some contentious recommendations in that and the Board should just take the one which have had full consensus on that and the others forget. So that's not the way. But I understand you would like to have - to suggest a clarification on CSG level with regards to that requirement?

Thomas Rickert: To be honest I don't know how this can be done. But I think there should be a clear message to the Board that the ISPs would not endorse any form of slicing our report. It's the report that has been voted up by the GNSO Council and it is the report in its entirety that should be resolved on in one resolution by the Board.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Tony, please.

Tony Holmes: I'm not against going down that path. I think if we made a decision to support it, we support it. But I'm not sure we should be as ISPs, raising that with the Board now unless other constituencies are going to go back in with the same thing because…

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Pardon?

Thomas Rickert: It has been raised with the Board. Steve has asked for the Board not to implement or decide on the contentious…

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: …my understanding, my understanding was the same as Wolf's. So I'm reluctant to go back as we're part of the CSG. I think the answer is they should certainly deal with it as a whole report; that's what the debate was on. But for us as part of the CSG to go back and start making that input if there's no input coming back let's say from the contracted parties or even from the non-commercials, isn't going to stand us in a particularly good space with our partners in the CSG.

So unless others are going back with any response I think we should wait and see what happens rather than go back now because my understanding was the same as Wolf's anyway.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks for that discussion. And well let me go - I will check personally as well so from the - from the transcribes, you know, what was said there…

Thomas Rickert: I can read the transcript for you, the one sentence. "It already has a substantial amount of cross community input that perhaps invites a really thoughtful response that dives into whether some of the recommendations that had divergence in them should be further explored before they're approved and implemented."

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes it should be taken into consideration, so that's what I was saying as well, that means, you know, from my point of view you cannot prescribe the Board, you know, anything in this way. And the Board is going to take the report and looking at the report. We can say so we are not - we are not going that way so that we recommend the Board well to slice anything from that report.

And so I understand you know, the notion or the impetus, you know, what Steve would like to see here, yes, so in that direction that the Board is going that way but he did go so far.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well, okay let's - I would say so we should discuss that with the CSG people as well and…

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: I don't know whether - yes discussing it with the CSG people is going to achieve anything. I'd be very surprised if the Board acted on it in that way personally. I don't think they will. I don't think it's in their interest and I don't think it would be appropriate for them to do that. If they do go down that path, then I would agree, we should make some representation. But until then I would suggest we just hold our fire on that and see what happens.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, at least. I would say so we have some channels to the Board, everybody has personal channels or whatever Board so channels so we should use them as Steve and others are doing as well.

((Crosstalk))

Christian Dawson: Nothing additional. I wanted to…

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Christian Dawson: I had the transcript up as well and wanted to acknowledge the same sentence.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. So…

Christian Dawson: I read it as Thomas does. I don't know whether that's enough - that sentence is enough for the Board to actually consider the idea of splitting things. And I would also be very troubled if they did. It's all I can say.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So thanks. Well briefly coming back to the Whois data access requirement part here, so we didn't follow on before you're coming back, Thomas, well the question was here so for example in the - on the EPDP team were they looking also to the ISP side, you know, in getting more input on that with regards to the potential request or requirement for Whois data access.

Because I am asking for so we have been discussing that or were asked by Göran on the telephone, you know, why telcos or ISPs they should have a big interest, well, to get more data and data access to that. So I'm just curious about that, that we should react on that in any case or do you need any kind of comment from our side? Go ahead.

Thomas Rickert: What we can do is Eco, for example, is operating a complaints office. We can ask what impact the changes in public Whois had on their work. For what I've heard, but I don't have any statistical data support - to support that - is that the abuse teams, if they see that there's some malicious activity going on from - using a particular domain name, they would not necessarily be interested in knowing who the registrant is because they don't want to take action against the registrant as IP lawyers would. They want that the malicious activity stopped.

