

**ICANN**  
**Transcription ICANN Johannesburg**  
**GNSO ISPCP Open Meeting**  
**Thursday, 29 June 2017 at 09:00 SAST**

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page <http://gns0.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Good morning Chantelle. I'll be ready to go.

Chantelle Doerksen: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I see the - so good morning everybody. My name is Wolf Ulrich-Knoben. I'm the Chair of the ISPCP constituency and we shall have our meeting this morning. I - would like to ask do we have remote participation as well, somebody on remote Chantelle?

Chantelle Doerksen: We have two people who are joining remotely.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Good, welcome aboard.

Chantelle Doerksen: I see (Dimitri Stasis) and Herve Clement. And we also have Julie Bisland from ICANN staff. And I'd just like to remind everyone to please state your name before speaking for the transcript. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you very much Chantelle. Before we go to the agenda I have to disclose something news. Well, you know, Chantelle as the Secretariat if you would like to have for the near future that she is going to do some work for the ISPCP and then I would like to ask that you be careful and not overload Chantelle in the future because she's pregnant. And we are very happy to have her here. Thank you and good morning Chantelle.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So we have roughly five quarters of an hour which is not about that much. And I apologize that this meeting hasn't – couldn't have been scheduled in a different way. I would like to have these kind of meetings in advance two meetings, two other meetings for example in advance of the GNSO Council meeting in order to have an opportunity on this platform to discuss issues which are in the agenda of the council as well as we have a position. This was not possible at the time so we can just then later on go through the agenda and tell you what happened on council. So having said this so I would like to ask whether there are any comments, commitments, ideas with regards to the agenda in front of you -- any additional points. No one. I see, thank you.

Then let's go to the next point which is not on the agenda but which is necessary procedurally a question about statement of interest whether there is something to be disclosed by anybody participating in this room for with regards to statement of interest. So I'm very happy to see not only well-known faces here at the table in this room and therefore I would be happy if I could have – you are here in the ISPCP. Are you? Yes okay. So if these – we have at least at the table a short going around well to say where we come from and where we belong to and that would be great. May I just...

Man: (Unintelligible) name?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes and you can - do we have a – it's going around already so thank you.  
So may I start with on the right-hand side here with from South Africa?

Alan Levine: Yes good morning. Thank you very much. My name is Alan Levine. I have a small ISP called the Vanilla. We're based in Cape Town and do fiber connections, various other broadband connections. I'm also a member of the South African ISP Association, the Chairman of ISOC South Africa and I've been involved in these meetings for about ten, 12 years or so.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thank you.

(Lyn Emila): Good morning, (Lyn Emila). I'm working for Knipp. It's a software company from Germany. I'm just interested to follow you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thank you.

Lacier Diaz: My name is Lacier. I'm from Brazil. I'm book the is PCP. (Unintelligible) my English is terrible. I'm sorry.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thank you.

Lars Steffen: Good morning. I'm Lars Steffen. I'm with ECHO Association of Internet Industry.

Malcolm Huty: Good morning. I'm Malcolm Huty. I'm with LINX, the London Internet Exchange. I'm also Chair of the International Affairs Committee for euros for the Pam European Association of for Internet Services Providers.

Christian Dawson: Hello. My name is Christian Dawson and I represent the Internet Infrastructure Coalition.

Chris Mondini: My name is Chris Mondini. I work for the ICANN organization staff based in Washington DC and I'm responsible for stakeholder engagement with the business community and also in North America.

Alain Bidron: My name is Alain Bidron. I'm a resident from near - the (North) European Telecommunication Network Operators Association based in Brazil.

Mark McFadden: My name's Mark McFadden. I'm with MICE.

Tony Holmes: Tony Holmes representing BT.

Olivier Muron: I am Olivier Muron. I work for (ON). I represent Orange from France.

(Dos Tatichi): My name is (Dos Tatichi) from Japan ISP Association.

Save Voce: Good morning everyone. I'm Save Voce: I'm ICANN staff. I'm the Vice President for Stakeholder Engagement responsible for Pacific Islands, Australia, New Zealand. And I'm part of the Pacific Network Operators group as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. Suman if you just could disclose who you are with the mic.  
Yes.

Suman Lal Pradhan: Sorry for being late I was in the network meeting of IGF downstairs. Yes I'm Suman Lal Pradhan from I'm (IPP) of SS and Internet Service Provider access Northern Nepal. Okay thank you.

(Ram Grisner Briar): Hey good morning this is (Ram Grisner Briar) from Nepal. I am from Nepal yes.

Woman: SSR...

(Ram Grisner Briar) I am from SSR too also.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: And thank you very much. I think we have a number people here joining us in the background as well. Thank you very much for being here in this meeting. And we have remote participation as well. Let me go to the next item is well just a small report what was happening on the GNSO Council. You know, Tony Harris and myself we are members of the GNSO Council. And just to brief you there was just to be taken one decision that is about the confirmation of the GNSO Lab representative to the empowered community administration. But, you know, that James Bladel as the council chair used to be the interim representative so we now had a – we had a process developed over time in order to select a representative. This process has now been accepted on council and after a few weeks there shall be elected by the so-called – by the chairmanship of the council one of the three members who is going to be the representative.

So the result of that process is that the council chairmanship will select one person of its own as representative for the EC administration. And that is going to be then confirmed by the council. It has to be confirmed by the council by voting. But that is the process so in future.

The other thing was there is the so-called Cross Community Working Group on Internet governance. And there was a question because whether James or should participate in future and participate as a chartering organization. Well in - at the end it was seen after extensive discussion this board with the ccNSO as well as a chartering organization that there is some importance with regards to that group. So from our side there was also given support that this group should exist.

We would also recommend that the group should as an ISPCP that this group should be chartered in parts by ccNSO but that is up to further discussion and decision. But it seems to be that the group is valuable and shall exist furthermore informed as a discussion forum on ICANN related Internet governance issues.

So then there is in different fora has been discussed so-called fundamental bylaw changes, the first time that the community had act on it. So there was a fundamental bylaw change necessary with regards to the – to a board committee on - oh what was the name? There are several. And I think it was with regards to a – the consideration request. I think so. That special committee shall be established, was discussed and it was supported also by the GNSO as it is going to be established.

In with regard to policy it turned out that the - for example the TO TLD discussion is one of the major items that shall be – I'm not sure whether it is afternoon there shall be a follow-up discussion on the first discussion about that, a facilitated discussion one very interesting and that one of the co-chairs Jeff Neuman he was also reporting the GNSO in requesting the GNSO for the report that geo names should be dealt with in future by the GNSO that and not by and not to – admit that could be drawn away from the GNSO to any other body ccNSO or GAC who else, yes.

So that was a big request which is we have to have a position on that as well in the future and that we can bring it up to the GNSO. This is a long term PDP and so on the - there's different opinions and discussion so there shall be time for this. So that was in total what was happening on council to speak. Are there any questions with regards to any of these items? I see Tony if you could follow-up the Adobe Connect so because I don't see that here but Tony please?

