

**ICANN Transcription - Marrakech  
ISPCP Meeting  
Tuesday, 8 March 2016 1330 UTC**

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio recording. 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.

Also found on page: <http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar>

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Good afternoon from Marrakech. My name is Wolf-Ulrich Knoben. I'm the Vice Chair of the Internet Service Provider Constituency, and we are going to start our meeting. Are we going to record this meeting -- may I ask? Oh, the record is on. Thank you.

Christian Dawson: We are about to start recording of this?

Woman: (Unintelligible).

Christian Dawson: Okay, it's recording and the lines are open.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you very much. So welcome to the session. I am Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, the Vice Chair of this Internet Service Provider and Connectivity Providers Constituency, and we have a time table of three hours.

So but before we start with the meeting, I would like to open for the introductions and I would like to have just a quick going around the table for introduction of the participants of this meeting.

I would like to start -- here on the left-hand side is Oliver and then we go around the table.

Olivier Muron: Olivier Muron from Orange in France, and I'm a member of the ISPCP.

Malcolm Hutty: Malcolm Hutty from LINX -- the London Internet Exchange.

Bastiaan Goslings: Bastiaan Goslings here on behalf of AMS-IC -- the Amsterdam Internet Exchange and participant in a relatively new platform DINL-- the Dutch Digital Infrastructure platform. Both of them -- by the way -- are not a member of this constituency.

Ariel Graizer: Ariel Graizer from CABASE and LAC-IX.

Toshiaki Tateishi: Toshiaki Tateishi, Japan NIC Association.

Lars Steffen: I'm Lars Steffen -- I'm with the ECO- Association of the Internet Industry.

Carsten Schiefer: (Carsten Schiefer) for ECIX- the European Commercial Internet Exchange is not yet formal member of this constituency.

Stanley Besen: I'm (Stan Besen) from Charles River Associates -- a newcomer to ICANN and I'm here because I'm member of the Competition Consumer Choice & Trust Review Team.

Tony Harris: Tony Harris from CABASE in Argentina.

Christian Dawson: Christian Dawson with the Internet Infrastructure Coalition.

Leonard Obonyo: Leonard Obonyo Telecommunications Service providers of Kenya, Internet Exchange of Kenya.

Oswaldo Novoa: Oswaldo Novoa of Antel, Uruguay.

Alain Bidron: Alain Bidron representing Orange and the ETNO. He's a member of the ISPCP.

Osama Tamini: Hello. I am Osama Tamini. I'm ICANN's fellow and I work for Wataniya Palestine and we joined the ISP and IC constituency last month. Thank you.

Carlos Rodriguez: Carlos Rodriguez, ICANN fellow and work for a telecommunications company in Nicaragua.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So thank you very much. I see also people sitting in - on behind, so if you don't mind you could approach a table -- so and sit at a table -- that would help us see you better -- and also to engage you if you don't mind.

And if you like throughout these -- just giving short introduction to yourself.  
Thank you.

Sara Bakkali: I'm Sara Bakkali, a newcomer. And I'm also a PhD student in the Faculty of Science in Morocco.

Vicky Risk: I'm Vicky Risk. I'm from ISC, the Internet Systems Consortium. I'm not a member of this constituency -- I'm an observer.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay. Thank you very much and welcome to staff as well, and thank you for preparing that meeting.

Well, I just heard from some of the participants here. They are not yet members -- so it's - so we have a process in this Constituency, so if somebody likes to apply for membership -- so they could refer to our Website.

We have a Website which is available for the ICANN Website as well. And so you will find a contact point where you can refer to -- so we would welcome any new member here.

And because we already talked and discussed with the Board about diversity -- geographic diversity -- as well as general diversity in all of the institutions of ICANN. And if you could help well, to enlarge and to improve in diversity, that would be very helpful.

Man: Can I add something?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Just a moment -- I would like us to ask the newcomers here coming in -- would you please take a seat here at the table. And please -- I would like to invite you just to briefly introduce yourselves here.

Ben Maddison: My name is Ben Maddison. I'm from a network service provider called Workonline Communications based in South Africa.

Renco Von Moek: Renco Von Moek, I work - I'm an independent contractor right now. I am on the Executive Board of RIPE NCC.

Edward Lawrence: Edward Lawrence -- also from Workonline Communications, Africa.