So they would look up the Whois, see who the registrar of record is, and then approach the abuse contact with the registrar to take care of the abuse. I mean, that's what telcos want; they want to make sure that the operations are not impaired. They want that the distribution of malware is stopped to be continued. So they have an interest in domain names to be suspended if something goes wrong. And you don't need the full Whois record for that necessarily.

But why don't we go and ask around, maybe on the ISPCP list, we have numerous operators on that list to back that up with data and then we can make a more informed - a little more informed view on that.

Tony Holmes: Just to comment, and that isn't the way BT work all the time. They go to the registrant as well, so that isn't always the case.

Thomas Rickert: I've not suggested that what I'm saying is the complete picture…

Tony Holmes: Right.

Thomas Rickert: I've spoken to people and asked their view and that was the feedback that I got. But we can launch a little query with our membership, with the people that run the abuse hotline because they also have a group where all the abuse managers of the members work together, right? And we can - maybe we can - we find more information…

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: Yes, I think there are different ways of doing this. And I think they're the issues we need to have some conversations around going into Phase 2.

Thomas Rickert: But even then we would probably have a good chance of obtaining data with the contracted party in question because that's sufficient to claim a legitimate interest in obtaining the data. So I don't - the biggest issues as we move on I do see in the arena of law enforcement, not that much for the civil claims that we're discussing. And I've said this on many occasions, but, you know, not only do I find this area important I also find it the more challenging and interesting thing from a legal perspective, so I'm really looking forward to be let off the leash and make this work.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I think that's a good idea so Lars, let's get together, yes, and maybe try that. But if others also, you know, representing any association or kind of company who is also impacted by that and so would like to do that so you are invited, well, to do so and report back maybe. So we can do that and we'll see what are the reactions, yes, from Eco Association. Thank you.

Good. So we are in the time so over half past six. We have to go for almost one hour. Well, the next one is the - the last words about the outreach event with JIPA which will take place tomorrow. We had a preparatory small meeting on Sunday in the evening as well about that but we have here Toshi as well. And maybe Toshi could say a few words on that just well any very last words for preparation. Thank you.

Toshiaki Tateishi: Thank you. Now already the preparation is already I think finished, must be just awaiting for tomorrow project but a little bit I think the Japanese people coming, I list them when I emailed before, so sorry. So but I talk to any of the Japanese people now still. So I'm very looking forward tomorrow. If you have - but we don't have so much time so after that we will make a reception in the (unintelligible) party a little bit so please asking anything to the speaker at that time. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much, Toshi. You know, that event shall be off site here, not here in this area and shall be transportation facilities, however, I have circulated the link you know, to register. And I said, well it's limited in attendance, yes, because, okay, the space is limited and there are many people from JIPA. It is sponsored by JIPA, by the Japan Association for Internet Service Providers. And so we are glad, well, that this shall happen. So if you get lucky, you know, to get a slot on that so please come on.

And so thank you very much for that preparation. And I'm also looking forward, well, for that tomorrow. Thank you, Toshi, again.

We have on our agenda some business, so which is more internally-oriented. And before we come to that if I may, I would like to come back to the - to what we discussed with the people from the GCSC, from the global Commission on cybersecurity and the question on how we are going to deal with that. So I think it's essential. So I think we ended with that discussion that they would be satisfied to get a comment from our side to that - to their work in total and to the several norms they have outlined.

So they would be that happy, well, to get any input from us. So the question is, how could we manage that? How could we deal that? So I understood they would be happy to get something by Marrakesh, by the Marrakesh meeting which is three months from now. And is there any idea from you who participated in the discussion how we could deal with that?

So we could say on the one hand, well, get back just pick up, you know, what is here in the background here the document, look at it and make a kind of internal public comment as they put it together, or how we should deal with that? Please, Christian.