Tony Harris: Thanks Wolf. Just one other thing to make people aware of there's also a discussion in council some follow-up on the issue will be later today. But there is a discussion about forming a permanent budget committee within council. And it's very unclear as to how that is going to relate to the budget activities of the constituency. So certainly I think our view at the moment is we would like some clarity as to how that's going to work. And well after today we should be able to bring them back to the constituency with a little

bit more clarity. So it sounds a good idea but the scope and fit of that with how we deal with budget activities at the constituency level isn't clear.

Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks for this. So I understand it so do you think there's some more information so after this meeting if there any decision to be taken?

Tony Harris: I believe that it's going to be discussed during the GNSO wrap-up because it was deferred at the council meeting yesterday.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thanks. Any other questions? Oh yes so what's go straight ahead because we have this a straight timeline here. Next item is the universal acceptance. And I would like to ask Christian Dawson just to give a brief update on what's going on there, what is the importance to us, you know, are there with status and are there any actions needed or any – do we have any questions to ask?

Christian Dawson: Sure. Thank you. I'm happy to give an update. I think that the ISPCPs leadership in the realm of trying to move universal acceptance forward is something that we can be very proud of as a constituency. I'll briefly touch on what it is for those of you who have not heard me speak on universal acceptance before. First I want to acknowledge that within the Universal Acceptance Steering Group which this constituency helped form Lars Stefan and I serve as co-chairs of the Outreach Committee. As an organization we focus our attention on building resources, building reports and doing outreach. And I think of those three the most important thing is to make the efforts that we are undertaking known. And Lars and I are in charge of that. If you have any questions moving forward he and I are good resources for you and I'm going to defer to him at the end of my brief update to see if there's anything that I left out.

So conceptually what we're talking about with universal acceptance is over the past few years of the - once the new gTLDs had been launched we had

this situation where there were all these new domain names in the root. You need to make sure that those who work with all of the systems of the world. It is a problem for ISPs in particular when their customers complain that their systems aren't working when they're trying to use their new .ninja domain or .photography domain or even more likely one of the new internationalized domain names -- anything that is not in ASCII characters.

And so putting effort on our part into trying to spread the word specifically how people need to bring their systems up to modern compliance is something that we have found great importance and focusing attention on. To that end we have been -- I guess were about 2-1/2 years now into the project of trying to actively go out there to developers and CIOs and giving them resources and information so that they know how to update their systems so that they know the importance of doing it from the position of building a multilingual Internet from the position of increasing their potential market share and just fixing problems that their users are going to see and that our users as ISPs see. To that end I mentioned resources, reports and outreach. I wanted to give you a brief update on things that are happening at each level.

We are just finishing up a new report for as far as resources go on linkification. The linkification document is basically going to show people how they should handle linkage in the Internet when it comes to using all domains especially including IDNs. As far as reports go there's something very interesting that we are about to release. It is still in beta form and Lars and I are still reviewing it before we prove it to move forward but I think you'll be interested in what's going on there. It's an evaluation of the top 1000 most popular Web sites as recorded by Alexa to rank their acceptance of a variety of email addresses. And we found some pretty interesting results. Just 8% accepted all email addresses including EAI addresses, email addresses -- email address -- international addresses and addresses with the top level domains, long TLDs and internationalized domain names. The rate improved for ASCII mailbox names -- 30% rising to 91% for new short



TLDs at ASCII. So when it comes to dealing with things especially in non-Latin character sets we have a long way to go before we've seen – before we get to where we go especially when it comes to email. And that report will be coming out soon.

Earlier in the year we put out an economic report when we go to CIOs and developers we can now point to that and show the potential money that they're leaving on the table by leaving this big gaping problem unresolved. The last thing that I will say about outreach is that we have been - we've been reaching out over the past year and a half or so to developers and the CIOs alongside the PR firm that we hired as a UASG to assist us. That PR firm is Edelman and Lars and I have been managing that resource along with Don Hollander who was I guess Executive Director of the USAG.

We have determined over the past couple of months that our net is too wide. And because we're trying to get that millions of people it's difficult for us to narrow in on specifically our easiest targets. So right now we're going through a series of narrowing exercises is to find out to figure out who of those multimillion targets when it comes to CIOs and developers are going to be most interested in our message and likely to take it up with the idea that there can have a ripple effect over time. Lars other things that I've missed?

Lars Steffen: No it was a very comprehensive overview.

Christian Dawson: Okay thanks. Thanks for you both. Thank you. Chris I'm just I have a question with regard to the report yes. So you mentioned the nice improvement. You're now showing that. What is the - what is your mission and against what level you are going to measure, you know, your – the improvements?

Christian Dawson: So measurement and Mark you could probably attest to – you probably have questions about this as well. The measurement is the sticky wicket here.

And we need to be able to show that the things that we're doing, the efforts that we're putting in are effective. To date the best thing that we have planned that we continue to look for other metrics that we can use to hold ourselves accountable is to do reports like the ones we're going to release, email adoption and to track that over time.

So now there's an effect to which that doesn't affect whether there is correlation or causation as to the effect of what it is we're doing here. And so I don't have the best answers. But we are trying to find better ways than simply reporting on the successes of the ecosystem to track back to the successes of the organization.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Any further question here or Lars please?

Lars Steffen: Only one thing because you haven't finished a report on this yet but maybe there's nothing to discuss about but you attended the last mock meeting regarding universal acceptance. Maybe there's also something to report about.

Christian Dawson: That's a really good point. So what we've realized is that we've actually got a bit of counterprogramming going on in the ecosystem. There are a number of people especially who are focused on anti-abuse which is a very important part of what goes on to keep our network safe where people are going out there and saying as we are saying update your systems particularly when you are dealing with error checking to make sure that they are inclusive of modern TLD sets. They are saying most of the modern TLDs are sources of abuse and you should ignore them and/or block them outright.

So that is a distinct problem and one that we're trying to meet head on. There's a group called the Messaging Malware and Mobile Anti-abuse Working Group or MAAWG. By trying to directly connect MAAWG and their leadership and their technical communities to the efforts that we're putting

into universal acceptance asking them to contribute to our documents and put anti-abuse measures into it into our own best practices we are hoping to try and force some of that counterprogramming and build a tighter relationship there.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay thanks very much and don't forget – forget you say your name when you start here speaking. This is Wolf-Ulrich by the way. So my last question would be is this report given by ICANN is that still ongoing and on - of a level which is good for the project?

Christian Dawson: So there are – I'm not sure which report you're talking about with ICANN. So there two – oh support, the support that we're receiving from ICANN. The supports that we're receiving from ICANN is excellent. I'm very pleased with the efforts that Cyrus and (Ozzie) has put into supporting our group.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Christian Dawson: There may be a point in which it is sensible for us to widen our scope and widen our pocketbook. Today I'm not exactly sure what we would do with an expanded set of resources so I'm pretty satisfied with where we're at at the moment.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thanks very much. This is Wolf-Ulrich. Thank you very much. So it we could - I think we could close at this point because we have to come now to a point which is important for the preparation for the next meeting of next ICANN meeting in Abu Dhabi to discuss it is about outreach and it is about a special outreach event we have in mind not to do it similar as it used to be in one year ago in Hyderabad. So a special event with regards to the ISP community and in that region and (et al).

