

**ICANN**  
**Transcription ICANN63 Barcelona**  
**GNSO – ISPCP Meeting**  
**Tuesday 23 October 2018 at 1515 CEST**

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:  
<https://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Good afternoon in of the ISPCP meeting in (unintelligible) Barcelona, sorry. And we do have microphones here, spread over the table here so there's some microphones so nobody needs a specific microphone just to speak, (unintelligible) can understand the other. We don't have loudspeakers here in the room but I do hope (unintelligible) that I could - could be understood here from - from the distance. So we have a fairly full agenda for today and I would like us, before I go through, (unintelligible) going to go through the agenda and then for statements of interest.

So we intend (unintelligible) until around 6:00 today. We have a little bit reshaping of the agenda and that may be the reason why we may take more time for some of the items than for others, which are indicated, so the times are not in shape with the items, maybe, because we reshaped the agenda (unintelligible). We will go through some updates, one update, Universal Acceptance and also (unintelligible) two updates and then we will like to dive in, into the discussion on the status of the EPDP, (what) all the constituencies involved in the item are doing and afterwards, I would like to go through the

outreach event, the outreach events - the one we had already here yesterday and planning for another one or talk about how to do that.

So we will have guests here, Chris Mondini: and some other staff members will be here, in order to discuss with them what's to be done.

So we have, from the ICANN Academy, (unintelligible) something about programs they are providing for the community, (unintelligible) (chairing skills) and also with regards to (unintelligible) programs and then we have, of course, the focus on policy developments, what's going on in (unintelligible) and so on and we'll end with some more internal related items which we will have to discuss internally in the ISPCP, for example elections, upcoming elections and our membership and (unintelligible) charter but that will consume time in the future as well.

So that is the agenda for today. From your point of view, are you okay with that, or anything, any comments on the agenda, (unintelligible).

Philippe Fouquart: I have just one very quick comment.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh, please.

Philippe Fouquart: On the Council part, I have to leave at 4:00, be back at 5:00, so you can push that ahead in the agenda, if you would (unintelligible) before 5:00, just to let you know that I...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, so between 4:00 and 5:00 you will...

Philippe Fouquart: Yes, I'll be leaving, just to let you know (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, good. Thank you for that. Good. Already asking are there any statements of interest to be disclosed (unintelligible)? One question (unintelligible).

Ozan Sahin: I'm now starting a circulation, yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: You're starting that and then circulate that, please. Yes, that would be helpful. I wonder whether we should, a little bit quickly, go through the membership here and the attendees, only because we have new faces at the table here as well and I would like to welcome them all and we'll just say your name and where you come from and what's your affiliation, that would be helpful. Is that okay?

Andres Sastre: Andres Sastre, Latin American Association of (Telcom Operators, ASIET).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes, welcome. Thank you.

Oswaldo Novoa: Oswaldo Novoa from Antel Uruguay, the telecom operator.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thank you. Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, I'm with DE-CIX and the chairman of the ISPCP.

Lars Steffen: I'm Lars Steffen, I'm with ECO (unintelligible).

Christian Dawson: Hi, I'm Chris Dawson and I'm Executive Director of the Internet Infrastructure Coalition.

Thomas Rickert: Thomas Rickert, Director Names and Numbers with (ECO Internet).

Philippe Fouquart: Philippe Fouquart, Orange, and GNSO Councilor

Olivier Muron: Olivier Muron, emeritus member.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thank you very much, a great welcome.

Alain Bidron: Alain Bidron, I'm with ETNO. (Unintelligible)

Rudi Daniel: Rudi Daniel, I am here with Calahub.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thank you.

Man 7: (Unintelligible)

Gonzalo Barajas: Gonzalo Barajas, with Telefonica.

Marie-Noemi Marques: Marie-Noemi Marques with Orange.

Jenn Taylor-Hodges: Jenn - okay, (Jenn Hodges), BT, British Telecom.

Mark McFadden: My name is Mark McFadden. I'm from the Midwest Internet Cooperative Exchange.

Save Voce: Save Voce, ICANN Staff, I'm responsible for Stakeholder Engagement in the South Pacific region. I do - made a lot of ISPs and telcos in the region so far. Glad to be here.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Great to be here, yes.

(Rene Ogantona): (Rene Ogantona), telecom (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

Malcolm Hutty: Malcolm Hutty, LINX, the London Internet Exchange.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: And the gentleman in the background.

Ajay Data: Ajay Data

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: (Unintelligible) of India?

Ajay Data: Yes, (unintelligible) of India, thank you.

Paulos Nyirenda: Paulos Nyirenda from ISP Malawi.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: There are still some chairs over here, so if you like, to join us at the tables.

Tony Harris: And I'm Tony Harris from CABSE, Argentina, Internet (Exchange).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: What's the country that your (from)?

Paulos Nyirenda: Malawi.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Malawi.

Paulos Nyirenda: Yes.

Philippe Fouquart: Sure. Someone just came in.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So thank you very much for this and yes, we go straight into the agenda.

Ozan Sahin: Wolf-Ulrich, if I may, I'd like to make an announcement before we start. So I'm Ozan from ICANN.ORG, managing the remote participation here. As Wolf-Ulrich stated, we don't have the push talk mics today, so if you will, please speak up. Otherwise, your voice will not be heard by the remote participants and because we have the polycom, it captures all the background noises as well, so when you work with the papers, it captures all the background noises. The last announcement is that for the transcript, please start by introducing yourself for the staff as it greatly saves time in working on the transcripts, so thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thanks for that, Ozan that was really helpful. And we try well, I would have, you know that during discussions, we lose track of this, these things, you know, please remind us if necessary, if somebody from the transcript is asking for that. Yes, thank you. And I invite (Ali) as well to tell you, tell us where you come from and...

(Ali Kamass): Okay, so (Ali Kamass) from (Orange) and (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay, thank you very much.

(Ali Kamass): And also something else, ICANN - ICANN protocol, I should also say I'm - I'm an ICANN Fellow.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Is that -

(Ali Kamass): I'm an ICANN Fellow at this meeting.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Fellowship program.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: You are from the Fellowship Program.

(Ali Kamass): Oh, welcome. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: We like that, because you know, (unintelligible). If you have something, questions, anything you may have, related to any ICANN, what we are doing and how we are doing, so you know, we are working here within ICANN since 20 years (so we are kind of getting) older and older and you are getting less (flexible) so you could help us as a community. Thank you.

So the first item is universal acceptance and we have two colleagues here, Christian Dawson and Lars Steffen on that team so I would like to ask to help us, to give us an update.

Christian Dawson: Yes, certainly. We have a series of slides but I have just given them to Ozan and I don't know if there is enough time to load them. If we need to go without them, we completely understand and can do so.

I would like to start by asking Ozan if it's possible to bring up the slides or do we not have enough time?

Ozan Sahin: I need just one moment to bring up the slides.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Oh, okay.

Christian Dawson: You know, it's okay, you know. I can say some introductory remarks while we bring up the slides, if that is okay. We have been working now for four years on the subject of universal acceptance through a group that many in this constituency helped develop, called the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. For anybody who is not familiar with the concept of universal acceptance, we are attempting to go out there to the software providers and the systems providers of the world and teach them that the DNS has moved beyond simple two and three character sets in ASCII format.

Now, we have complex internationalized domain names, we have long string domains and yet there are systems all across the ecosystem, all across the world, that need to be updated to accept full email addresses in other character sets or simply just with - anywhere within their software, be it a part of their sales process or something else, to make it so that any domain that is valid in the DNS also functions within the software that any individual has built.

The problem with this lofty problem is that we need to go and talk to pretty much every software developer in the world and that's a pretty big task. So one of the things this group has been working very hard on is trying to develop a system, a strategy to make as much of an impact as we can on this

wide problem so that we can eventually make it so that more systems work than not across the globe.

Just today, there was a large announcement that Microsoft's...

Lars Steffen: Exchange 2019.

Christian Dawson: Exchange 2019 is fully UA compliant. Microsoft has been one of the leaders who's been working with us very closely in this group and they've carried a number of successes forward. Internet Explorer is actually the number one browser, with a perfect score for universal acceptance, with the number two being their (unintelligible) server, which also very close to being...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Mark pushing for that?

Christian Dawson: Mark Svancarek, who is one of the cochairs of the group has been one of the people advocating very heavily for this.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Great.

Christian Dawson: There are a number of large providers who are paying close attention to this. However, there's a lot of groups that simply don't even know this problem exists. So Lars and I, we're in charge of the community outreach group. Our role has been to direct the resources that we have collectively gathered, including a PR firm and a technical marketing firm and figure out how to get our message out to the world. See how long I have to talk before we get our slides.

Ozan Sahin: I haven't received them yet.

Christian Dawson: You haven't received them yet? Okay. You know what, we'll just go ahead and push forward without our slides. Over the past four years, we started out trying to make sure that we had the right definitions in place and we had the

right guidebooks in place so that if people are interested in fixing the problem, we could define for them exactly what the problem is and give them the right guidelines on how to address the issue.

By that, we meant that we needed to settle on technological methodology and we needed to be working from the same thesaurus, which actually took a lot of effort. We have accomplished those goals. Now we're working from the same language, now we are - we have developed a number of technical guides to help people who are interested in UA work, helping them get on the path to do something about it within their own systems.