Christian Dawson: So I had some - a few - some praise in the room but I want to be clear that I do think that with regard to how the ICANN community should proceed with this, I think that the only proper venue for them to sort of look towards acceptance of their norms here would be through a report by the SSAC or RSAC. And I think that we could ask both those groups - send a note to both those groups asking them to put the norms, if they decide that they wish to take up the norms, to put them through the lens of ICANN's scope and remit so that when we review this as a community we have that information.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Any other input, any other idea with regards to participation in that? So that would - Christian, I understand you - that way that get in contact with RSAC, SSAC in this respect. Just sending a note, how we see that going, so we expecting them and we would be happy if we get upfront from them some comments so where we could chime in?

Christian Dawson: Perhaps the best thing to do would be to get back to them and tell them that we saw the best path forward to be through the SSAC and RSAC. But that the scoping issue is of utmost importance them and if they convince those groups to bring the community a paper that they address them. That would be my comment back to them.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Any other idea? Additions? Okay I'm going to draft something and send it around. Christian, if you could chime in please and help me and would be helpful, yes, thank you. So let's go to the next one, more internal-related. Most important, continuation on charter work. There has been a lot done before that but I think it's ongoing and please, Christian.

Christian Dawson: Certainly. So I want to walk us through what we have achieved so far. Where we are at the moment, which is a relatively stalled position. And I have a proposal to this group on how we get unstalled. So we started meeting at the beginning of this year in order to move the plan forward that we discussed at the last meeting to begin the process of revisiting our charter. And in doing so we put the charter into a sharable document with the group that we had identified being interested in helping the party move forward, helping the plan move forward.

I have taken the role of coordinator. But we broke it into sections and people who were in the steering committee took specific ownership of specific sections. We went through the entire document and flagged areas of concern and flagged areas where we thought that we pretty much had it covered. We then went to ICANN staff and asked them to bring in examples of other charters and governance documents pertaining to areas in which we needed to have additional things in our charter. They brought us those documents and we have them flagged as well.

Then we had decided that basically there are two takeaways. We have Mark agreeing to take a look at those additional examples and flag thing that we

could bring into our own version of a document. And we had Tony and Malcolm agreeing to take a crack at some word-smithing of mission and principles section. We haven't moved forward past those two action points.

Now here's what I think. I think that it is difficult for Mark and Tony and Malcolm to operate from a blank sheet of paper. So I have gone to ICANN through Chantelle, and I have asked them if they would take the - since they have a great deal of experience in this, take the responsibility of taking our note to date and the example documents that are put forward, and to create a starting point document for us, basically a discussion draft of a second version charter.

Chantelle and the experts at ICANN would take the pen, that pen would be immediately removed from them and we would of course have all the source documentation that they used in order to prepare that document so that we could see exactly where it came from. Then, when we go back to Mark, he'll have someplace to start from. When we go back to Tony and Malcolm on the mission and principles section, they'll have something to start from rather than a blank sheet of paper. So I'm seeking the permission of the group to basically have ICANN draft us a starting point for discussion.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Any comments from the floor on that procedure?

Tony Holmes: I'm not against this, but the fact that Mark's responsible for part of this, maybe ping that out to the mailing list and then get some feedback I think would be a good idea. I'd hate to try and speak for him, I'm sure he would object, so maybe we should do it that way as he's a key component.

Christian Dawson: Certainly, absolutely. My goal is not to - in fact I'm always nervous about anybody but this group having control over any aspect of this group's word-smithing. The only reason why I'm doing this is because we're a very taxed group and there's a lot going on right now and if we ask them to do some work we could decide at some other point to throw it out, we're under no

obligation to take their work, but it could be a useful starting point for us to operate from, again, not a clean - not a blank sheet of paper.

Tony Holmes: One other way of doing this, which covers off part of your concern and probably my concern as well might be if they could assemble those sections of the other charters and just give us the information, the bare information. So rather than them do the draft, let's look at what's out there and assemble our own text from that rather than asking them to do it. That might be a different way.

Christian Dawson: We do have that document prepared and that document was circulated to the group a couple of months ago. And that's - and so…

Tony Holmes: Right. Right.

Christian Dawson: …that's why I'm trying to move us past that because they've already done that stage and we haven't been able to take action.