So I'm happy that we have Chris Mondini here this morning which the - which entity was heavily involved I think last year's. And that brought us to that big success which we had in Hyderabad and a good – very good

participation from the region there. And that we could follow-up as well also for a – some new applications for membership here and people are interested. And that is one goal of this outreach event but also to get people more interested and or to get people and ISPs to the table.

The best would be if those ISPs don't show up just once at such an event but stay and doing and participating in the work which we are doing. But that is another step here. But the first one is really going to outreach.

Just let me summarize. We have had tried in the past I think it was in early this year well to offer to file some information out information at the MENO event in was it in Abu Dhabi or was it in Dubai or Muscat, the Muscat, yes so on. So I'm also happy to have you here this morning.

So what we learned from that is if you go for an outreach event we should be present personally so because otherwise - and that was the experience from that time. People who would like to help us they are very much feeling but to bring that to the organization up that we are present there so that is another thing. So we have people had decided who would like to help you who would like also to help you out is that but they are engaged in other things. So it's the best way would be if somebody would be at all as we could be at site. And that is the opportunity in that.

So I would like to hear so and just first ideas what is needed when we would like to do that in Abu Dhabi and what we have to take care how to organize in our preparation, how we can fit in. So I know last time we had a - we had people here was Chris, it was Tony Harris. Tony Harris I'm afraid well he has health problems at this time, couldn't be here this morning and so far on. So if I can just hand over a little bit to you Chris and then we could follow on.

Chris Mondini: Thanks with Wolf-Ulrich. This is Chris Mondini with the ICANN Stakeholder Engagement Team. Really this can be very short. I lead Business Engagement. And that role is really meant to support the efforts of the

community groups in their outreach and engagement effort. We're fortunate in that we have a track record of some success at least with our Hyderabad outreach event. And I think if we could replicate that success looking at a few of the key ingredients it should be fairly easy to do the same in Abu Dhabi.

A couple of early decisions though I would say picking a date, picking a time on the calendar because it's the annual general meeting it's a very long -- it starts on a Saturday and goes through Friday -- in Business Engagement my experience is usually it's better to do it on a weekday. But I guess in that region the weekdays are slightly different. So this group what we should do is work with that people to, you know, the Outreach Committee and anybody you identify locally that would like to be your local champions both inside the ISPCP.

And another thing which we had in the event in India is we had very strong local partners in terms of ISP associations and mobile operator associations. And I'm less familiar with the market in the region but I think they -- we should contact them pretty soon. The venue in Abu Dhabi is perfectly suited for this because it's convention center between two connected hotels and has other hotels within walking distance. And usually our policy is that just as in Hyderabad although it seemed like it was all the same venue that we support you in contracting with something outside the formal ICANN center because it's not supported so much by ICANN meeting staff but it's supported with the funds and the contracting that you -- we can do together with the local hotels.

And the other thing which was in my recollection that sort of the heavy lift was the content so identifying the key messages that you want to convey and then identifying if that's in a panel format who would lead those panels. And again we can replicate what we did with Tony and others by giving a champion - deciding on a skeleton agenda of topics, picking a champion to organize this modules or the panels on those topics.

A strategy that we've used throughout the Business Engagement is to find topics of general business interests that relate to your target audience and Internet development and then intersperse those with the various specific DNS for ICANN relevant topics like for example universal acceptance because as we know these are all topics that you're trying to reach people on them. So you have the benefits of conveying important business relevant information and then being able to attract people to the constituency to help you in your work.

So in summary what I can do is give kind of a list of what I think are the very early decisions to make about how you'd like to proceed and memorialize what I just said. I have - we have two colleagues in the Middle East region Fahd Batayneh and (Franz) in Haman. They're both heavily involved already in planning for Abu Dhabi and we can get them started as well. And certainly we'll have help from Riccardo for Chantelle again as we did before. So net net, we're here to help. We'd like to support you in the lead but I think that we've done that successfully in the past.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much Chris. That's very helpful. And for me before we go into that and I would visual appreciate if you could rely as much as possible on you we have done in preparation of the Hyderabad meeting. But the first question would be is that comparable? So is that - so and I think we have may be also a colleague from this region could say a few words on this yes because so he's the one he's the representative from that region from the main org and on that time - type of associations. So that would be helpful to hear this thing.

Another thing which was I have to say is it was important to me was is it the right time to go there since I realized that the right 75 meeting is in the same area in Dubai just one week before the ICANN meeting. So and (Wiop) is usually is participated by ISPs as well so and request - I contacted (Axa Public) from (Wiop) IP, who is here and ask him whether - what is his

opinion about whether we could attract people to stay for two terms in offer of conventions there with different.

So he was open there. If you have an interesting program it - that might help. And people are there so that is not something which is against us yes usually. But of first before I go to Christian I would like to hand over to you and now so give you the floor for some comments please. And please introduce yourself.

Khalid Samara: Okay. Thank you very much Khalid Samara, I'm Middle East and talk about the MENOG chair.

Christian Dawson: (Take) the microphone.

Khalid Samara: Okay Khalid Samara speaking. Thank you very much for this chance to meet you here. And actually I have just two or three comments. As you said the arrive meeting will be held and that will be the week before ICANN meeting. So I believe this is a big chance for ISPCP to maybe have a chance to meet ISPs in our region especially that drive involved in Munich from the beginning. So I think we can some maybe some – send some advertisements or something about ICANN in general and ISPCP in the mailing list if you have something or agenda for ISPCP and all of you we can send it over (MENOG) and over (RIPE). I have the access to that by myself.

So this is the first - or should be since it's about time and early innings. We should prepare the agenda and the program, maybe some kind of (brochure) or short or something be the value, whatever you like and via email from now in simple emails. The target or the answers also and discussion I think we have shared with the same target at the onset about enter ISPs Internet Service Providers and also our members or maybe our ISPs. You know that to be a good chance. The third point about introduction about you mentioned that you have colleagues from ICANN in our region. I know them they are so active and actually from my point of view we need

someone who are already working with ISPCP itself because the - your colleagues as the (members) they are working for ICANN in general.

We need to focus on ISPCP group itself. This is what we faced in Munich last Munich. Actually we try to find someone from ISPCP. And I was there but as a chair I just mentioned that but I can't focus on it all the time. So it is good to have someone from ISPCP to focus on the regions start to contact people there and maybe by email or contact guys by phone for whatever you like.

I have a contact. I have the mailing lists so and mailing addresses so ICANN has on that even for the content itself ICANN has on that because and actually in our region the - maybe I feel that the guys there are interested in several topics (unintelligible) that you are talking here in South Africa or in Europe because they need still the introduction about what is ISPCP, how we can – how - what is all of these points, what does this mean. You need to focus introduction first, not to go deeply inside each topic. This are my comments (sic). Thank you very much.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much Khalid. Christian, please.

Christian Dawson: Certainly thank you. And I think that that is...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: This is Christian Dawson by the way.

Christian Dawson: This is Christian Dawson for the record. I think that that – those are – that's excellent feedback. I think we are left with two separate conversations that we as a constituency need to have. Can we get the right meeting logistics and can we build the right agenda -- two separate questions probably for two separate groups.