Akinori Maemura: Akinori Maemura from Japan Network Information Center.

Tony Harris: Okay, you would like - yes, we sent sign-up sheets and anybody who just came into the room now, please make sure that we - you sign into a - the sign-up sheets. And getting to the fact of enrolling as a member, I can make it easier for you if you want.

If you give me your card before you leave the room, I'll make sure that we get back to you with all the information so you don't have to worry about looking us up. It's just in case you're interested. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you very much. So looking at the agenda, which is well packed today, so we have just three hours for discussion. And I would like you to comment on the agenda if you mean.

So we have just to go through at just a point talking out the ICANN accountability and the IANA stewardship transition, which means to fix the position -- the very last position-- of this constituency towards what we are going to do on GNSO Council tomorrow.

This is not - should not be a discussion about the content of what has been done so far -- other than on the process. And so that you - I would give you an introduction to the process and that you can see what's going to happen.

And we would like to see that this is going to be passed. Then we have another item is on - we're getting an update by Christian about Universal Acceptance and the IEN implementation project so far.

We will follow up with the GNSO Review and specific ICANN's related to what from our point of view is still open and should be followed up and the activities so far have been taken - undertaken during the so-called - the session meeting in Los Angeles.

And then we have a - we could talk about the new meeting structure and the proposal which was made by ICANN with regards to the next ICANN meeting -- the - called B Meeting. This other point is well about GT - new gTLD structure and procedures which - process is now put on the way and the question is then, "How shall we deal with it in which way we are going to handle that?"

Nevertheless, at the end - so some housekeeping activities should be discussed in order to be prepared for the next calls. So I'm asking whether this agenda is there's any question to this agenda please – raise your hands. Tony please.

Tony Harris: Yes we have a request from the Japan ISPA in the room to present a subject, so maybe we can put that at the end of the agenda if that's okay.

Tony Harris: Would you like to briefly state what the title of your presentation will be?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: (Unintelligible) at the end, so it is (unintelligible) kind of presentation. Also, you are going to give it?

((Crosstalk))

Man: So now in Japan we have some - a program to slow network because of the Windows application.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, so we will come to that.

Man: Right, okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: But thank you. May I ask everybody who is taking the microphone to say your name so - in order that the others taking part remotely and that transcribes knows your names and that will be helpful. Thank you. Christian?

Christian Dawson: I have no additions to the agenda, but I wanted to know whether it's - whether we should acknowledge our remote participants -- we went around the room, but we didn't acknowledge who's with us online?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sure, thank you. We have remote participants here - actually it is - I'm not sure who is really remote because several joined here -- the Adobe Connect from this room. Can you help me...

Christian Dawson: Tony Holmes is here I think in that room.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Yes, Tony Holmes at least,

Tony Holmes: Yes. So just to confirm, Tony Holmes here. I'm a consultant with the BT and normally chair of the Constituency.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Thank you Tony. So let's start the first point -- ICANN accountability IANA Transition.

This is still the over-running item which is going to be discussed here throughout the entire ICANN meeting in various combinations of meetings in the constituencies on GNSO level on the - see the different SOAC level and it's - it is going to be expected to come to an end at the end of this meeting.

So the - as we have -- as the constituency viewing our calls in the past -- also discussed the different items on this. This meeting is not focusing on the content of proposal itself -- rather than on the process -- how this proposal is going to be handled by the GNSO where we are a constituency in.

And so to do so, I would - I have prepared some slides which describe the process themselves and I could - I would ask that you -- Christian -- to bring up the next slide. I do hope you can see that -- it's in Adobe Connect as well.

So but it's in Adobe Connect room as well, yes - so because, you know, it was complicated. So we started to discuss on GNSO level since Saturday -- for two days -- how we should deal with that -- the proposal.

Everybody knows that several groups are - or let me say in that way -- that all the groups are balanced in being unhappy with the proposal. So some of them may be more unhappy than others. And so they would like to express their concerns also during the voting about its approval.

So discussing - so the discussion centers then on how the council -- who is the body -- who shall vote on this approval -- shall handle this. And there -- in the end of the discussions came up this more or less about that - shall we vote on the package of all these recommendations which are on the table.