In the past year, we have taken our technical documents and we've started putting them in front of technical operators, so we created a relatively technical message that we packed up to deliver to developers, system architects, consulting, contracting firms and CIOs and we've been using the resources of Edelman, which is our PR firm and some of the technical marketing people that we've got to try and deliver that forward. Perhaps, Lars, you could talk about some of the specific initiatives and then maybe I'll take it back and talk about what's going to come next in the future.

Lars Steffen: So, (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: State your name, please.

Lars Steffen: Yes. I'm Lars.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Lars Steffen.

Lars Steffen: Lars Steffen, yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: For the transcript.

Lars Steffen: For the transcript, yes. Lars Steffen (ECO) Association. So as Christian already mentioned, so we are directing our (unintelligible) those who can direct to make it happen and who can influence to make it happened so it's the developers, CIOs and also (unintelligible) the governmental officials because we regularly encounter the discussion about what's in it for me so when you're talking to companies who become UA ready, they will tell you that they have to put money and resources into fixing this thing and to address this question, we brought in (unintelligible) as our technical marketing team to address this question but also to talk to governmental CIOs because when you talk to governments, it's more about how to do things right and not to talk so much of - talk about budget first.

So over the last year or so, we produced a number of articles and blog posts and together with Edelman and other partners to spread them in the media and associates that we are cooperating with. And in general, this year, the face to face meeting of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group in Hong King, we launched our social media strategy, so we open up the account on Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn to make it as easy as possible for everybody involved to share our content that we already created and then to spread the word in every community that you have on your own.

So in the very first beginning, we had the discussion about social media and in the very first beginning, we had no content to share. Now we are in the position to have this content, to have regular updates and so from our point of view, it made sense to start this initiative on social media as well and so far, we collaborate Edelman on this and we really have made progress and we have growing numbers of followers and also reposts and views and whatever metrics you would use for each platform.

So next to, to the coms, (EAI) working group, I think you can also see we also have a sub working group on EAI which is very active, so we are currently working on a deeper analysis of email software and services, regarding EAI, where currently research is in work and we have those collaborations with

associations in India and we have contracted with to arrange a series of roadshows and events to teach about Universal Acceptance and with them, we are try to leverage our efforts in India. India is next to China, some parts in Europe where we have also ambassadors in place at one of our very strong focus areas in the world.

So it is stakeholder engagement, I already mentioned the associations, we are also talking to analysts on a regular basis and we arrange with our chair, Ramon, interviews with analysts so that they are aware of Universal Acceptance, that it's still something we have to (promote) in the world and that they have it on their own agenda and when they have clients they can talk to or have studies, publications, that they are aware of the Universal Acceptance and also put it in their work and effort.

We are also currently working on a plan of events that we want to be involved in, 2019, and where we would like to reach out to, on the one hand, to show presence but on the other hand also for speaking slots and being involved in panel discussions. If you have ideas where we should be present, feel free to reach out to Christian, me or on the UASG mailing list and make suggestions where you think the Universal Acceptance Steering Group should be present. We have a group of ambassadors spread all over the world so it is quite easy for us nowadays to be a presence anywhere in the world to make sure that we can take the chance to be involved in those events.

We have now a huge inventory of material and documents on our website, really covering all aspects of Universal Acceptance. We will add a few more throughout the next year so there will be a quick guide on variance, there will be a quick guide on a write for that script that will be added to our inventory. We are already starting to review our document that has been produced in the very first time when the Universal Acceptance Steering Group was set up, just to make sure that also the documents now already three to three and a half years old and still up to date. So we will take those documents one by

one and review them and if necessary, also update them. And for closing remarks, I hand over to Christian.

Christian Dawson: I am - I'm just going to make one quick comment and then I'm going to turn things over to questions from the group. It has been very exciting for Lars and I, and I believe, I don't want to speak for you, but I think it's been exciting for us to work this important issue on behalf of the ISP for the past four years. We have started with the technical documentation and many of the technical outreach efforts that Lars has described have been focused on raising awareness of this very important issue but it hasn't really centered around changing hearts and minds.

We haven't gotten that messaging yet. We've gotten to creating all these documents and putting them in the places where the technical operators can see them. I think in the coming year, we're finally going to be ready to start to make some influencer marketing and to put them in front of people - sea level individuals who may be able to direct technical operators to use our guides in order to change their networks. So I think having taken this one step at a time is going to bring us to a pretty exciting place in the next year.

I wanted to see what questions existed within the constituency about our work in this area.

Mohamed Abuabed: Hello. My name is Mohamed Abuabed. I am under the Fellowship Program. I'm working in ISP but I'm representing of myself, so when I entered this meeting, I get confused bit because I couldn't get the relation between the Universal Acceptance and the ISPs and the content providers, from the understandings that I have about the ISPs. So if I'm not going to waste your time, give me, like the relation between those?

Christian Dawson: I would love to explain. Tony, actually is - you raised your hand. Would you like to describe why this is important to the ISPs?

Tony Harris: Thanks. I won't take over the whole answer, but basically, very quickly, somebody uses, tries to get to a website or send an email and that is rejected because the ISP or cell phone op - that provide this or for any reason doesn't recognize that new - that new domain extension, right, one of the new domain extensions, they're familiar with .com, .net, .org, usually. What happens is the user will immediately complain to his ISP or provider so we will get the complaints. I don't know if you want to expand on that.

Christian Dawson: That - I think that's right. This is Christian Dawson and one of the reasons why the ISPs have stepped up to really lead in this area is that in many ways, we are a global help desk and if something is functioning at the DNS level, so it should resolve properly, but for some reason, some other piece of software is preventing it from doing so, we're still going to get the calls.

Mohamed Abuabed: Perfect. So can I follow (unintelligible)? So one of my concerns during the whole day ICANN meetings is as (unintelligible), as the resolvers, as one of the - it's the keystone in the DNS ecosystem and they couldn't find any working group who addresses the problems with the resolvers. So are you handling everything related to the resolvers, because usually the resolvers is part of either the ISP or some companies like for example Google or (unintelligible) directs those resolvers. Are they - is those part of your concerns in this group?

Christian Dawson: So the answer is yes. My - it depends on your definition of handling, are you handling this? We are attempting to identify where the most common UA problems are across the Internet ecosystem and we're trying to prioritize those areas so software libraries or common scripts, specific types of software, we are trying to go, strategically target and raise awareness and point out those things and so yes, that full process is something that we're trying to take advantage of. Of course, we're not going to see every instance, unless it's reported.

One of the things that the USAG has developed is a reporting mechanism, you can go online and if there's something that you want us to try to convince software purveyors to take actions on, we can do that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: All right. Thank you for the question, Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking, so I'm - I would suggest that if you can directly get in contact here with Christian, yes, exchange name cards and business cards and so on. That would be the best way and Lars, they are the guys here, you know, we have different kinds of areas around the (UA) here, but that is helpful. Lars, last word on that and then we will go forward to the next one.

Lars Steffen: Yes, just one thing. This is Lars Steffen speaking, so on our website, we also have one document, it's called Blueprint for CIOs and in the appendix of the document you find a list of software and systems that are regularly used, especially by ISPs so that you have some kind of checklist where you can take a look at whether you are ready or not, just to give you a first (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thanks very much, I have to start to look at the - from the time here and we have as the next item, something which we should further discuss in detail with regards to EPDP discussion and formation of our ISPCP position. I wonder we'll have some time, so half an hour or so, about that to stay here, so I have put here - oh here, it just have 20 minutes, but we should take the time we need, you know, really for that, for that to be - to have a clear view on that and have a firm position on what's going on with regard to the EPDP. I know there was some discussion already on Sunday, where I didn't participate. You did also not participate in - so and that's helpful, this is to form - to coordinate from that. Thomas, please.

Thomas Rickert: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, this is Thomas Rickert for the record. Do we have any remote participants on the session?

Ozan Sahin: We currently have (unintelligible) and the other two participants in the AC room also in the room.

Thomas Rickert: Okay, great, so welcome and I will give you a little overview of where we are on the EPDP. And then I'm going to suggest some positions that the ISPs might want to assume and I think we need to make sure that we receive feedback from the remote participants as well, whether they object or agree to the suggestions that I'm going to make.

As you know, I'm one of the EPDP members who are presenting the ICPCP on that small team, and so far, I have to confess, there was not a lot of policy to be made because we were doing basic compliance work. So we had to work on narrowly defining purposes, finding the legal basis for processing activities and that took up considerable time.

So I think there would only be one item where I might have taken the policy decision. I'm going to introduce that to you a little bit later during my intervention. But there is the perception by some in the CSG, in the Commercial Stakeholder Group that the ISPs do not go along with their views and I think that's something that we need to discuss a little bit.

So as you know, the Commercial Stakeholder Group consists of three groups, with is the Intellectual Property Constituency, the Business Constituency and the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency and I think that they have distinct interests in this exercise. The BC and the IPC are particularly interested in getting access to WHOIS data by either keeping as much as possible public or where the data is not disclosed publicly, to make access to that data, make disclosure of that data as easy as possible, because they're interested in pursuing trademark infringements, they are interesting copyright infringements that might take place via a Web site that is traceable to a certain domain name.