Tony Holmes: Yes, I can only - apologize, I'm sure that Malcolm and Mark as well, I'll have a look at that. If you could maybe make your proposal and then give us a chance to look that document as we should have done, or I should have done certainly more closely, and then come back.

Christian Dawson: Certainly.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Malcolm, please.

Malcolm Hutty: I'm feeling guilty about not having done more work now as well. I must say my initial reaction would normally be to be very cautious about having staff take the pen. But actually, you know what, given the circumstance and given (unintelligible) about how, you know, what we - it's not going out for consultation with anyone else, it will stay with us, we'll be able to decide

whether we want to work on this basis or throw it out and go back to where we are, what have we got to lose?

So yes, I mean, by all means, put it on the mailing list and see whether Mark's got the same opinion, but, you know what, thanks for trying to push us forward. Yes, I'd say if we can - so long as Mark's okay with this as well let's move forward.

Christian Dawson: I'll put it to the list. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So what is the agreement? So to follow - Christian.

Christian Dawson: (Unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I fully understand, well, yes, all guilty here around, you know, in performance sometimes. So but the question is really so sometimes how to organize it, fully understand that, so we are not able, well, to bring it together maybe it would be helpful if we sit together one day, you know, and just talking about and working on charter issues and these things so to put that forward. But that seems to be not possible. On the other way so if you go away from here, then, you know, we are away and then there are other duties, well, to do. So I think the proposal is good and we should follow. Thanks.

Christian Dawson: I will wait until I put it out to the list and see if we collect feedback, but I'll do my best to move that forward expeditiously. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much. Good. The next point is officer elections. So we have to look up to the end of this year, I think in this regard. We have Council members who are going to be elected. I think there is one slot is to be filled or is to be elected, the one which is interimly filled by Osvaldo right now because then Tony Harris term was time limited and the - to the end of this year. So we should be prepared for that.

I think there shall be a timeline set by the GNSO Secretariat, they usually have a timeline for electing councilors, so I will come up with that when we got triggered from them.

The other one is NomCom is also to be elected because Alain - his term is coming to an end as well and maybe afterwards you can say a few words in course of, you know, your report for NomCom as well that side. So that's also coming up to us.

In addition, I would say we should also have at least we should - also we did not yet finalize our charter, but I think coming from the existing present charter it should be necessary, well, to have an election round for the chair and for the vice chair as well because that is necessary after two years at least to have that.

In that respect with regards to chair and vice chair elections, we are not time limited I think so we should start with that as soon as possible. And I will get in contact with Chantelle to call for a round of nominations, yes, for that as usually. And then we shall have elections on that as well.

Any comment to that or any - did I forget anything with regard to that? I think maybe we could directly go to that, to the NomCom part because that is related also to the election of that, and then hand over to Alain with regards to NomCom. Please.

Alain Bidron: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. I am - I was selected by you to be on the NomCom this year. So I think I have to provide to you a few information at this stage. The role of the NomCom is to fill some leadership positions and we have 10 position to fill this year. One position is the - one Board member of the PTI, Public Technical Identifiers. It's a position for three years so three years term.

We have three Board members open for election for three years term also. We have two seats on the GNSO Council. Those seats are voting seats, one for the Non Contracted Party House, one for the Contracted Party House. We have three seat for the At Large Advisory Committee, one for Asia, one for Africa, one for Latin America and one seat, three year seat for the GNSO Council - ccNSO Council, sorry.

One thing to mention is that we have a very specific situation because we have already five Board members and we will have next five Board members for North America, it means that according to the bylaw we will not be able to select any additional Board member coming from that region.

The other point to mention is that regarding Africa, the two positions are ending at the end of the year, it means that according to the bylaw we need one position from each of the ICANN region and we will have to - we will have to select at the minimum one Board member from Africa. So no Board member from North America and at minimum one Board member for Africa; this is something to take into account.