Or how we should deal with this -- which (had interest from some part of the GNSO to vote on recommendation by recommendation -- which from our point of view -- was not the favor of one because it could send a signal to the CCWG that there's something going on still.

But - and it's not - that the proposal has not reached the level of consensus which is necessary in order to submit this proposal to NTIA. So in the end, the council to this proposal here -- this process in several steps.

We have already reached a consensus on that proposal - this proposal itself - its process is not more under discussion. That is - it's got to be understood and the question is then for the counselors on the - how to vote on this -- and how to handle this.

So we are - Tony Harris and myself -- we are both council members and we would like - ask you as well to comment on the process and give us - to action if possible on how we shall proceed.

So the council meeting shall be tomorrow afternoon from 1:30 to 3:30. Today there is a deadline given where the council members I expected to declare any recommendations they would like to have sub-sectioned in the (unintelligible) roll call.

So up to now the process would be to vote on a package that is by today -- the council meeting in the evening. And a counselor comes up with some recommendations they would like to be voted on separately -- that is to be



concern today. And then that is going - then the counselor is going to discuss those recommendations separately tomorrow.

So the counselor is going in that way -- tomorrow that he will split up the whole packets in two parts. The one part is the parts where recommendations are not in question from any party. So if there's agreement from both - from all sides, then these recommendations go - shall be bundled as a package as one part of the package.

So we have in total I think 12 or 14 recommendations -- I think 14 isn't it? (Unintelligible) I think, so yes. So if for example, ten of them shall be out of question, then this would be one package -- one bundle of these ten. And the other ones shall be handled and discussed separately.

And then - so the discussion will then run around these separate recommendations. And at the end, there shall be a voice word -- voice words taken on those recommendations -- recommendation by recommendation. The processes in the council is beneath just simple majority on that -- which is complicated enough because of the council's structure.

But if there are questions from your side how that is handled, I can answer them. The next slide please. So the roll call shall then be on each recommendation.

If all recommendations are going to be passed -- that means if they meet the threshold - the - of the majority -- then council is going to communicate the approval of the proposal because, you know, there is one bundle which is where there is no discussion about -- and which is a post anyway -- and the other separately having been approved also.

Then this is communicated to the CCWG as having been approved -- plus any comments in written form which have been made by the various parties.

Everything adds to the - to three recommendations having been discussed separately.

So this is how the council is going to deal with that. Next slide please. In case - if one or more of these recommendations under separate discussion fail, then the council is going back and opening the whole package again -- and putting all recommendations in one package and put them on the table for last or for - on voting the council.

So meaning - okay, if one recommendation fails, then the whole package shall be bundled again and given to the council to vote on the whole package. And then the outcome of that voting is going to be communicated in addition with some comments related to any recommendation made by any party of the council.

So that is the way the council is going to handle. It took me also some time to understand that, so I don't know, but I - to have an (unintelligible) additional - do I have an additional or no - it's not? No you can go back. So okay, so that's the process.

So what I would like to achieve now in our discussion if possible is to under - any question with regard to - so - to that process in order to be - to make you fully aware about the - what is going to happen if you have any open questions to that process -- we would like to answer that.

In the end also, since there are several steps of voting possible on council, I would like to have an indication from your side if there are any problems with any of those recommendations -- some from your side -- any questions. How shall we handle ourself -- this process so that we have firm guidance from our council -- from our constituent members on how to deal with that?

And in the end, so we would like also to know on how to vote on that. So I'm - have the confidence that we can achieve that very easily, but I would to open

that -- the floor -- right now for questions, remarks, comments, ideas, directions -- whatever. The floor is yours.

Christian?

Christian Dawson: I guess I'm happy to step up first and say that you had stated at the beginning that we have achieved a result that everybody is relatively equally unhappy about. And I think that that is an indicator that we did our jobs.

And we have to balance our unhappiness that certain components with our desire at this point to enthusiastically support moving things forward. And that's what I believe we need to do here.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen: Tony?

Tony Harris: Yes, I think we should comment on something which - I'm sorry, Tony Harris for the record. We should comment on something that happened with our interview with the Board just an hour ago -- and which Malcolm spearheaded actually.

Wouldn't you like to say what the Board replied in your question, if you don't mind?

Malcolm Huty: Certainly, I'd be happy to if you check me out on the ISPCP (email) prior to that list, you will see that there's been - we've had some discussion and planning for that meeting on this question.