I regret that Tony Harris is unavailable today. Tony Harris and I have been working very closely on outreach over the past couple of years. With him not



here I guess representing sort of the Outreach Committee I can say that because we work a couple blocks away from each other I'm happy to sit down with you and start to work on meeting logistic possibilities. And I can sort of offer to bring some thoughts from that perspective back to the constituency to see if we can get the right logistics down. Simultaneously we as an organization can sit down and talk further about your notes, get Tony Harris backed looped in when he is well and see if we can get the right agenda forward. I guess my question to you Chris is how quickly do we need to have it figured out if we're a go, no go on that?

Chris Mondini: So by – listen, if you think that there's a market and there's interest and you can attract an audience then I think it's ago. I think the early decisions to be made are -- this is Chris Mondini of course -- what time slot, what dates and in fact if you feel you would attract more people during the right week than during the ICANN week we can contemplate doing it the week before. If people are willing to travel earlier and spend even more time in Abu Dhabi. I'm very happy to consider supporting that.

And to (Hilet)'s point again as you said in terms of getting the word out and using mailing lists even what we did last time is the Outreach Committee just decided on the broad topical areas and said, "You know, save the date this afternoon. We'll be doing a program. We'll be talking about these three topics." And we started publicizing very soon.

So again I – in terms, you know, I can look at what timeline we used last time but of course every region is a little bit different in terms of how much advance notice people need. But if we can settle on it a date that will work the best and as Christian said we sort out the logistics, settle on the broad topics and we can begin promoting it while in parallel working to fill up the program. But again I'm happy to support whatever the decision of the group is that would be best for your objectives.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Chris, Tony Holmes please?

Tony Holmes: Thanks Wolf, Tony Holmes for the record. We have worked with Right before. There is a number of times we've been to Right and presented (unintelligible) on that. I don't think we should get into repeating that and doing it at the right meeting. So I think we should rule that out from the start. And this should be an event that's held within the construct of the ICANN week as it was with the very successful event we had previously in India. I think the right way to do this would be to set up a call with the ISP Outreach Team in two to three weeks and certainly would be helpful having Tony there to talk about this.

There's a few things that we need to do and certainly Chris's point about setting the date is a key one. One of the things we shouldn't lose sight of is that we've also sent a letter to the ICANN board supporting follow-up activity on DOA blockchain and other technologies and hopefully they will pick that up. And there has been some discussions in the margins about the possibility of having a follow-up workshop on that in Abu Dhabi.

I don't believe that we're going to suddenly get a mess of ISPs saying we've been in Abu Dhabi for a week right, we're going to stay there for another week going to get – it works the other way. They've been there for a week and every hour of the day is important. So we may capture them for a day or so particularly the local community which we should aim towards anyways. And if we could – if we're aiming for half a day which I assume is the case -- that's what we did before -- then if we can correlate that with any activity that's taking place from the CTO office on DOA then that's a pretty attractive day for ISPs. So putting those things together would be helpful.

The challenge we've got and it's certainly a challenge that our Secretariat would appreciate is actually getting that embedded into the ICANN program and realizing what other important activities are taking place around the particular date is a real problem because we're still at despite all of our attempts with ICANN meetings we're still at in a situation where the agenda

isn't finalized until pretty far down the path. So maybe put in a bid and now would suggest one of those things we need to do is to reach out to the CTOs, see whether they have any thoughts about a follow-up presentation on other technologies trying to make that the same day would be an attractive composition particularly.

In terms of the agenda say it's unfortunate Tony isn't here there was certainly a heavy slant before towards IOT as an element of that. I think that ought to be included on the agenda again. But maybe we've got some homework to do with Chris, with CTO with the ICANN staff in terms of possibly getting some urgent notification as to whether the schedule is going to look similar to what it does that other ICANN meetings, finding the ideal day and perhaps having that follow-up call in a couple of weeks or so would be a good start. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Great. Thanks very much Tony. Before I hand over to someone well a good idea. So we should start already to collect ideas about that. And we should form a team which is aware of that so in order that we have some progress to do. That would be good. So I think as I understand that we have a kind of outreach team here in our group that was used to be Christian, Tony. I would like to join as well so being responsible Tony Holmes as well. So why not to set up a list or even to put it on the – on our list well first round of ideas and we shall then fix a call on the list with the Doodle as well after this meeting so that they come together and then present and then afterwards we'll make progress of that.

Tony Holmes: Just a comment on that there was an outreach team establish some time ago. And I appreciate Christian and Tony have done a lot of heavy lifting over recent months more so than anybody. But the team I think was exactly as you've described with the addition of Alain Bidron and Osvaldo as well. That was the original team.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Suman please.

Suman Lal Pradhan: Thank you. Yes that in the context that we are exploring for like is in the for our outreach event that is why I want to - I mean put my opinion about it is that as we are I mean we're discussing about the future I guess this is the future. Perhaps one isn't that could be ISP future itself for our outreach event. So this could I mean attract the general people who are engaged in the ISP people, ISP people so if we could have some discussion on this still how maybe this would be good for the ISPs who are doing good in the world and we are trying to survive in the world. So perhaps my opinion is that we can have an agenda like ISP (unintelligible) for our outreach review). Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thanks Suman. Yes Chris is first. Yes please.

Chris Mondini: It's Chris Mondini and we are jumping a little bit but I –in looking at the dates and looking at the calendar and wondering if it would work I think an ideal date would be Sunday, 29 October and only because but I'm not, you know, is Sunday in UAE the date - like the beauty of that is you can attract people the day before the Monday morning general kickoff of ICANN. And so hopefully they stay at least one night. And also the Wright meeting will event it on Friday. So in fact it's, you know, you make a people willing to stay a day or two.

But this is the thing I believe also to Tony Holmes' point about conflicting with the ICANN schedule. The earlier we can decide and internally start almost carving out a space and telling everybody else, you know, ISPs are planning an event we can get that earlier into the mix both through the SO AC planning process for the agenda and the staff side as well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Well Tony well just so you - what is your impression with regard to the date? You know is that – are there any limitations?

Khalid Samara: No Sundays the first working day it is perfectly. After the arrive meeting also that meeting will finish on Friday so maybe we will have one day off and they can (unintelligible) least for one or two days we can touch them first also one or two days so it's perfect time.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Tony Holmes please.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. There is a problem with that and the problem is the inherent one we have at every ICANN meeting is Sunday is normally taken out with GNSO issues, council issues. And it's going to take a number of people right out of the equation for the ISPs. That's the problem with the Sunday.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I'm not sure about that. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking about the overall schedule. Yes, I know today they are starting now to organizing the schedule because all these – as soon as we possibly we can have a kind of block schedule for the ICANN Abu Dhabi meeting to see what's going to happen and which days and then we are more clear about that. I'm wondering because the GNSO part of that - those meetings is just I think it's in one day I think. It's on – I'm not sure that it's Sunday or so that time. So let's wait for that for the block schedule and then think about what we can do in case just in case there is - we are covered by the GNSO.

Tony Holmes: All right just on that point I was just going on the basis that it's the annual general meeting and normally in the past it's always been the council day on the Sunday Monday. But...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes.