An initial point is that the deadline for application not only to (unintelligible) but to validate the application (unintelligible) stage, the deadline is the 27th of March so it's still time to apply but we - you have only one week to do that and to complete the application. I will be happy to respond to any question regarding this process.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, Alain. Okay, Alain will be - okay counterpart for questions for that. Alain, I understand that usually the NomCom members are still in place until the meeting before the AGM, isn't it?

Alain Bidron: Yes. So the term of a NomCom member is until the general meeting so the meeting - this meeting would be Montréal but I'll get into the current process, the new NomCom member for next round it will be installed at this meeting and the new one is funded not general - the previous one.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. We have for the - for that part - I don't know why the CROP program is on the agenda, is there any comment - oh yes, Christian, you have…

((Crosstalk))

Christian Dawson: Just briefly, we do have - so we have not been using our CROP. We do have - Chantelle and I filed a plan for our fiscal year 2019 CROP usage. But we have not been using it. One way that we can use it beyond simply outreach events if somebody has an outreach event that they wish to apply CROP resources to in-region, please talk to me.

But we're also able to use them to bring somebody in region as a candidate for membership so we've got Africa coming up, if there's somebody in Africa that you think would be a possible candidate who could be brought to the event we may be able to use CROP resources there, just let me know. But the deadlines come up pretty quickly so you'll have to let me know in the near future.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: That's for Marrakesh?

Christian Dawson: That's for Marrakesh, yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes Tony.

Tony Holmes: Just on that, I think that's where we're thinking about. And maybe we should have a dialogue with the - I can't think of the person's name, the ICANN lead for that part of the world, for Africa, to help us maybe try and identify somebody who we…

Christian Dawson: Ozan?

Tony Holmes: Yes.

Christian Dawson: Yes. Okay, we can speak to Ozan about that.

Tony Holmes: Maybe identify someone that would be a good candidate for membership to come to Marrakesh.

Christian Dawson: That's a good idea. I will reach out to Ozan right away. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I think the last time I remember, well, we had in Africa there were two persons were named, the one was from South Africa and one was from Malawi, wasn't it? I'm not sure.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Or Nigeria, so we can look at the files as well, you know, okay. Thank you. It's - so coming to that I think it's ICANN 65, not 64, 64 is now going on, as well. So that really ICANN set a really tough deadline for all these decisions for travel support. I think it's 120 days, you know, before the meeting, so that we had a situation that we had to decide before this meeting, you know, for travel support for the next meeting as well. And that was decided, well in course of that also the reelection on Council and these things.

So that is done, so for ICANN 64, the five slots are already allocated so it is the chair, the vice chair and the two councilors and then we decided as well that Christian is going, well, for that program as well. But in addition the CROP program may help as well, you know, to put somebody on that.

As I know we're coming back to the CROP, the CROP program is time limited, I think it's limited to four days, isn't it of attendance, because we had a problem this time, you know, for attendance of Suman as well so because he could come only today so that limitation.

Christian Dawson: That's correct, it is time limited. There are lots of restrictions to the CROP program. But if you have ideas about interested parties I can walk people through anything.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thanks very much. Okay, so let's go to the next point, so we have put in addition to the agenda is, well, we covered NomCom, that is, well, Christian as well it's going to you so with regards to the items you were raising. Please.

Christian Dawson: Fantastic, I appreciate it. Christian Dawson for the record. In addition to operating CROP and helping - and being on the Outreach Committee and the charter, I am also working with the Secretariat to maintain our web space. And the first thing that I wanted to bring up is that I am looking for help from the membership to address two specific things in which we are stuck on. I'm also going to circulate these to the list.

Both of those are around our own GDPR compliance, the ISPCP website is not GDPR-compliant. We've identified two specific areas that we need remediation. One is a privacy policy. We have drafted a draft privacy policy but it needs to be vetted by the community and it needs to - and then it would need to be put online. So I'm going to be distributing a copy of our privacy policy for review. It has not been looked at by lawyers, it has literally been me and Chantelle, so please keep that in mind as we put it forward, but we need to put something up in order to maintain GDPR compliance.