And I think the role of the ISPs is slightly different and let me try to explain why in a moment. So there are, I guess, some disagreements and I'm speculating to a certain extent, but there are some hearsay that you know, the CSG should be following the same agenda and I think this will be difficult for us to do. There is - there are disagreements on the sequence of work as well on the substance of work. So in our EPDP charter, we have been asked to deal with a couple of so-called gating questions, the questions that need to be asked - answered first, before we get to the next set of questions that are related to access.

So the thinking is, in order to determine what data you can make available to whom, you need to establish what data you need in the first place, i.e., what do you need to - what do you collect? What is collected by the registrar? What, of that data collected by the registrar is then travelling to the registries? All that, I think, is something that you need to know in order then to establish who can get access to that data.

And this is why I have proposed that the EPDP team, given the time constraints that we're working under, parks everything related to access until we've answered the gating questions and the IPC and the BC, they wanted to make sure that we discuss the purpose for data processing, namely the collection for the purpose of disclosing the data to third parties at the outset.

I think that's, to a great extent, a waste of time because you can't really finalize the discussion of what you can collect for the purpose of disclosure, if that's at all possible, without knowing exactly what the access scenarios are, i.e., is it a disclosure request coming from law enforcement? Is it a disclosure request coming from an intellectual property attorney? Is it a disclosure coming from a consumer protection authority? Is it a disclosure request coming from (CERT) or from an IT security team, talking about a breach? Right?

So I think we need to discuss both in combination and in fact, I'm one of those who said, early in the process, we should not leave any stone unturned to find out what can be made possible in a legally confined fashion to get those - give those the data that need it. I think we all appreciate that we want secure networks, that we want to be able to efficiently fight cybercrime and other that's using the Internet in conducting crimes.

We want to make sure that the bad things on the Web can be efficiently tackled but I think we need to do it in a way that follows a certain legal methodology to come up with appropriate results. And this caused some pushback from particularly the IPC and the BC, but I stick to, and you can disagree with me, but I think that it's appropriate to discuss this all in one block but we've sort of come over that point, we've discussed something related to collection for the purpose of disclosure but that's for you to be able to put that into perspective.

The other thing is shall we discuss the Unified Access framework in parallel to the EPDP? And ICANN, as you know, has put out a paper for public comment and we don't know what ICANN's plans are with this, but we see a paper being put out by ICANN without community involvement. We see ICANN reporting on talks to European authorities about making ICANN the central authority for WHOIS, and when we asked Göran, whom we had as a guest at our - at a meeting of the EPDP what is meant by that, he was quite vague, right? So they are going to the authority, they're not really - without a clear plan of what they're trying to achieve. And becoming a central authority, and Göran also said, you know, it can't be the trademark database are public while the WHOIS is not public.

And that sort of made a lot of folks think, because trademark databases are based on applicable laws, so there is a law prescribing exactly what data needs to be collected and what data needs to be published. We don't have that law for WHOIS. For some (unintelligible) operators there, fine, but we don't have it for the gTLD work and is it actually - is ICANN going to the

commission and begging to be regulated? I mean, we've been fighting for years to get, in the (unintelligible) transition program to get ICANN out of the supervision of the US government, do we want to be controlled by the European Commission now? Not sure we want that, or by any European member state.

So I guess the only viable option for that to take place would be to write up a code of conduct, according to Article 40 of the GDPR and get that accredited, approved by the European authorities because then everyone who is operating according to the terms of the code of conduct would be safe. And ICANN could be the entity that controls and monitors whether somebody is in compliance with the code of conduct, so I think that's the way to go with all this and that would give legal certainty to the operator. Right?

And then there's this other idea that ICANN should be the sole controller for disclosing this data, so they want to - they're toying with the idea of detaching the WHOIS database from what registries and registrars have. So they are toying with the idea of being the sole party responsible for responding to disclosure requests, which has some beauty to it.

Man 15: (Unintelligible) disregard to the (unintelligible).

Thomas Rickert: Correct. So they want to - they want to shield the contracted parties from liability and say, okay, if we disclose something under the UAM, then we will be the only responsible party. And I think that, you know, everyone will agree that if that would work, it would be a great thing to have, you know, if ICANN wants to do that, they that they take the responsibility for their action.

I have serious doubts whether that will fly because in the (unintelligible), the joint controller article has been introduced to shield the data subjects from being forced to analyze, and in the complex world as we have it today, in the online environment, you know, you have one party responsible for that processing activity, Party B being the controller for another processing

activity, Party C being the controller for yet another processing activity and the user or the data subject has to find out to whom to go to exercise their rights for data to be erased or data to be rectified, stuff like that. And therefore, the lawmakers said, in these scenarios, we deem all of those to be joint controllers and be jointly and severally liable.

Now if ICANN picks out one of the processing activities and says, we want to be the sole controller for that, that looks good on paper, but I think that unless we get official blessing from the European Data Protection Board that this will work, we should caution against that because I think that in a supervisory proceeding, chances are good that an authority says you can't deprive a data subject of the right to go to multiple entities, to registries and registrars, who are jointly and severally liable.

I'm not sure whether you're familiar with the concept but if you have different parties that are liable to you, you can pick the one that's most financially viable, and if we have millions of users that want to exercise their rights, they might prefer to go to Go Daddy because they're wealthier than ICANN, than only having ICANN. So basically, we're cutting away some of the user rights, if we concentrate all the risk with ICANN.

So I think that chances are good that judges will say, well, you can put on paper what you want, but de facto, we have a joint controller situation, therefore you have to live by it. Right?

So I think what we should be doing as a group is support the notion of exploring options for a joint controller situation in ICANN, but only support it if there is an official blessing for that to be waterproof. Why am I saying this? A lot of infrastructure operators that are partners with the ISPPC do run registrar business as well or be a reseller thereof, right? So you don't want to have additional risk through the back door. So that's my quick take on the recent developments on the sole controller thing.

Then I think what we should really be fighting for is legal certainty. I've been working with the (Unintelligible) Industry Association for almost precisely 20 years now and I see a lot of parallel developments for ISPs that we now see with the registrars. So the ISPs have been confronted with data disclosure (unintelligible) for ages. Give us the data of who is behind this certain IP address, who is behind a certain website, and the ISPs have been fighting that because they said, well, we don't want to take the legal risk of being forthcoming so wherever there's a compliance way of disclosing data, it's okay. Where there is legal uncertainty, we should be fighting for legal certainty.

And it's even worse when governmental organizations are involved so let's just remember the discussions about wiretapping, about data retention, about blocking access to certain Web sites, where we had the ongoing struggle between the authorities who asked the ISPs to be their deputies and just ask on an informal basis, where the authorities didn't want to take action for this.

I mean, the perfect example, I think it was in Norway, where there was an agreement for blocking access to certain Web sites and then there was (unintelligible) so (a legitimate) Web site was blocked and then the person running the Web site went to the ISP and the ISP said, well, I'm just using this list that I get from law enforcement, you go to them. And then law enforcement says, well, we just gave you this list and you voluntarily used it so we're not doing (unintelligible) either.

That's a scenario to be avoided so I think it needs to be founded in law and (unintelligible) confined and that's what I think my mission is for the infrastructure operators, again, many of which have a double function, being the (domain) industry as well as in other parts of the Internet industry to ensure that what we're accepting is not just giving things away without a legal basis, (unintelligible) that any type of disclosure is legally solid so that we can avoid liability but everyone wants to operate in a compliant fashion.

So that's my quick take on this, if you disagree with that, with that mission, if you wish, please do speak up but I think that compliance is key. Question, please.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks, very much, Thomas. And we should discuss them and that is very helpful to have it here. On the other hand, these, taking (unintelligible) so we are mostly not lawyers (unintelligible)...

Thomas Rickert: I'm trying to use (germain) language, I might claim to do so...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (Unintelligible) or not, that (unintelligible) all these details so and we are relying on our members of the EPDP team that you and (unintelligible) give the time, but really, we are relying and we are - we also welcoming every (unintelligible) feedback, you know, that is coming from that or the team and when there are critical items, we discuss, send the feedback to all this (unintelligible), that is very helpful, so Christian, please.

Christian Dawson: So I wanted to say that as somebody who is closely keeping an eye on this, who's working on it and who is not a lawyer but used to working with lawyers, I followed about what you said and I, for the most part, agree with it but I think that it is important for us, for the remainder of the conversation, to reflect in a much more sort of abstract level, what we as ISPs are sort of looking for in our representation and I was hoping that perhaps that I could get Mark's help in making sure that I properly articulate the core of the conversation that many of us had in our closed session earlier this week, which centered around the idea that there was a core of frustration that was arising around us being accosted by our fellow CSG members saying, hey, you're not aligned with us, the IPC and BC and us saying, well, that's true.

You know, we may have a different, unique ISP-based position and having talked things through, we said, well we want to make sure that if we sort of (unintelligible) this thing out with the IPC and BC having certain things that they're attempting to accomplish, the contracted parties having certain things

that they're trying to accomplish and the non-contracted, the non-commercial parties having certain things that they want to accomplish - that it may be true that we're not aligned with them but we're also not directly lined with either of those groups and we that we have our own unique position.

Whether anybody understands the specific legal challenges that are in front of us or what we need to achieve, I think that it would be helpful for the people in the room to hear that the ISPs have an ISP position that does not directly align with any of those three groups.