Tony Holmes: ...yes it's difficult to judge.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: We'll take this into consideration. Mark please?

Mark McFadden: Thanks. Mark McFadden for the record. I was getting my head around the content. And thinking about something Tony said. And I would be willing to volunteer to make contact with the Office of the CTO to see whether or not they have any plans and actually encourage them to join forces with us. So I - if you're going to have a call in a couple weeks certainly one of the things I can do is follow-up with the CTO before that so they can have an answer for that call. That can be a to do on me.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay thank you very much. And may I just to the end come to the question. You mentioned there should be a local contact point for the ISPs because specifically with regard to the constituency. Is that someone you could provide or do you have somebody in mind? I remember, you know, when we talked about the MENOG meeting we had this the German colleague as well. So he's in the area but he's not involved specifically in our matters here. So what you have in mind with regard to that?

Khalid Samara: Yes you talk (unintelligible) yes and for ICANN in general, not for the ISPCP. I don't have anybody in my mind. You can want someone to do that I can help him on that. Otherwise I can find anybody if you want.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

Khalid Samara: I can do that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: I didn't ask (unintelligible) exactly.

Khalid Samara: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: But that's where that's yes...

Khalid Samara: It is not (unintelligible) itself, that's why. And the last time it was difficult for me to go forecast on it so next time I can do that then too.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay and he knows he's the ICANN partners in the region as well. So what is best for - that's very helpful. So we would like to I'll put you on the list here in the - of this outreach committee yes so when we have calls and so then we can contact you...

Khalid Samara: Sure.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: ...as well for that. That's great. Thank you very much. Any – I'm looking to Chris Mondini. Any open question at the time being? So what I will say as summing up this topic is there is no doubt that they should have this. So we are convinced that this is a prosperous area and that is for us really a good time and a good area to go with that event.

We wouldn't like to go to the WrightEvent directly so because of the arguments Tony point and others point as well. So we should do it in the context of the ICANN meeting. So we are a little bit doubtful about, you know, that specific date. But we shall contact I'm not - is it (Sally) or who is in charge of setting the frame of the next meeting? As soon as possible we shall contact her or her team well who's responsible for that to know what is about the GNSO and well then we can finally decide about this date. I think that can happen within the next two weeks or so please.

Chris Mondini: Yes I'm very happy to write up some notes of what we discussed and share them via Chantelle with the people that want to work specifically on this event and identify sort of the players, or workplan, a timeline and so forth. I want to ask though with the potential conflict Tony Holmes identified apart from Tony you and Wolf-Ulrich if there's a conflict with GNSO council work or other ISPCP members also pulled into GNSO counsel work or is it really just the two of you that we have the big conflict with?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Tony...

Tony Holmes: That's a difficult one to answer. It certainly at the moment takes out Wolf-Ulrich and Tony Harris. It also takes out potentially other members of our community who are involved in various PDP working groups depending on the schedule that GNSO set. So it could take for instance people who work in on RDS out. So whichever way it cuts it's going to take a few people out. It isn't ideal.

Just while I'm at the mic just one other request Wolf-Ulrich. One of the actions from this I think also should be if we could ask Chantelle to set up a Doodle when we can have the call that would be helpful as well thanks.

Chantelle Doerksen: I know we just need to – my name - Chantelle Doerksen for the record. And for those that are going to reach out to the different offices at ICANN if I could just remind you to copy me that way I can jump in as needed. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Thanks very much. And a last comment, short comment Alain please because we are...

Alain Bidron: Very short comment. I'm a bit confused because the Wright meeting as far as I know is in Dubai. Would it be Dubai is not very far away but it's exactly the same place?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Well, you know.

Alain Bidron: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: But people have two days to travel.

Man: Thanks.

Man: We don't need to travel just sorry just, 30 minutes here.



Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: So thanks very much for that. So I think we have a path to go. So I'm happy to see Thomas Rickert in my - there he is. So and I would like to invite him to briefly to update us on the CCWG matters please briefly. We have only time in total until quarter after 10:00. It's - it would be nice if you could focus on matters which are related to us or to the constituency work itself. Thank you very much Thomas.

Thomas Rickert: Thanks very much Wolf-Ulrich and hello everybody. Did you get the slides that I sent to you early this morning, sent them to you like half an hour ago so but what I would like to do in the little time that we have is focus on two things. One is the discussion on jurisdiction and the other is the overall approval process for the WS2. And I guess that is something that you need to take to heart sequencing your constituencies' work. I'm sure that those slides will be distributed to all of you so...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Yes.

Thomas Rickert: ...we are publishing a monthly dashboard where you can see the completion status for all of the sub teams work. As you might recall we have split up the work in Workstream 2 into nine different subsections all of which have their rapporteur and, you know, folks like Malcolm are very active in some areas. So I think you - he can give you updates on individual topics that you might be interested in at the sub team level.

Some of the sub teams have produced papers that have already been published for public comment, are currently in the process of analyzing public comment or will start analyzing public comment very shortly. So that's something to keep an eye out - eye open for. And then I think four or five of the sub teams have not yet produced anything then went out for public comment. You know, so we're not - we're on our way. We're not as far as we thought we would but I'm quite hopeful that we will deliver to within the time frame that we are now given which has been extended by a year to June 2018.

I guess that's also important for you to note that a couple of days back the budget was approved by the financial folks in ICANN. And we did not ask for more money overall because we understand in the time in the early couple of months. And we will take the remaining budget to cover the costs that we've plan to spend. And also we have funds that have been allocated to us in the transition budget that we will spend. So even though we will take a year longer than originally anticipated this will not affect the overall bottom line of the expenditures.

And I should also say that, you know, folks have been asking why does it take you longer? And I think that works from one has been quite all right. So in the first couple of months I guess all the volunteers were just burnt out and didn't really feel like, you know, continuing to work as hard as they previously did immediately after the transition.

So I think we're in pretty good shape. We've – there's one group that was a particular concern. And that is the Jurisdiction Group where two topics came up every now and then. I mean all of, you know, that PDP work is not a straight road to (unintelligible) consensus. I'm describing this as, you know, it's quite natural for PDP working groups and other work, you know, the groups are meandering and then finally they go to consensus.

But this group was not meandering. It was moving in circles because there were folks that wanted to discuss the relocation of ICANN outside the US to another country and there were others who wanted to discuss over and over again to make ICANN an immune organization meaning that you can't take ICANN to court. And then the co-chair said that they needed to step in in order to end these discussions because they obviously did not get any traction within the sub group but they caused disruption for the otherwise fruitful discussions inside the team. So we did a co-chair assessment and reported to the group that the group should focus on accepting ICANN being incorporated as a not-for-profit organization in California to subject to the

jurisdiction in California as the starting point and looked at remedy based solutions. Those can be contractual related to dispute resolution so that not all disputes need to – go to California courts necessarily. And also they can discuss if they wish so partial immunity or relative immunity which is a concept that is possible because some of the colleagues particularly in the GAC are specifically unhappy with OFAC and the limitations that OFAC imposes on ICANN when it comes to contracting.