The other thing that we need is a popup notification or cookie script for the ISPCP website. And us and the resources that we have been given by ICANN in order to address that have not - have not - we - none of us can figure it out. So if anybody in your circle has people that are really good at java script, really good at navigating systems like MemberClicks, we could use your resources to help us figure that out so that we can get GDPR compliant. That is the first thing that I'm looking for community help on.

The next thing…

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Can I comment on that?

Christian Dawson: Yes, sir.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I have a question, GDPR-related, so why don't we just copy what is - what ICANN is doing in general with their website so with regards to GDPR - in relation to GDPR requirements? So should we invent our own…

((Crosstalk))

Christian Dawson: Well the answer is that we have used guidance from other websites but ICANN's website uses data in very different ways than we do and it's much more expansive than we want ours to be. So we have a draft. And I would love comments on the draft once we circulate it. And either I or Chantelle, thank you for joining us, Chantelle, and we'll be circulating the draft for comment as well as circulating the request to help us with the java script issue that we need to resolve.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well to fully understand, Christian, so we are free to do that, so I mean, we are forced to do that but we are free in which way we are doing that on our website?

Christian Dawson: Well, I mean, the privacy policy is ostensibly it can be considered a legal document but really GDPR requires you to explain how you use data and for what purpose. Like what do you collect and for what purpose? And the reason we can't just use ICANN's is that they collect different data and use it for different purposes.

You know, so the only risk that we have is not putting in a good faith effort. Ultimately I wouldn't worry about the legality of the document, I would worry

about the accuracy of the document when we distribute it. We need to look what data we collect and how we use it and to make sure that the document that we make public properly identifies those things and then we're in the clear, which is not my legal opinion, it's simply my understanding for the record.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So I have to refer to Chantelle in that I suppose, Chantelle is GDPR-compliant, let me say in that way. So are we going to do that so in that way that every document you would like to put on the website with any kind of data or so is going through our secretariat and she's going to manage that. And is there any kind of GDPR compliance test or check, you know, for that?

Christian Dawson: So this is again Christian for the record. The requirement is to explain what you're doing and then do what you say you're going to do. We already have a secretariat who manages our data flows, who maintains our membership list and the contact information that we collect. And that's what we've put into the draft. So I think that we're in the clear as long as we all agree that the - that Chantelle and I have properly articulated what we're already doing. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So I understand you need help or you need specific actions from us?

Christian Dawson: I need advising consent, so I need everybody else to look at and say yes, we think this looks good so it's not just me and Chantelle unilaterally putting out a document that represents our understanding of how the organization uses data. And since, you know, the ExComm may themselves utilize data in different ways than are demonstrated in this document that we are unaware of, we need that taken into consideration. We need other eyes than ours on it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay so let's move that way forward. So and ask, well, the community so for consent, yes, for that. Okay, thank you. Other points.

Christian Dawson: The next one is that we utilize Mailman for our internal mailing list. And we are having specific technical difficulties with certain aspects of it. If you happen to have access to a Mailman expert, normally I'm pretty good at diagnosing issues surrounding open source software platforms like this, but this one's been tricky for me. So we're looking for help within the community of finding a Mailman expert to help us with problems with private list. I will also put that to the list.

The very last thing that I want to say is that we have our membership list. Chantelle and I periodically update the membership list, make sure that it is - that it has all the proper information, that people are added and removed as necessary. We do have organizations that have been passed into membership, Verizon is an example of one of them, that no longer have a representative to the ISPs but remain on our rolls.

And so the last item is an item that I'm putting to the community of whether we wish to start an internal outreach campaign to existing member companies for representatives if they do not otherwise have them. Does this make sense? And if so, who wants to help do that?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Philippe, yes please.

Philippe Fouquart: Just to make sure I understand the question, you have members, company members and you don't have contacts per se, so when you say help it means finding a contact within that company or…

Christian Dawson: It is not a deep problem. This is not something that…

((Crosstalk))

Philippe Fouquart: …you're sending emails to those contacts that you may have.

Christian Dawson: Let me give a specific example?