Thomas Rickert: Yes, and if I may respond to that, I'm going to come up with a few examples of our work to illustrate this but I think you're spot on. For my liking, the NCSG is overreaching with some of the - so they are trying to block almost every type of access to data from third parties and they go to the court, get a court order to get that data and I think that's not - that's not sustainable.

GDPR has in it provision whereby data can be processed (unintelligible). I think disclosure to dispute resolution provide us as a framework of UDRP - no-brainer and I've supported that that can be done without any complications. Also, trademark disputes are relatively easy if they are properly substantiated, right? So they need to be narrowly framed, they need to be specific. The data disclosure event can be honored on that basis.

Man 17: Is that something that the NCSG would not support?

Thomas Rickert: I think that's something that we would support or that I would recommend we do support. It becomes more problematic when we're talking about law enforcement access but, you know, I will get back to you when we get to the access discussion with a quite granular overview of the request (unintelligible) and what the legal basis for disclosure might be. But I think that for the system to be sustainable, for ICANN to have a role in this, I mean, this is the beauty of the multi-stakeholder model that we are able to shape

that and that we come up with a regime whereby disclosure can be made possible in a reasonable fashion, right?

So ideally it can take place in an automated fashion or a semi-automated fashion, so that's something that we should be working on, so just a broad brush block of disclosure requests will not work. Also, I guess that the contracted parties have other considerations relating to their operational costs and stuff like that, which are legitimate reasons for them to put forward but that's nothing that I would make an ISP position or recommend to make an ISP position. It's not our money that they have to spend.

So again, I guess it's more or less about compliance and that there are some points, all of which are still in discussion so nothing is stable yet. We're having discussions around natural versus legal persons. So that means if you have a company registering domain names, there are some who say that data doesn't deserve any protection, it should be publicized without any limitations. For natural persons, it's the opposite. It needs to be redacted because that's under the GDPR - that would be protected.

Now, there's a gray area. If you have a company, the name of which is the name of the owner, for example, that makes the name of the legal entity personally identifiable data. Some national laws see that differently but the GDPR has that concept in it and that means if a registrar just takes all corporate data and publicizes that, they might be publicizing personally identifiable data and subject themselves to liability.

The IPC and BC say, well, they should be taking that risk because the risk is small. My take on it would be there is a risk, we should try to avoid risk and let's make that point to the authorities and get confirmation. If the authorities say that they won't sanction contracted parties if they do the categorization based on the self-identification of the registrant, then I think that we can do it. Right? But that's a point where I would try to get some confirmation from the authorities. And again, if you disagree with this, please do speak up.

Then we have a discussion about the geographic coverage of the temp spec or what might be the policy coming out of the EPDP. So there are some who say we should require the contracted parties to make a distinction between the treatment of data of customers that fall under the GDPR and those who don't. Because obviously GDPR is designed, territorially and scope-wise to protect certain customer groups while others might not be protected.

So if there is a registrant in Malaysia who only serves the local community with no bearing on European customers, with no offering made to European target groups, they might not need to be - they are not required to be (unintelligible) but the downside is that if you have registries that have a registry service provider based in the EU, even if they don't have to follow GDPR rules, their registry service provider has to. Or if they have resellers, you can't make a - you can't use the same system to serve a global reseller and since ICANN is about one world, one internet, since we're trying to keep systems interoperable, I would recommend that we support the notion that we keep one system that is globally applicable.

And it even goes further. GDPR comes along with user rights. I mentioned the right of rectification earlier. The right of erasure, all these things. So we would have two classes of registrants, one group which would be able to exercise those rights and one group which wouldn't and I think that should be avoided and therefore, my recommendation is that we keep one system that's universally applicable to all registrants around the world, to all operators around the world.

Then, I have two points left, if I may. We have questions around ICANN's mission and to what extent ICANN should be enforcing data processing to be able to enforce copyright infringements. So should it be ICANN's purpose for data processing to enable copyright infringement enforcement? That's a tough one.

I mean in the (unintelligible) transition, we reframed the bylaws and (Malcolm) will remember this, we took great care to ensure that ICANN can't do anything like content regulation. So where does supporting DNS abuse litigation end, where does content regulation start? And I think we should be pushing for a very - for ICANN only being able to support data disclosure or anything related to access within ICANN's limited mission and that's closely related to the DNS. So DNS abuse litigation is fine but everything content-related, I think we should push back against.

Last point, the - there's been a lot of talk about whether we need an admin contact and a tech contact. So far, it's required that registrant's data is collected, Admin-C data is collected, Tech-C data is collected and that (Billing-C) data is also added to the registration data. Nobody wants to keep the billing data, the billing contact, by the way. Nobody is using it, no registrant will ever look up the WHOIS to see - to check who to send an invoice to. They would use the account holder and invoice the account holder. For tech-c and admin-c, it's slightly more nuanced.

There - I think there's a consensus emerging in the EPDP team that the Admin-C data should not be mandatory, so at best, it should be optional. We're still discussing whether it should actually be optional or whether we don't need it at all. Those who want more contact points say, companies in particular, they want to have, let's say, the financial department to take care of the administrative requests, the technical department to take care of the technical requests but so far, ICANN does not specify any difference in the roles and according to information I got from registrars, they claim that in 95% of all cases, an Admin-C, Tech-C and Owner-C data is identical and if you take the principle of data minimization in the GDPR, that means, you know, you only collect data that you need to have.

If data can all be the same, if there is no difference in the roles of the content, if it's actually mostly duplicate data, then how can you justify collecting these additional data? So therefore, I think we should - unless we come up with a

good reason to be for these additional contact points, we should support not collecting them.

For the Tech-C, I think it's slightly different, so James Bladel from GoDaddy actually suggested that we - that an email address and the phone number for a tech contact should be collected, the BC then requested that the physical address should also be collected so that contact can be made, in case the registrant data is corrupted. My question would be, if there's something wrong with the domain name, most folks would go to the registrant and the abuse point of contact with the registrar or the support of the registrant and say well, there's something wrong with your customer's domain name and then the registrar would reach out to the account holder, in most cases.

So I think that unless our group comes up with a good rationale for an additional contact point for the tech contact, that's not needed either. I think (Nic Atit) (unintelligible) just illustrated, they said well, there are cases where we need quicker responses and a different type of expertise and this is why we're still asking for the tech contact and I think if you do that, actually give it the special role (unintelligible) attached to it, then I think you can justify collecting the Tech-C data, if you (unintelligible)...

Thomas Rickert: That's a good policy if we get a good rationale, which I'm going to share with you, (unintelligible) support the collection of an additional Tech-C or the Admin-C, I think we should not endorse collecting additional data points. So I hope I haven't frustrated you with all that (unintelligible). You have a question?

Man 18: Yes, (unintelligible) what would it mean that ICANN is - has not (unintelligible) due to (unintelligible), that that data would be accessible for any issue related to the (unintelligible)?

Thomas Rickert: So, that's an excellent question. From my legal perspective (unintelligible) under GDPR to pursue the (unintelligible). Data can be disclosed

(unintelligible) copyright infringement. The question, however, is, should that, say that the relationship (unintelligible) or ICANN make it mandatory for the contracted parties to help enforce copyright infringements and that's, I guess, where the difficulty lies. You know, I think you can make it work legally. The question is should ICANN endorse that or would that be a breach of ICANN's limited mission, to help with copyright infringement.

And there are some and this is also being said by the GAC representatives, they said we want the DNS to be safe so copyright infringement, malware and everything makes the whole place slightly more unsafe and therefore everything is within ICANN's (unintelligible) and I think that - I think that would hold water if ever legally contested.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thank you. Well, maybe some additional questions as far as (unintelligible). We have to, a little bit, to wrap it up, also. At least we got to the main questions you had from the beginning, Thomas. You know, we were asking so what I understood is there are two things. The one is which you were recommending our side to support is that there is (worth exploring) that ICANN could be a sole - in some circumstances - sole controller, with regard to UAM and then the other thing is the - which I took also, is under the assumption that the European Data Protection Authorities would agree to such a model, an ICANN model.

So that means it's a kind of precondition for you that - and you could agree, that would mean they have to put a stamp on it or (unintelligible) so could you focus on that and could, if your questions are related also to these things, add something to that question? For example, (unintelligible). Just think about that, come back to that, to these points and let all the others just quickly ask their questions. Mark and (unintelligible). Okay, Mark. Okay.

Mark McFadden: I think this is too bad, because we're not going to have a conversation about this?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes, sure. Yes, sure.

Mark McFadden: I mean, first of all, from my point of view, and this was certainly true on Sunday, I thought we had agreement in the room, there is no ISPCP position here, right? We don't have a position and I think that's very important, right? We're not allied with the contracted parties, we're not allied with the BC or the IPC, we're not allied with the privacy (unintelligible), in fact, we think that there are interesting things about each of their positions, right, but we have no agreed consensus position in our constituency.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Right.

Mark McFadden: That's the just the first thing that I think is really important. Another thing I think is really important is that the issues we bring up are grounded by principles that you think are important to - for the EPDP to hold true to, right? And I think that what would be really helpful is that you would bring those proposed principles to the mailing list, so there could be a discussion about them. That way, you could get guidance, sort of like the last thing that you were talking about, about what contacts should be recorded, right? I think that's an important conversation to have. I think the mission - the mission issue is an important conversation to have.