And there was quite a bit of an uproar when I did this. I personally said okay I'm fine as a co-chair to convey this to the sub team. I am happy to take the heat for it because the rapporteur needs to work with this group for another year so they better hate me rather than Greg Shatan in that case. And so there was some debate and we've discussed this jurisdiction topic again in the CCWG plenary a couple of days back here. And it showed that, you know, even those who raise objections first for example like the Brazilian government then said, "Okay this is not ideal for us but we're willing for the sake of compromise to work on that basis."

And so we even had more folks converging to consensus which is not yet a consensus, well formal consensus call but, you know, leaning towards the solution that we've asked the group to focus on. And it became clearer and clearer that those that were talking in favor of immunity that were talking in favor of relocating ICANN actually said well we just wanted to keep it open as an option but we didn't really mean it, you know, so it was sort of a weird conversation to a certain extent. But I think it was good to get the elephant out of the room so that the group can really focus on looking at issue based remedies.

So should you have read anything on mailing lists and the like, you know, I guess this discussion is over although an Indian representative has still complained about all this being flawed and inaccurate but I think that this is truly a minority. And as we always do there's the possibility to file minority statements should the group come to consensus on other solutions. And

there will be a public comment period. And it is pretty well possible that if the public comments show that we were - we did everything entirely wrong that the group needs to reconsider. But at least for the moment let's take for granted that ICANN will stay where it is and that is in line with one of the basic principles that we've established for Workstream 2 and that was not to undo anything that we did in Workstream 1. And for example making ICANN an immune organization would mean that the community powers that we've established to dismiss the board and other things would not work because you have nobody to take to court right? So I guess that's good news because that's been a discussion that's been popping up every couple of weeks and that I guess is the first takeaway message that I would like to share with you.

The second is the overall approval process. There are folks in the ICANN community who say well I will not give green light until I see the whole package of what's being done. I need to look at those set of recommendations together and then I can say thumbs up or thumbs down.

Now we have nine sub teams working on recommendations. They are not getting their stuff ready at the same time. At the same time I guess it would be just inappropriate and pertinent ma be to face to make the broader community take a look at recommendations that might be a couple of hundred pages long and ask them to respond to that in the public common period which is why we agreed and we've got feedback on that which consensus on that. We've agreed to do that in stages.

So we've had a couple of public common periods already on recommendations produced by the sub teams. You should watch out for more public comment periods from other sub teams work. That is the time when you should talk to the substance of what the sub teams have produced -- diversity, transparency, IRP and all the others.

Once this is all done for all sub teams we will put together a package and put it out for public comment. But this is not to be misunderstood as an

opportunity to take a second bite of the apple and try to unpack what's been done for the individual sub teams. But we're only looking at comment on inconsistencies between the packages. To give you an example we have the cooperative engagement process and then we have the (unintelligible). And as you may or may not know the CEP is sort of the starting place before you go into an IRP. And when the sub teams, with recommendations on timing and stuff like that that needs to work well together. And that's something that we don't yet know whether the sub teams have a good eye on that or the relationship between the ombudsman's work and other dispute resolution related work. So it may well be that our group fails on delivering a package that is consistent.

So this public common period is only there to spot those inconsistencies. If people want to try and squeeze in additional recommendations or changes to recommendations that are not inconsistent with other parts of the overall package it is very well possible that we will say okay this is well noted and we will provide this information to let's say ATRT or other periodic reviews that are relating to accountability. But we cannot afford to reopen debates on individual subgroups works otherwise we will never end this.

We're keeping the charting organizations as well as the board apprised of these processes and we ask them to do the same so that ultimately we are going to have this consistency check and then we will deliver our overall work product to the charting organizations for approval. And that's what's relevant to the ISPCP as well and also to the board for its approval. And if this doesn't work seamlessly then we might fail delivering on time.

Now you might say I'm happy to stretch this a little longer because then I might get my will. The fact is we've got this extension because we didn't ask for more money. It is very well possible that the board denies additional funds beyond June 2018 and that they say, "Well you had your chance. You've been working on this for two years. You didn't seize the opportunity and therefore let's feed accountability enhancements into the other periodic

reviews." So you those who are trying to speculate on getting more if they try to torpedo the process might end up getting nothing because we're then possibly preserving the status quo of where - of what we had.

And let me conclude by saying we make get nothing. Maybe that's not entirely accurate because we've done a lot already even there was a lot of accountability in ICANN before we started the stewardship related work. But, you know, the additional things that we thought would be needed to come up with a holistic accountability architecture in ICANN might suffer if we as a community fail to come to consensus and deliver on time.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks very much Thomas. This is Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thanks. So I think it's understandable right now so how the process is and it's very valuable. Just one question on my side before I give to others well I remember recall that there was a - this was a part of Constituency Stakeholder Group accountability where they preferred to be done. Is that going out public comment as well so and when we can expect that?

Thomas Rickert: So you say in front of you the SO AC accountability sub teams work results? So there was a public comment consultation already and SO AC accountability is a topic not to be taken lightly because we've been asking the US government to hand over its authority and ICANN - and the US government is accountable to its - to the US population. They can choose to elect somebody else if they're not happy with what the administration is doing.

They did - let's not go that route. I might say some things that I don't want to be on transcript. So you have to this whole issue of who watches the watchers? So we are passing on authority from the governmental - from government to the Global Stakeholder Community and therefore it is important that the global stakeholder community itself which is reflected in ICANN's structure of SOs and ACs is accountable. And what we saw is that when the recommendations have been put out for public comment the

feedback was not overwhelmingly positive to put it mildly but there were commenters who concerned about, you know, the transparency enhancements, you know, you see here that, you know, there were recommendations that there should be public and open meetings, recorded meetings, that meetings should - meeting minutes should be published and that there should be public mailing lists who said, "Well that's not a good idea."

Speaking purely in personal capacity I think this is something for you to consider and potentially speak out in favor of being very transparent and accountable to your respective communities. We need to up our game. And this doesn't really look like the community is trying to improve its own enhancements, you know, so now you've got all these powers which are quite which have quite an impact on ICANN operations and existence and the responsibility comes along with it.

So the I - we had a couple of points. You know, one was pushing some of the accountability on - into ATRT and there were concerns that ATRT is already overloaded and that we shouldn't add to that which is an understandable response. Then there was the suggestion that volunteers should be reporting and there was the notion of, you know, volunteers are already burnt out. They should be tasked with additional reporting duties.

Then transparency I already spoke to. Then we had the question whether the IRP, the Independent Review Process should be applicable to issues that aggrieved community members have with SOs and ACs. And that was rebutted so the commenters said the IRP should not be opened up for that but then and this is the last bullet point, we need to think about what dispute resolution mechanisms can be used for taking action against SOs and ACs. And I think that the mechanism such as that, it doesn't have to be the IRP, it should be supported by the ISPCP as well in order to enhance accountability.