Philippe Fouquart: Sure.

Christian Dawson: This is not a deep problem; this is not a problem that happens very often, but I want to use example or the one or two cases that I have so that we as a group understand how we want to handle situations like this. We had for many years; Jim Baskin represented us from Verizon. When Jim Baskin retired, nobody else came to represent us.

What I want to do, because Verizon is still a member of our organization, but what I want to do is I want to get somebody showing up to members - they're getting information but nobody is showing up and becoming a part of our daily interactions or our interactions at events. I want to know how we want to go out and do outreach to existing membership to make sure we get more participation.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Tony please.

Tony Holmes: With some of those, Christian, I can probably help like going back to other people in those organizations that I do have some association with. So if there's a list you can provide I'm happy to pick off the ones where I may be able to help.

Christian Dawson: I'll provide it directly to ExComm with a note to you to take a look at it and we can use Verizon as - the one that I think we could - we should look at.

Tony Holmes: Yes, Verizon should be an easy one for me but I'll look at the others as well.

Christian Dawson: Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I think it's - refers also to members who represent associations like Eco so where we have a big membership, you know, also but not that active, yes. So then so we could refer to them as well. Yes.

Christian Dawson: Thank you. Just looking to maximize our active membership.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. So that leads me to the last point, Tony, it's yours. That was the question we had on engagement.

Tony Holmes: So long ago, I was forgetting. Yes, after the session we had, CSG session, where we had that discussion once again that Philippe raised about ICANN's plans for reaching out to other global organizations, I had a conversation with Matthew Shears particularly about the concerns we have. It was noted I think Wolf more than adequately made the point that we still had some concerns over that activity.

And we also discussed the issue particularly of ITU-D and the application that's going on there for membership. It was really interesting that Göran, he explained ICANN as a technical organization and how we needed to reach out at the technical level to other organizations. And ITU-D has got absolutely nothing to do with technical realities whatsoever, it's all about development and outreach.

So Matthew suggested that the best thing we could do would be to go back with some comments but address those to the Board Governance Committee, which is basically Matthew and Leon and on receiving those he would use that as a mechanism to flag our concerns up at Board level. And as part of that Philippe, I know we had some conversations about particular ITU recommendations that have some bearing on ICANN.

If we go down that route then we could also include that information as well. So just to make everyone aware, what I'll do is draft some comments back with the intention of supplying it to Matthew and Leon, put it out for comment first just to raise the issues and then we can make sure that our concerns do filter up the tree.

There appears to be a disconnect on this. One of the points that was made to me was that ICANN are looking to partnership with ITU-D and to do that if you look at ITU-D there is a specific role for partners to partner on projects. And one of the things that I was pointed to was that at the last WTDC there was mention that the development sector were going to engage in capacity building and outreach that also included the Internet.

Now that's a great thing for ICANN to be part it, but they can do it through a partnership arrangement, they don't need to become a sector member which is more focused towards the study group activity. And I'd suggest there's very little at the study group level that ICANN would want to engage in. So I'll draft the comments and circulate them around and hopefully with your blessing we can go back via that route.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Any question to that, any further idea to put on that?

Philippe Fouquart: Just a follow up?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Philippe Fouquart: Philippe Fouquart. Yes just a follow up I had on this a chat with Akinori, he came up and I gave the example of (E.9-10) is something we may look into. Appreciating that it's an example of the T-sector so I said we had concerns as to what that might entail being a member of the D-sector. But that's as far as it went. I think it would be useful for us to spell that out in the document and happy to help.

Tony Holmes: Yes, I think that's a great idea if we provide examples and that clearly is a good example; we should list that and express some concern around that. And I think that's why it's - it's another preferential way to do this because if we go back via the Board Governance Committee, Matthew has assured me that he would make sure that the Board are aware of the comments we submit. The good thing about going down that route is the issue that Philippe

referred to, this particular recommendation, which refers to dotINT, it's always been something that we've been rather concerned about that ITU could launch some additional activity around that.