Unfortunately, we apparently don't have time, right? And so what I'm frustrated by, and I am, by the way, for the record, Mark McFadden, frustrated, future emeritus member of the constituency, what I'm frustrated by is that you bring those principles to us, right, in kind of a tsunami of information and we don't have a way to - we don't have a chance to react.

So my proposal is, is that for those principles, for those questions you were asking, you wouldn't - you started with the words, "I think we should support," right, and then you said something. I think those should be brought to the mailing list so that you can get guidance. One of the things we talked about on Sunday is that Christian and I, and other people in the room, had a

conversation about well, how do we give you guidance? What guidance do we give you as our representative and I think there's a little bit of a difference of opinion but I would say that there's 90% agreement here, right?

But on those specific things that you're bringing up to the table to day, I think it would be even better for us if you could, in a short, relatively pithy way, bring those to the mailing list and say, even if you have a recommendation for us. That's cool, but let us have the discussion so that we can give you guidance.

So I think that's very important. The two things that are crucial to me are first of all, as a constituency, we don't have a position, that and when people come to us and they're frustrated with us as a constituency because we're not backing them, frankly, as a member of the constituency, I don't care, right? That doesn't really matter to me very much. It matters to me what the constituency thinks.

And then the second thing is I think you're bringing concrete, substantial issues to the table, right? But we're not having a chance to talk about them. So the only place for the constituency to do that work is on the mailing list. So what I would hope, what I would ask you to do and this is just one person, what I would ask you to do is those principles that you've laid out, I think for these reasons we should support this action, I think you should bring those to the mailing list.

Thomas Rickert: And you're right. And I get that, you know, in terms of timing, you know, the last point that I mentioned on the Admin-C, Tech-C, that discussion was held on last Friday and Sunday, you know, so the group has only the last couple of days come to relatively stable and firm resolves and I guess it's up to you - I can certainly more or less give you feedback on a daily or by two-day or 48-hour basis but I thought that it would be better use of everyone's time to see how the discussion in the team evolve and then send you the relatively stable things and that's what others do as well.

They say, well, I have to take this back to my group and I said, well, we're going to meet on Tuesday so I will take this back to you. We now have the - have a couple of workbooks, as we call them, in draft format, so you will get those and then I think we should take a look at it. But I can - I can give you more information than you - love to.

Mark McFadden: No, and that's good and I guess my feedback for you is that part of your 20 minutes there that you just did, you asked questions and you made proposals. You said, there's this question about the contacts, right, and I - and you ended with I think we should support blah, right? Well, and I hope what you're observing here is we're not having a chance to talk with you about that. Right? So the only way the constituency can come to you and say, we think you should support this proposal is by having that discussion on the mailing list because it's clearly not happening here.

And there wouldn't be time on the monthly one hour conference call either, unless the chair thinks or if there was support for perhaps a separate, a separate supplementary call that just dealt with these issues, right? I mean, that's a possibility but that's really my feedback, is that the underlying principle here is that as a constituency, we don't have a position at this point, an agreed position and I think it would be really, really helpful to have the issues that you've brought up further discussed by the interested parties in the constituency.

Thomas Rickert: Sure, no, I - I'll send you the workbook that we have, I mean, you have to understand, in the first couple of weeks, if not months, we've done basic groundwork, so there were not a lot of resolves so it's in the last couple of days after the Los Angeles meeting that we're getting relatively stable things that are worth sharing.

Mark McFadden: No and I completely - trust me, Thomas, I completely understand because I hear that report from other people, not just from you. And so I appreciate your

continued energy on this and it's - it's positive to hear that you feel like there's some substantive things starting to happen, right? That gives me some hope and optimism and Christian can tell you that on Sunday, I was not Mr. Optimism. Right? So I won't take any further time here except to make those suggestions to Thomas.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much, Mark. Well, it's shed some light on the situation that we have here and we have these members, you know, they are very close to the issues themselves so they (unintelligible), they're discussing that, they come back, say feedback on the list or (unintelligible) to some extent, you know, and not everybody in our world can be as much informed as they are about that so this is one thing. So there's - some trust is needed.

That's all, that's one part here on that, with what they are doing, so we get a lot of feedback from others, from other constituencies, from, you know, I get more negative feedback than you, maybe, from others sometimes, they are hammering on me and to find other way - the best is to be as transparent as possible and to be informative as possible and I think this message came over well, Thomas, in order so that we can do our best to keep all members of (unintelligible) what's going on and then you can see, what Thomas was saying, so then the sessions are, the things are moved ahead, you know, and (unintelligible) and there's, something has been refined in the in-between and he's asking about - okay. So that's taken, that's taken.

I do hope I can also help the situation, though, by keeping a close contact to Thomas and also to inform you about (unintelligible). Thank you.

Mark McFadden: And your first question, I do support ICANN's exploration and I hope that's the right word, explanation of preparing a package, a hypothetical package as we heard it called in the (Board/CSG) meeting. That hypothetical package that they could take and see whether or not that would work. I think that exploration, in parallel with the EPDP but what I'm hoping there and one of

the principles that I think is important to us, is that none of that exploration work should affect or derail in any way the EPDP work.

Thomas Rickert: Okay. Yes, correct. Thanks.

Mark McFadden: Good.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Are there other questions with regards to that? So going through with Thomas?

Tony Harris: I just want to thank you, you clarified a lot of things with your explanations (unintelligible) and I feel comfortable with that and particularly, I would ask you when you think - when you are (unintelligible) towards (unintelligible) position, saying I think, you know, I recommend this would be the best way to go, that always at the base of that would be the consideration of how that would impact the business of ISPs and connectivity providers, that above any other consideration, if possible.

Thomas Rickert: Sure. Okay. Thanks so much for your time.

Tony Harris: Thank you.

Thomas Rickert: I need to run, I have a meeting with somebody from the European Commission, hopefully I find out more information that I can share with you. Thanks very much.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes, thanks very much, for joining, Thomas. So I have to take care about the schedule, time schedule because we have two guests here waiting for their presentation. First one is Jia-Rong? It's your name? Yes. Okay, so he's from - from (GSE together with Chris,) so you are going to introduce and tell us here.

Jia-Rong Low: Well, we're mostly here to listen, I think.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: We would like to use that time at first, for a - not for (the outreach conducted) yesterday. Looking ahead to two outreach events, potential. Of course, time is limited as well and we can do that and let Sandra chime in before she has to leave and (an internal discussion) later on about the (wrap-up) yesterday. So I would suggest that you start in with (introductions) so we do that and yes. Please. Go ahead, introduce yourself, please.

Chris Mondini: Introduce yourself. The main thing is for you all to know Jia-Rong.

Jia Rong Low: Well, thanks for having me and I'm Jia-Rong. I'm the Vice President for Asia and for the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team and I'm also the Managing Director for the ICANN (regional office). So we are going to go to Kobe for the ICANN meeting next year and I know you want to some kind of outreach event then, so I'm really here to help. So if you've got any kind of plans in any way, if you need any contacts, (Tokashi) here, she's going to be the key contact here with the Japan (ISP) Association so you are already in good hands and I thought I would be here to provide any support in your discussion about your plans, I would like to be plugged in and I would like to support you as much as I can. So I thought to just come here and let you know who I am and that we can work closely together the next few months.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you very much for that, for the introduction to yourselves. So what we have done so far, in the past, to give you an impression on that is - Wolf-Ulrich Knoben speaking - so we had outreach events in the past (unintelligible) here in Barcelona as well. I wonder whether you could follow yesterday's event? I'm not sure about that and so, it is, you know, the main reason is, why we are doing that is to raise awareness throughout the community of what we are doing, what ISPs are impacted by, the DNS environment and the technologies related to that and the operation related to it and that's why we are using the ICANN meetings.

It turned out that it's a good platform to do so in order well to present ourselves and to accompany that with a, I would say, really a professional set of presentations, panels and so on in order to make people aware. We also use other events in the - from the (unintelligible) for example, I think we have been at all three, in Africa and just to some events so where people went to and also presented our constituency.

So we - in order to do so, we rely on support and we are happy to have ICANN (unintelligible) department on the one hand here who has supported us in the past and unto today, that's really great. And we have also other supporters here, for Barcelona it was Telefonica itself supporting us and that is very helpful, that's what we need.

We had - we did that annually, using the big ICANN event annually, general meeting. We did not do that in between, not yet, but it doesn't matter. So if it's a place where it's worthwhile, well, for example people living in that region and being close to us see and would encourage us, let's start and think about how we can promote this, then we are with you and would like to start a discussion on that.

So we did not have, we don't have at the time being, any plan with regards to Kobe, so if, well, you make us enthusiastic about that, yes, so we will also put in a lot of work well to make that happen and so we are open to that. So I would like to open the floor and then for comments, for questions and ideas and whatever, please, Tony Harris. To yourself, please, Tony, introduce yourself.

Tony Harris: Hello, I'm Tony Harris from CABESE, Argentina, the (unintelligible) executive committee. I - in my mindset, I have a benchmark for our events, which was Hyderabad. Basically, all events have been good but Hyderabad had an additional ingredient which you may be able - excuse me - you may be able to replicate in your case. The additional ingredient was that the, let's say the ISP community, through their organizations, the CCAO and the ISP of India

Association, took it upon themselves in combination with the ICANN Regional Manager for India, I forget his name.