So, you know, this is I guess the status quo. There's one aspect which does not fall into this category but which is in the same school of thinking and that was the original idea of a mutual accountability roundtable that was discussed in Workstream 1. That idea was also rebutted by many because they said, "A mutual accountability roundtable is not the correct approach." I think that one of the experts that we had in Workstream 1 meant it differently by, you know, mutual accountability between ICANN and its community. But it was that understood as ISPCP being accountable to the GAC or to ASO right. And I guess we don't want that to happen because these SOs and ACs should be accountable to their respective target groups or customers if you wish. And then we took the M out of the acronym to make it the accountability roundtable as an optional idea. That has not been liked by too many folks but as an option I think it would be worthwhile considering to keep on the table.

Wolf-Ulrich Knohen: Thanks very much Thomas so we have to be straight with the agenda so we have - I think we can continue if you like for the ten minutes because well it consumes something from our coffee break here but coffee is available also on the table here. So last question for this from Olivier please here.

Olivier Muron: Yes. This is Olivier Muron and just one question Thomas because the concept of immunity is very new for me for organization so I want to - just you to give me an example of immune organization...

Thomas Rickert: Sure Red Cross. So the Red Cross would be an organization that is set up based, you know, through governments. And that's an organization that you can't sue. So they are immune. Partial immunity or relative immunity is a concept that's been discussed by lawyers and a lot. It's - I think it's not been there for too long but that means that you get immunity for certain types of things that you're doing so it's not per se immunity. So let's see when ICANN staff is being dismissed they can still go to a court and try to get redressed there but it may well be that, you know, if the US government chose to do so that they make ICANN immune from antitrust claims or from OFAC



regulation. I'm not an expert in the field so this might not be perfectly accurate but just to give you an idea so that would really be sector related.

I have to confess that I'm not sure whether this will get sufficient traction from looking at what the subgroup is debating because there are some that claim that even if you have the OFAC issue in the US this is not an unusual concept that you also have sanction list. And you can get - can ask for permits to do certain things with certain countries, certain entities, certain individuals. And what's been discussed in that area also is to get what I think is called might not be the correct technical term, a permanent waiver or permanent permission that would allow for ICANN to contract with states. I mean this is relevant to ccTLD operators in particular, you know, the case where somebody – where an attorney took ICANN to court to get the .ir domain name and therefore certainly countries do have a vital interest in making sure that there is no risk of courts taking away their ccTLD.

You know, so this is something that you can do. For the moment we just clarified that the possibility of partial immunity is not off the table, can be discussed. Whether it's likely or not that the group will come to consensus on landing on community-based concepts that's the big question. And also I think there are some issues with going for immunity because this, you know, other recommendations that we come up with can be implemented by ICANN right so we can change our bylaws. We can change or dispute resolution mechanisms. But coming up with a recommendation that requires governmental approval or even laws to be made is something that's beyond our control. And there's a certain danger in asking for those things because what do you do if you don't get what you're asking for? You know, so I think this is for further down the line but I hope that this had answer your question.

Olivier Muron: Yes. Thanks very much.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thank you.

Olivier Muron: Yes.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thanks very much Thomas. Thank you very much for this so we are updated and thank you and good luck furthermore with your work. So we still have an excellent team. You know, I'm not that desperate just to count on hope and luck. I know that yes.

Okay so we have some items here still under AOB to discuss. Well I think maybe we suffer, the public comment this is going to suffer again as usual. But so we have as a next item here the new gTLD auction proceeds and then the question about what - about this work and how it's going on in that and how we are involved. Just to update you on that there was a meeting during that ICANN meeting session about this and there was percentage and we have a representative on that group. It's Tony Harris who is well really sick. So – and there was a presentation given this kind of bubbles, you know, what should be in the proceeds, the auction proceeds what should be, what should be out in the election of what to do with the well let's see like what to do with the proceeds and what should be out.

This kind of thing was discussed and was confusing to some extent as well. And in the end this meeting to my understanding ended well that there should be done a survey within this group with regards to those questions and those suggestions and ideas and with regards to additional ideas and it should be sent out to the working group members. And in a short timeframe I think we two or three weeks we should be beyond that survey.

And so we should discuss a process how we do that because we got a feeling that Tony Harris needs some support for that and would be happy well also to get some support on that. So just well to bring that out and then asking for comments and ideas from your side on what is your opinion on this? Is Malcolm specifically I am pointing to you is there any idea you have here because we discussed that before then? Thanks Malcolm.

Malcolm Huty: Okay thank you Wolf-Ulrich. I attended that meeting. I hadn't previously attended meetings on auction proceeds because I'm really not that interested in what this money gets spent on for the sake of what the money gets spent on. So it hasn't really concern me.

But I did pop into that and I discovered that actually it's an extremely important topic for an entirely separate reason. I have spent a lot of time in the CCWG accountability talking about ICANN's mission, the scope of the mission and ensuring that its property limited. And it turns out that thy auction proceeds discussion is extremely relevant to this.

I discovered to my great surprise that the auction proceeds funds is now up to the net proceeds and the available funds is now up to \$233 million. So you can imagine that a lot of people are looking at this with wide eyes and great Pavlovian expectations as to how they might spend this money on all sorts of worthy projects. ICANN's legal team or CFO and their legal team started the meeting by reminding the group -- and they like to tell me privately that they rather struggled to get to sufficient attention to this point - or understanding of this point -- these funds can only be spent on things that are considered to be within ICANN's mission.

ICANN's mission limits all ICANN activities and that includes disbursement of funds from the auction proceeds. Accordingly if it is decided and agreed to spend these funds on a particular kind of activity or for a particular purpose that amounts to a decision that that activity or purpose is within the scope of ICANN's mission which means that in the future ICANN might do other things other than just disperse funds out of this fund towards those activities. It might develop its own projects and activity streams in this area. It might potentially continue to fund those activities out of other revenue streams. So if you think that oh well we can get this big pot of money and spend it on something nice that we think is worthy bear in mind that at that point you are also potentially saying that one day ICANN might take a general surcharge

on domain registration or whatever for us to raise funds to continue to fund that activity.

And that's not to say that we're making a commitment to do that but what we are saying is that that would be within the scope of the things that ICANN would be entitled to do if it chose to do so. And it will not be possible to have an independent challenge before the IRP to say no, no this is not the sort of thing that ICANN is authorized to do because if we decide that it is within the mission then there is no challenge to it.

So now the mission is not - we tried to make the mission reasonably tied to what ICANN is currently understood before but it's not a complete straitjacket. It would properly so. There needs to be a range of things that ICANN could potentially do and would be permitted to do in the future that it's not doing at the moment and that's quite proper. But nonetheless there is a potential for interpretation there.

When it comes to looking at the mission you can either take a very restrictive interpretation of what the mission means in which case there's going to be limited numbers of things you could spend these funds on or you could take a very broad and lax interpretation. I mean for example and it talks in the mission about supporting the resilience of the Internet. Now you can wonder whether that means anything that would support the resilience of the Internet or should that be read in accordance with the other aspects of ICANN's mission and to say that well no this only really means resilience in the Internet in terms of the things that ICANN is responsible for such as the domain name system.

And it's that sort of how we interpret what the mission means that is going to come to play when people come up with suggestions for new areas of projects to be funded. To give one area that was mentioned in that CCWG auction proceeds one of the things that - the comments that in their first survey that came up was that it could be spent on projects that would aid the

evolution, development and distribution of the Internet. That was one of the suggestions. Now distribution of the Internet what does that mean, because in my mind distribution of the Internet is actually talking about access. It's talking about the availability of Internet access.