I would hate for us to flag it to the Board and then find that just by doing that we make people aware and think, oh this is a really good idea. Now if we go directly to the Board with comments all those comments are made available publicly; if we go through the Board Governance Committee that isn't the case. So it raises the issue without flagging it to everybody out that there's potentially a big problem with this and some people may react to it so that seems a good route.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, Malcolm, please.

Malcolm Hutty: Yes thank you. I really like this idea of going through the Board Governance Committee. It's the issue of being a member that's the issue, not with collaborating; there's no problem with ICANN collaborating with the ITU, but being a member has a different connotation. And it actually, I mean, and this isn't directed at Tony because I know you're extremely aware of this, but the only thing that would concern me more than ICANN joining the ITU D-sector would be ICANN joining the ITU T-sector.

But with that said, therefore, I think if we phrase this in a way that's actually directed quite narrowly, specifically at the scope of the Governance Committee, to say that actually they should have concerns specifically for the implications of membership of that - of an organization, and that and the obligations that might come with that, and that is specifically a governance issue and go down that route, and that would give them not only potentially be persuasive when it's received but also persuasive - more persuasive when it is passed on by them to the Board as a whole that it is within their purview.

If we were finished on this topic I have one other thing relating to that that I wanted to add?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, just let me do one comment and then follow up. Well we heard Göran saying several times or ICANN saying well that the community has been involved in the course of the discussion before and in the discussion well, of engagement of (unintelligible) engagement of ICANN. So I wonder whether that has been discussed to extent on the CCWG IG, you know, in that respect? And whether we have been represented in a proper way in the past in that and whether we should more chime in in that group in order, well, to get heard, our concerns with that.

I'm not sure about whether the ICANN is following some advice from that group so that could be a path also to influence that. Tony, please.

Tony Holmes: On that particular point, I'm the CCWG-IG list so I do monitor what's going on there. And although obviously I had the concerns before I came here, the situation was totally unclear because there were already people on that list who were asking the question, what is the status of ICANN's application to the D-sector. It was never answered. So we came here and that's where we had that debate the other day in the working group. But I'm happy to make sure I take an action to flag anything that would be of concern to the ISPs from being on the list, so I'm happy to do that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So very last points from…

Malcolm Hutty: Yes, on one last thing, also the CSG discussion with the Board. We had quite a lively discussion about how to approach that yesterday. So I wanted to place on public record my congratulations to the masterful way that Tony handled that and the success that he achieved in that. I'm not sure that everybody necessarily knows just quite the significance of what Chris said. We were expecting that Chris would come back by saying, oh this is an internal matter to sort out between you and that it's all in your own hands.

But he did not say that and he accepted that there was a problem and he also accepted that there was no route for us to solve it. Now while he did not hold out anything that would happen as a result of that, there will in time be some opportunities to make similar - stipulations, complaints, for example to ATRT and so forth, all sorts of things may come up in the future.

We now have, and Chris is somebody who speaks very carefully and does not make concessions lightly, we have on record him saying that this is an issue and that it is not within our power to do. And it will be more powerful in the future to repeat that back to something like the ATRT or some other consultation rather than say it in our own name but to say that this was what we were told. So that I think was a win and congratulations to Tony and thank you for the sensitivity in which you handled the output of our discussions.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, Malcolm. You were…

Christian Dawson: I simply wanted to second his praise of your handling of that situation; it was masterful.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much. Yes, I do hope we will have a really good follow up together with the Board on that as well. Thank you. So let's finally decide on the next ISPCP meeting or call on that. My suggestion would be I think we do it on Mondays, isn't it? Yes, so the 8th of March.

Chantelle Doerksen: You mean April?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sorry, oh yes sure, I'm sorry. This year should be - is that acceptable? Okay, so we will circulate that. So having said that - with that, thank you for the lively discussion, thank you very much for your all participation in the other meetings chiming in I think, that was very helpful and thank you very much and have a nice other days with ICANN here in Kobe and further on. Thank you. The meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

END