Tony Harris: They did a fantastic job in bringing their constituents to this event. So we had that additional value. The other two events we had were good, Abu Dhabi and here, but there was a majority of ICANN regulars present whereas in India, we had 120 people and 100 of them were people we'd never seen before, involved in our industry. I thought that was absolutely, it blew my mind way. It was - and the enthusiasm they had and everything and we've had a lot of feedback from them since.

So if we could possibly get that additional ingredient repeated, in the case of Japan, where the constituents of the, the Japan (unintelligible) and any other association of that nature, might bring their constituents to this event, I think that's a - that adds a spice that makes it complete.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, Jia Rong, please.

Jia Rong Low: So as we mentioned, so Sandra, when we were in Hyderabad, Sandra is a member of my team, so I've been closely overseeing that activity in Hyderabad. So I'm glad everyone enjoyed it and I'm hoping that for Japan we could try to come up with something of a similar nature. So in fact, I was just in Japan a couple of weeks back and I headed a Japan ISP meeting. It's - the association is JAIPA, I don't know why it's JAIPA. So it has over 100 ISPs who are members and they are also exploring holding a JAIPA meeting alongside ICANN meeting, so we could have that additional ingredient, with the local ISP association to do that and (Unintelligible) she is actually a member of JAIPA, so it's a (unintelligible) as well. So we can explore here as a group whether we think we want to do something along those lines and as a Kobe lead team, reach out to the Japan ISP.

And the Japan ISP's profile is quite varied. They have very, very large ISPs as we know and also very small ones in the rural areas and I heard that they

are there and they exist because there are simply no engineers who could do networking and they happened to be there so they still exist and provide until today. So we have a very broad group in Japan and all of that group, I think, within - perhaps was not a (unintelligible) point, we should think about what are some content that they would be interested in that would mix within this group as well and from finding common content that would be interesting but then we can decide how we want to go about this, so that's a suggestion.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Okay, thank you very much. I think that's very helpful and encouraging, I think so and so let's just think about, briefly, so how we could, you know, come to a firm position on that. We need to, to have that, so we'll have later on a discussion on outreach events and then usually it comes that we will have, after this meeting, the first call for the monthly call, that we have, and then we invite (Chris Solver) and we would invite you or - for this call and well, (unintelligible) ideas how we can fix it and whether we are convinced to do so and ready to move forward.

And if it turns out well from the organization part as well as from the content part, you know, which is very important, well, what to do there, that we can do that, then we will go ahead.

Chris Mondini: This is Chris Mondini:. We have a body of content now, not just from yesterday's events but also the prior events. So if we could ask our friends and colleagues in the community in Japan to look at that now, from a Japan ISP market perspective and tell us if any of it is interesting, then already we would know if we have something interesting. Because I agree with (unintelligible), we should start with the content and in fact, this may drive up even more that they should co-locate their event, because we'll have world experts on some of these topics in Kobe.

So that, I agree with starting with the content and if we could quickly, even before the next call, we have recordings, I'm picking them up this afternoon,

but we also have even the slide shows so you could even start showing our Japanese colleagues and counterparts and asking is it (unintelligible).

The second thing is but and even get some initial feedback would be helpful. The second thing is the deadlines for making decisions are very accelerated, so if, as you know already, we're having an event, here we no space to have it here (unintelligible) Telefonica space. But (unintelligible) it's not only a similar situation in Kobe but also the deadlines for what space there is, to reserve it (unintelligible) are already in early December. So I would say the next month is really key to have at least a skeleton of an outline or the decision to go forward or not.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. I think that...

Chris Mondini: So and even you, your constituency has the contacts as well and if you're with Jia Rong and his parallel path, he was just there, visiting with the ISPs, too. We might do a similar (event).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: We have changed contacts here. Thank you very much for that, very encouraging. Thank you very much for coming here and we will stay in contact, yes?

Jia Rong Low: Okay. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you.

Jia Rong Low: Thanks a lot.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So I would now like to invite Sandra for the chairing and then I think the (unintelligible) as well, yes?

Christian Dawson: Ulrich, one question about this (unintelligible)

Christian Dawson: ...meeting before we move on about the outreach (unintelligible)

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: A problem?

Christian Dawson: When can we decide as a constituency what are next steps with the contacts we have gathered this week should be and who is responsible for moving those forward?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I wanted to come back to the - from yesterday, you know, because of - but because of - oh, thank you. So it's the timing, so Sandra has to leave, so I would like to talk to, let her go at first and then we come back.

Sandra Hofericheter: So thank you very much for inviting me, I would like to promote two programs that...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: If you could like to, could introduce yourself...

Sandra Hofericheter: Oh, I'm sorry.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...first and then we have - also for the transcript, you know.

Sandra Hofericheter: Yes, Sandra Hofericheter, I'm connected to the At Large Community of Europe, to EURALO and I was six years sitting in the (ALAC) and for the past two years, together with (Alain) in the Nom Com and my day job is organizing the European IGF, the EuroDIG and the European Summer School of Internet Governance so I'm looking very much into capacity building.

Here at ICANN, I also founded the ICANN Academy Working Group a couple of years ago and we developed meanwhile three programs and two of those programs I would like to introduce you and invite you to participate in those. The first one is the Leadership Program and Anthony Harris just left but he, for instance, was one of the participants we had in the past and Leadership

Program is a two days program taking place two days before the Kobe meeting.

You can meet the leaders of the other constituencies, you can improve your chairing skills and your mediation skills and be working together with external facilitators and some members of the community that build a program which is a good balance between ICANN issues, discussing the hot topics, discussing with the board, learning about how the other communities are functioning, what are their dirty secrets, so you have the opportunity to build a network with the other leaders that are going into their terms.

And believe me, it's not only program for newcomers, it's really also a program for ICANN veterans, because what we heard from them is that it was really enlightening to learn about the other communities, how they are functioning, why they are deciding in the way they are, which seems sometimes strange for someone from the outside and on the other hand, you have the opportunity to also improve mediation skills, chairing skills, et cetera.

This program takes place, as I said already, two days before the Kobe meeting. If you would be interesting in participating in that one, please liaise within your group and with your chair. We have one seat for each stakeholder group so one of you could participate in that one and as I said already, Anthony Harris participated a couple of years ago. He might give you some more insight about why it might be worth participating in that one. You should need or you should have travel support because this program does not allow for additional travel time but it will cover the additional hotel night for the Kobe meeting, that is two days before, on Thursday and on Friday.

I leave a couple of those flyers here, there is a registration period until 8th of November so if someone from your group wants to go, you should decide rather quickly and then register on the ICANNWiki, it's all mentioned on that card, until 8th of October (sic).

And then the second program is one program that came out of the feedback that we got from participants from the Leadership Program, which is the Chairing Skills Program. It was mentioned many times that the success of an ICANN meeting or the success how a group can proceed within ICANN very much depends on the skills of the chair. If the chairs are not really doing a good job or if he or she has problems, then this might really annoy the community and bring this to nowhere. So we just developed, also together with the people, the external facilitator that we developed the Leadership Program, a dedicated Chairing Skills program. This will also take place around Kobe, but we will start already with a call, with an introductory call before Kobe, then we will have meetings during Kobe and even later on. And here we need two types of people that can sign up.

First, if you are a chair and I'm not only talking about a chair of a constituency, also a chair of a working group, and if you would think I might take that training, I would like to improve on a peer to peer basis with other mates from the community, then please sign up as a chair. You will get assigned a coach, the coach is actually the next opportunity to register as and you will have the opportunity to get feedback on your chairing skills and those would be telephonic chairing skills as well as face to face chairing skills because there are differences if you have an online meeting or a face to face meeting.

And if you say, okay, I'm not a chair but I was a chair and I could actually give feedback on someone who is chairing, how to do better, then I would invite you to sign up as a coach. This might a time implication or a time commitment of I would say seven hours, not more. You will have an introductory call before the Kobe meeting where we give you some guidelines on how to do a coaching, how to give feedback and things like that.

Then we will have face to face meetings during Kobe, one or two and then, of course, you have to find some time where you observe the chair and this

might be a chair from another community, you might get in contact with a GAC chair or with an ALAC chair or whatever, it's also fosters a little bit of understanding for each other, for the community because that's one of the ideas of the ICANN Academy Working Group to horizontally connect the ICANN community.

Sandra Hofericheter: And it is also possible, for instance, for the telephonic part, to listen to the recording, so if you have problems with the time zones and all these things, (Unintelligible), for instance, he's also an ICANN veteran. He was one of the coaches last year, he worked together with a lady from Africa, I think, they were very active and they had a good relationship and he was just listening to the recording and it made it easier for him to do this time commitment because scheduling could be a difficulty.

So I repeat, for the chairs, there is not much time commitment because you are chairing anyway, you just get - have to dedicate some time to get feedback and participate in joint feedback meetings and for the coach, it might be like seven hours, which is really not much. The beauty of this program is that really the community is helping, we are helping along each other, it's a really peer to peer program where an experienced ICANN chair or former ICANN chair can really help a new chair to elaborate a little bit further and get on to speed and help this community to work better.