So are we saying that ICANN, was that suggestion saying that ICANN will be using these funds and potentially therefore in the future working towards projects designed to increase Internet access to those that don't currently have it? That would seem to be something that would be deeply significant to this community. And the question of whether that is within the scope of the things that ICANN should probably be entitled to do would seem to be deeply relevant to this community. And that's why I bring it to your attention today.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thanks very much Malcolm. That is exactly, you know, what's also what I realize, you know, there were some conflicting suggestions made. So the one which you raised here was, you know, widening the Internet. And there was on the other hand a suggestion saying yes but don't spent it to physical enlargement of the Internet so that it means no infrastructure project and these things so that was a different suggestion. So as you know this is now in a stage of, an early stage of bringing in suggestions than filtering it within this group and then also measuring against the ICANN scope and the ICANN mission at all.

So but it's really it's very important to us as well and especially if I understood that correctly so that they were asking, they have a deadline for a survey for two or three weeks which is which I don't understand why but it is that way. So that means there shall be sent out the survey. So I would like to say that I'm sure that Tony Harris is going to get the survey. I will ask him that he's going to chair the survey on the list so that everybody from our group could join or assist him but in which way to answer the survey and then to follow on I think that would be a step which should be taken right now. So but it's interesting and it's very important to us as well in this stage. Any comment

from others to that? I don't see one so let's fix it as an action that we approach Tony Harris rather than he is going to share that on the list directly.

Christian Dawson: (Unintelligible).

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes?

Christian Dawson: From a point of view and ISPCP position on these matters I would like to suggest that it be our position that as the CCWG auction proceeds considers the kinds of activities and purposes to which these funds may be put an iterative process of review for mission compatibility is conducted so that it's not just done at a very high level at the start of the process to see whether it's possible that there might be something in a given area that was within the mission but instead that at every stage of refinement of what the proposals are there is an iterative process for checking the compatibility of the proposals as they stand would be a mission limitation.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Very good idea. So we should take that into consideration. Mark.

Mark McFadden: Mark McFadden. I don't understand the idea. So there aren't any proposals. There are no proposals so I don't know what you're talking about.

Christian Dawson: They aren't asking for proposals. They are asking - that's what this two-week exercise is. In two weeks' time they're asking their own Cross Community Working Group to come up with proposals not for what to spend the money on as individual projects but for the kinds of things, the descriptions of the kinds of categories that could be done. And that is likely to be something that will be developed first as in very broad terms and then more specific descriptions of program sort of templates and so forth over time.

Mark McFadden: I understood these to be strawman proposals to test the boundaries of the process right? That's what the proposals that are coming back are supposed to do.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: If I may Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So that's what I understood if - they are in very early stage, you know, because saying oh well it's far away from forming recommendations, final recommendation for a report or so. So it's just well coming to that point is this the way how we go forward? Is that the right way and what could be - what is your opinion on that? On this thing you can see there are every time there are conflicting ideas about that how should we proceed? But then as I understand well Malcolm's request here well to be visible as an input entity here as the (ISPC) at every stage of this process at every stage of this discussion. So that is what is your request and that should be done.

Mark McFadden: I don't - Mark McFadden again. I don't have any problem with the ISPs being involved at every stage. That doesn't bother me. But I think Malcolm's excellent idea and I have no problem with what you were saying but I think the place where it applies is when that CCWG starts talking about how to develop criteria for the evaluation of proposals and they're not even to that point yet right? They're...

Malcolm Huty: Actually no I don't - I think it applies. Well I'm - what I'm recommending is that no, not just when we get to the stage of developing criteria for the allocation of proposals but actually at each stage they're - the CCWG's going to go through a set of processes that it's going to need to do of which the criteria for the allocation of proposals is really quite a long way down the line. What I was actually suggesting is that this test of that be applied at each stage down the line, not just as the final stage or not just at the first stage.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: We have to wrap up so we are over time here. So and Tony last comment and then we have to wrap up and...

Tony Holmes: Okay I've got a lot of sympathy for Malcolm's point of view on this because during the course of this meeting I've had some side discussion in the hallways with people who clearly have ambitions already to go down the path

that would infringe that that there's no doubt about that. And I think we are in a position where if that gets embedded into the thinking now it's very difficult to address that. So I think Malcolm's point is valid.

I would suggest for the ISPs one of the things we could do so we don't lose sight of this is we have a place in our Web site where we record our positions and things. We could have a reflection there is current thinking of ISPCP towards use of auction funds. And we could actually put some text in there they can be used as ongoing guidance for Tony and the rest of it so we don't lose sight of that. So I think it is important to do this. Maybe Malcolm could draft something that could go on there.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Malcolm really?

Malcolm Hutty: Yes I'd be happy to. I'll draft something...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Okay.

Malcolm Hutty: ...circulate it on the list for your approval.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Great so let's put that idea to the - well thank you. Thanks very much for your patience. Well I was told that we could use this room but we have even to - we have to wrap up because of the I don't know, any organizational limitations here. Very last point is I would like to raise is we have to start with the offices election process right now with regards to the NomCom, our NomCom appointee as well as for the GNSO Council as well so because at the AGM, the next meeting there shall be a change on that. I was asking towards the NomCom responsible staff persons and the GNSO responsible ones what the process is there. I just get the answer we can start immediately with our process. I would like to find out the very last dead end, you know, where we are limited to go through this process.



I would suggest that we well after we have this available as in from the GNSO there must be also something. So immediately we sent out an email on the process with regards to that. And so outlining what is going on I understand that many people shall be on holidays maybe in the summer season. But it may happen that we have to start doing that period already. Any questions from your side - any - that - no it's a procedural item so we shall follow-on with that.

So I think we should skip the public comment list. Do we have any urgent - you should share that with us on the list yes? I think you should you did already. We should have a view on that what is relevant to us and then proceed as usual with public comments. So any further...

Christian Dawson: Only one note that we are actively working on one public comment around GDPR and I'm getting that.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thanks very much for that.

Mark McFadden: And if there's is anyone interested in working on a public comment on the ASO review that's actually do on July 14. So I'll work with anyone who's interested in working on that. I know that that's arcane stuff to some people but I think it's worth the ISPs responding.

Malcolm Huty: And though there is not currently released a draft of the IRP supplementary procedures the first round public comments resulted in some significant changes to what was initially proposed. And it is likely that there will be a second round of public comments probably sometime in the late summer period or something like that then yet to be determined. We've yet to get to the point where they'll be ready for that but that - it will be important to reply to that when that occurs.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay thank you very much. Thank you so much for your patience. I know we are under time pressure here. Thank you. We shall have this closed

meeting I think in two hours from now around that or even before. I'm not sure. I have to look at the agenda so thank you very much and the meeting is adjourned. Thanks. Thanks operators.

Chantelle Doerksen: For those that didn't have a chance to sign the attendance sheet it's going to be at the front of the room and if you could just sign in and we can follow-up with you that'd be appreciated. Thanks.

END