I will leave here flyers for this as well, here the registration period is a little bit later, it is 21st of December, so there's also the link to the ICANNWiki where you can find more detailed information but also, if you have a question, I have some time to answer some questions now or you also find my email address on these flyers and can reach out to me directly because that was, I think, quite a lot of information now.

Chris Mondini: May I make a comment?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, please. Chris.

Chris Mondini: So I want to just, as somebody who was in the early days working with Sandra and others on these, it's Chris Mondini: again, I want to just reiterate three points. These are - sometimes people think, oh, I'm already very senior in my organization and in my constituency, on my committee, I don't need this. But everybody benefits from it and the reviews are very good and it has really effective results and the experience that you bring into the course makes the course better.

The second thing is, you know, ICANN, it's a lot of work, it's a lot of time, it's a lot of time away from other things that you do in your life, but finally, here is an opportunity to get some skills that really also help you in other things you do, whether it's your professional job, your community endeavors, (unintelligible) family members, like all of these skills of driving consensus or dealing with difficult debates or understanding the complex issues in a multi-stakeholders way, these are all really valuable skills in the real world.

And then thirdly, also Sandra mentioned, over time, as more people participate in these programs within ICANN, I believe and I actually believe I've observed, that the community also learns to work better together. So all of these strategic things we heard about in the opening remarks, for example of Cherine, saying how can we assure that the model continues to provide results, being in these small group learning peer-to-peer exercises with something that's not a contentious policy issue, it's about helping each learning new issue, helps build this community that helps the work that the community (does) in my view.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. Thank you for that.

Ajay Data: I have a question.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, please. I'm sorry.

Ajay Data: Are you sure that three hours and seven hours for chairs and seven hours for coaches? This hours are spent during the entire ICANN? Or one day duration (as a requirement).

Sandra Hofericheter: That's a very good question. I said three hours for the chairs because if you are a chair, you are chairing anyway, that's not an additional time commitment. And for the coach, it would be like seven hour and this was in a timeframe of two or three months.

Ajay Data: Okay, and - just a quick note for all of us, that what kind of (unintelligible) there to go for this kind of program?

Sandra Hofericheter: Well, if you would like to take the training as a chair, you must be a chair, a chair of a constituency or working group, otherwise it wouldn't work. If you would like to be a coach, you - there are some criteria (written here) you must effectively communicate and understand English without using translation tools, you must have secured travel support for ICANN 64, you must be able to dedicate the time and preferably have experience as a chair within ICANN. That's all the criteria for the chair, basically.

And for the Leadership Program, as I said, one per stakeholder group, so one seat for you group. You decide among yourselves if it's going to be the chair or if it's an incoming leader that's new or if it's someone who is experienced and could contribute to that program from his experience, but also (unintelligible), I mean, and Anthony is back in the room now. I mentioned that he was there. I think you will appreciate it, even if you are really an ICANN veteran and being there from the very early days, you participated in the Leadership Program in Los Angeles in 2014 and he is probably one that could speak from this point of view, not being a newcomer and profiting from the program.

Philippe Fouquart: I did it last year and it was very useful.

Philippe Fouquart: The problem is (unintelligible) is that you would - I think it would also be helpful, that's not what I'm suggesting but to take it again and to retrospectively (sic), to consider whether the way you work within ICANN has changed over the years because of that. And I would certainly agree that it's helpful anyway, even if you have like a ten-year background of ICANN, you'd be learning things (I certainly agree).

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay, Mark, another question and then Tony.

Mark McFadden: Thanks. Just really quickly, two things. First of all, in our constituency's comments on strategic plans, we've - every time we've had a comment on the strategic plan, we've identified capacity building as a significant requirement for the entire organization so I really welcome this and I think this is a wonderful program, so much so that that my second point is going to be either an offer to you or an offer to someone - it's great that you have these flyers, it's wonderful that they came and talked to us.

But another way to get in touch with our members is through our mailing list and so I'm hoping that one of the two with you, it doesn't matter to me, I'm happy to work with you or through Chantelle, who is our Secretariat onto the mailing list, especially since the timelines are short. So while it's wonderful that you've come, I think it's also important to reach out to the entire community of people who are in the constituency, that will get a broader range of possible candidates and so, like I said, I would offer to be the conduit or if we can work through Chantelle, that would be great as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thank you. Tony.

Tony Harris: Yes, I would definitely build up on what Sandra was saying. I did participate in that program, I thought it was very, very useful and actually I'll admit, I've used it in my - outside of ICANN also. It does give you - it does add some skills for what you have to encounter when you're leading a group or

coordinating some committee or whatever. Basically, it also - it teaches you to listen more than speak so much, which is pretty good.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Wolf-Ulrich speaking, so just to that point, in addition, I think that is for many, it's harder - when you are in office, you know, and you go to do an ICANN meeting, well, it's hard to spend on the time there and if you put on top two other days, it may be even harder to go there. Still, but an argument internally for you is well, what Tony has said now, it's also helping you in your own office, in your own business, you get it for nothing, let me say. Otherwise you'd have to be sent to seminars or (unintelligible) advance in your business and all these kind of things. So that's an argument for you as well, internally.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thank you, Sandra, thank you very much. Very helpful.

Sandra Hofericheter: I will follow up on the mailing list like you suggest. I leave those here with you and feel free to contact me, my email address is on the (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thank you very much, thank you very much. I wonder, right now, we have 5:00. I wonder whether we should have a short break of ten minutes. Is that possible?

Chris Mondini: I have to leave...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: You have to leave.

Chris Mondini: ..in 15 minutes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So okay, let's do the following, so let's you will speak the next 10 to 15 minutes for the wrap up of the yesterday's meeting and the questions related to that and then have a short break, yes, of ten minutes, yes? Okay.

Chris Mondini: Do you want me to just give you some statistics?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes, that would be great, so Chris, if you would (unintelligible)

Chris Mondini: This is Chris Mondini: again. I'll try to get it short so people are not flagging their break. So many of you were there yesterday. At the end of the day, we had 132 people who registered. It turns out about 100 of those actually showed up and signed in at some point but also what that means is you as a constituency now have 130 contacts and more than half of them agreed to be contacted again. And we have that all very segregated.

I learned that it's very important for us for the GDPR compliance is that in the invitation process and in the registration process and in the communication process, as long as we are always very diligent about saying it is the joint ICANN and ISPCP event, then we're okay with what we do with the data, in case you're interested.

I counted 47 different countries in the registration list, in the audience. It cost, from the Business Engagement budget, a little bit more than what I'm usually able to support, so it was just around 3,000 euro, 2,900 euro, more or less. And the space, of course, was dedicated by Telefonica, which was worth much more than that, but the money paid for the food, the recording, which we have now.

So we have a recording and we have all of the presentations. The presentations are already on your website, the recording I'm picking up at Telefonica after this. I'm going to give it to ICANN Communications Team to tell us what they can do with it and that's a question for you, if you're keeping questions, once we know the format it's in, will be what you'd like to do with those recordings. You could create a course, online course on the online platform, for example. You could put it on your website, you can use it for training or recruitment.

We didn't have a photographer, unfortunately theirs was not available. One, I got one feedback which was that the panels were very geographically diverse

but we did not have (gender diversity). We know it is a perennial issue. And I would say, again, we were very lucky that Telefonica provided us some very good, on-site support but we should really look very carefully in the future at the division of labor between the staff, Chantelle and I and the others (Ozan, and others) and others who help and also your constituency.

So that is one feedback from me is at the beginning, we should really be clear about - sometimes it ends up ending up like we didn't plan very well for the amount of work it took. So maybe that and starting early to have a very small steering committee instead of the whole ball and maybe relying on the moderators more and even having somebody bring an extra person to help drive. So that's me, really selfishly as ICANN staff.

So the questions really are, I think, what to do next. What do you want to do with the content, what would you like to do with the recording. We've already talked about how you'll brainstorm about Kobe in Japan. I think one of the, again, this is editorializing, I think one of the successes of yesterday was that the content was compelling. It was very varied but I feel like - and it was organized in a way that wasn't necessarily the most - you know, it didn't always hang together but there was something in there that somebody found interesting at each point of the day.

So in that sense, I feel like we were a little bit lucky but I found it raised awareness of the issues and I felt that it was helpful to people attending and Tony Harris has made the point, we didn't have the local ISP community so much, but we may be able to (unintelligible). So I'll stop there and it's up to you guys to sort of talk about what you'd like to do and how you guys thought it went.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes and thank you again, Chris, for the effort and I know, you know, what - a lot of broad issues behind it all to get that (running) and every item was there, from the organization's point of view. So this is a point I take seriously so how we can improve in these respects so as we are so - well, let me just

say, from location-wise, so diverse as well, you know, so how can the - can we organize it in a better way in future or share the work, well, maybe we can form some (temperature) or and you know, to make that easier and allocate it to specific persons or a kind of steering committee.

I have to add - well, I have to - yesterday, because the idea was before us before, whether we could or may join with the Tech Day people, so I had a talk Eberhard yesterday, you know, with the tech day from the CCNSO. They are running tech days every ICANN meeting so - which takes one day in four slices, I think, so they have a different approach, as we have, so it's a little bit more organized because they have (unintelligible) from 15 years or so, to doing so.

The only - the question is whether it fits, content-wise, together, that's one of the major questions. The organizational points are not that critical, I would say so we ended up that he's going to put me on his list, so to get informed how they are dealing with that, how they're working on this to get it done, yes. So and to have an exchange on that so and then we can internally start also to discuss, depending on the content we have that could fit to them. It shouldn't be just something which, let me say, is of advantage to one half of the entire cake and so we should find, if we go that way, well, to join once, not the next time because that's too early. And then we should be really clear about that we could have a balance. Mark? And then Christian.

Mark McFadden: This is Mark McFadden for the record. You brought up tons of things so let me see if I can get through them quickly. I don't have much enthusiasm for joining with CCNSO tech day. I think that our outreach event has a different purpose than what tech day has and it has a different motivation and so we would always be in conflict with the content and so forth, so I don't have much enthusiasm for that prospect at all.

A second thing, to deal with your selfish request, which I'm very sensitive to, one of the things that would be helpful to get from the engagement team is

something that you've learned and that is what tasks need to get done a week before the event? What tasks need to get done on the day of the event? And all it would have to be is a bulleted list because if we had that list and parsing that out among, for instance, people from the constituency, people from staff, that would be helpful. And I think such a list, if other constituencies decided to do outreach of this type, could be given to them as a sort of learning vehicle, right? And I would be, as a member of the constituency, I would be very, very interested in sort of long term planning to get those so that you have - so that the engagement team has confidence that all the bullets are getting accounted for.

I think, I do think that having a small team dedicated, that has separate calls, that it was dedicated to actually building the content and doing the organization, I thought that was extremely effective. I'm looking down the table to my colleague, Ajay, but one of the things that happened on those calls was we got a lot of very, very constructive new ideas, right in the middle of the planning process that we incorporated in the final event. I thought that was an extremely effective way to make sure that outreach happened again.

I think for Kobe, what I would suggest is that we do that - I thought that was successful. I think we should do that again and get immediate and direct participation, not only from the engagement team but for our partners who are going to be there on the ground as well and as early as we can get started, the better.

I have - one of the things that we did for Hyderabad that we did not do for Abu Dhabi and we did not do in Barcelona, is we did not put anything in the hands of the people who came. There was no printed materials and so one of the things that Wolf-Ulrich had to do was rely on his slide to show the email addresses and the Web sites and I think, if there's budget for this, if we can make this happen, having a small printed something that we give to participants is something that I wish we had yesterday and I hope that we have for Japan. It's something that, again, I would volunteer to help with. It's

something that I did for Hyderabad. It's not onerous, I don't think it's onerous anyway, because what happens is members of the constituency contribute to it, so being the editor wasn't a big, onerous task for me.

And again, I think, I know I've don't this privately but I think it's very important for the constituency to thank you and the engagement team and Telefonica also, very, very much for their contributions to yesterday's success because on the last coordinating call that we had, I sensed less optimism than I felt yesterday. Walking into the room, seeing all those people, the initial conversation between (unintelligible) was excellent. I think it was a great way to start the engagement. I thought it was a very successful even and I think whatever we can do as a constituency to build on the lessons we learned for this time, I think will be excellent, it will be great.

Chris Mondini: We did hand - this is Chris Mondini: - those - you have the ISPCP one-pagers and we were handing those out when people checked in. So I don't know if we - or at what point we ran out so some people went away with something in their hand.

Mark McFadden: With something. Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thanks very much. Tony? Nothing? Okay.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Harris: Oh, it wasn't me, it was Christian.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Anyway, so sorry. Sorry.

Tony Harris: Just congratulations to staff and to Telefonica. I thought it was a great event.

Christian Dawson: I will build up on what Mark said and say that we - I saw, during this, the gear up for this event, which I thought went wonderfully, more energy from our

community than I've seen in prior events. The people - there were so many people on these coordinating calls, so many good ideas being thrown out and that energy can just be better focused and harnessed. We are ready to have people step up and take specific tasks, but not being event coordinators, we sort of need to lay out a very clear set of roles and responsibilities going out and a very clear set of objectives that we come to together as a small group that is going to facilitate that.

You know, I knew, having been a core contributor to the outreach efforts for this organization for some time now that coming out of this meeting, we were going to have a spreadsheet and that I would need to get with the chair to coordinate what specific messages were going to get sent to those individuals (unintelligible) make good on the efforts that we put forward and so I raised my hand and said how can I do this but I think that this should have been something that was part of a list of things that needed to be accomplished from the outset, when we set up roles and responsibilities and your group is going to assign these tasks and our group is going to handle these tasks. If we accomplish that, I think we're going to make this one so much better.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes. So thanks for that and you know, one point I would like to make here, before (unintelligible), is there is - I see an issue with recruiting people at a certain level, presenting and participating in panels, you know, from the outside, so usually, you have to rely on people who are elsewhere in the ICANN community and participating (well, here,) because they have funds for traveling to come here so if you would like to recruit somebody from (unintelligible), it's not easy. So for example is (unintelligible) this time. You know, it was possible because (Gonzalo) is also in Spain but in the end, it turned out they had to fly in somebody from (elsewhere) because - so it is - it cannot happen every time because of their business and because and all these things.

So we should think about, you know, how we can cope with that, with this challenge, you know. We have a lot of experience in the ICANN community and that's what you could see yesterday, you know, it is sure the case so we have to rely in parts on ICANN staff as well, who is also available then on site, yes? So that is our environment that we have to rely on and that we have to take into consideration.

Mark McFadden: I think, this is Mark McFadden again. I think one thing that we learned this time is that we need to contact the speakers as early as we possibly can because we had invited speakers who declined the invitation, right? And then we had speakers who accepted the invitation and then went silent for the entire period where you're trying to - between the time when they accepted the invitation and the day before they were supposed to speak, right? They simply weren't returning email messages. So I think one of the things that's a challenge for us, for Kobe, is that we need to get the speakers on board as soon as we possibly can. In order to do that, we need to identify the content as soon as we can and in order to identify the content, we need to work with our partners in Japan as soon as we can.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And you have to identify, the only other speakers before you invite one speaker because he's asking who is going to participate.

Mark McFadden: Right. That happened on my panel. Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Tony, last word on that?

Tony Harris: One thing, one word of concern about Kobe and considering the fact that you mentioned (unintelligible). Your budget assignment would be language because we did this in English. Can we do Kobe in English?

Chris Mondini: I don't think so. I think we need interpreters, unless it's a question if we have this in conjunction with the Japan and its ISP providers association, they probably don't actually have interpreters.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (Unintelligible) I will prepare for that. (Unintelligible) Yes, I think (unintelligible) yes, yes. Yes.

Chris Mondini: Okay, that's a huge...

Mark McFadden: Because that could be expensive. Ear phone translation can be expensive.

Chris Mondini: So I have to run, but thank you very much and I'm sorry for running through your break. Did we - I do have all the contact information and one thing that we do as the engagement staff is we generally send a satisfaction survey out but I'll show that to you, before we send it, if there's something you want to change or add. I would separate that from any follow-up communications about ISPCP or (unintelligible) stuff but that's still a decision for you. You don't - you could give them the hard sell about ISPCP or you could just try to cultivate a community or create a mailing list or something like that but I know Christian has that on his list of questions for you. Thanks a lot. Thanks for all the kind words, too.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you, and before the short break, (Phillip), last words.

Philippe Fouquart: Yes. That was just a follow-up on his observations. On the scheduling, I was on the other side of the (unintelligible) fact that I was made aware of the slot ten days before and that wouldn't have been a problem had it been for the ICANN schedule, we missed the (ccNSO/GNSO Council), which had we known that earlier in the process, we could have scheduled (unintelligible), which wasn't possible with (unintelligible) a few days before. So just an illustration of the scheduling problem, which was a problem for me, (unintelligible) thing that I couldn't report on (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay and thank you everybody who participated actively (unintelligible) and in the preparatory work as well for that. So we have to find our way, too,

for that. I suggest about having a ten minutes long and then we have a last hour, yes? A ten minutes' break here and then having our last hour to talk.

Ajay Data: Can I have a last question before we break? And that question is, since (unintelligible) has gone, by the way, since we need this (unintelligible) thing and reach - outreach program, is it not possible to do it within the ICANN and do it half day? So we have a more packed program and (unintelligible) is not gone and we use the resources (unintelligible) a little bit less budget.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So we have, we have thought about, you know, and you have several types of meetings. I think we started with, that time, with the - with lunch. That was one thing so and then ended at 4:00 or 5:00, that was half a day. So we could think about that, so starting early morning...

Ajay Data: Tony has a very good, a very important point of language translation and there are going to be many people who would like to attend (unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I agree with his opinion because I did some (unintelligible) and if a event goes across the lunch time, then (unintelligible) charge the whole day. So if we can limit the event for half a day...

Ajay Data: That will be cheaper and more packed and qualitative program and one thing we should definitely think, because I was talking to the (unintelligible) who is JPIS CEO and who is (unintelligible) is a focus there. So we can start looking at the discussion around IDN and move, build, start building other content so we have a starting point already and there ICANN is focusing on IDN at that time. We can have (unintelligible) cohost there, so they will be there already, so we can immediately work with them and get ongoing.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes we will come back to that. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I think that's a good idea.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Short break, reconvening...

END