The question was essentially -- and to cut it a little short -- it's because of delay in transition because of politics in (D & GIA) therefore. Will the Board still press ahead with implementation of the accountability reforms? Will they use that as a reason to suspend implementation?

And we expressed our preference that they should implement -- we are -- I'm glad to say.

So Bruce Tomkin speaking for the Board and in the presence of Steve Crocker and other Board members -- said that they would absolutely be pressing ahead with implementation -- that they would expect to have achieved implementation before the decision was taken either way -- on whether or not to go ahead with transition.

And they did say that in the event that transition was refused by the US Government, they would have to review where they'd got to see if the refusal transition essentially implied renewal or repeated the IANA functions of the contract.

And they would then have to review it to see if it was incompatible with that new contract -- including whatever new terms the new - a future contract might have in it. But he did confirm that their review of the accountability reform would be limited to the extent of whether there was incapability with that contract.

So all in all I regard that as a very positive outcome -- it's basically a clear commitment to implement the report as prepared.

Christian Dawson: Malcolm, good job in your pressing of that issue and also in your leadership -- in the entire CCWG process. That's going to actually (unintelligible) yours in the CWG process.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes, thank you. Thank you Malcolm. Wolf-Ulrich speaking. So really, that statement from the Board, you know, it made me also very confident.

That - this is running the right way, so - and I think also that - that's just my expression that when they could make any - let me say statement which don't legally bind, I mean, in any direction.

So - but if an indication to the community how they deal with it, yes, and how they intend to deal with it -- I think it would also help the other parties in the community very well -- and I'm very confident that they are doing that.

Any further question with regard to this process -- the process itself -- on the GNSO is not - I would...

((Crosstalk))

Olivier Muron: Okay. No, I just have a question - I'm not sure I understand, that is the last Board that we in right?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: So there will be the following days a - in case, you know, in case we will have a split-up vote, it means in a package which is not in - not an issue -- and which is separate recommendation since there will be - there shall be a vote on each of those recommendations.

So - and then there will be no final vote about the whole package because then the whole package is done. So that means either communicate it to the CCWG that the proposal has been approved by the GNSO. But in addition, comments have been arranged -- they have been made in which inform shall be added to the - to this report -- to the CCWG.

This is also going to be happen in case one of the recommendations is going to fail because then the whole package is going to be voted on. And the communication shall be the same in the end. That means they - if the package is approved, then the communication will be - it has been approved and the comments shall be added. So that's the process.

Olivier Muon: Yes, it's clear. Thank you very much.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes.

Olivier Muron:: Am my complete?

Malcolm Hutty: Yes, what are the terms of the question of comments and other such statements? It's possible for individual counselors to make statements of this type that -- as comments that reflect their concerns or their constituencies' concerns on this issue.

It is also possible their not currently on the table for the GNSO council to make such comments. I would think that the - that in terms of in any such statements by -- whoever they're made by -- are likely to have a substantial effect on the process going forward provided that they are confined to statements of preference.

However, if there are statements of interpretation, that is essentially significant -- and certainly significant to coming from GNSO council as a whole. The reason is this -- the next stage from this is implementation. And the implementation process will begin with the CCWG's lawyers in cooperation with ICANN's lawyers in drafting bylaws to implement this package.

There will then be some review by the CCWG. Realistically speaking, the degree of review that the CCWG will be able to give to the implementation drafting by the lawyers will be limited because if legal language -- the lawyers' recommendation will carry a enormous amount of weight.

And the CCWG is unlikely to be able to be united in their interpretation that - of its -- certainly in united in their interpretation to disagree with what the lawyers have proposed. In fact, I suspect the CCWG will even struggle to stay on that they - the implementation is supposed to be about -- namely whether or not this actually implements what we have agreed -- and to stay off the subject of whether or not they'd prefer a particular thing.

So the lawyers' first draft will be extremely important. And when they write that first draft, they may - when they are likely to have to have regard to interpret your statements that chartering organizations make at the time that they pass their approval.

So should GNSO council -- or for that matter one of the other chartering organizations such as the GAC -- pass the state - pass the reports, but issue a statement interpreting an element of it -- that is likely to be quite - sway significantly in the minds of the lawyers.

So I think we should therefore think, "Are there any elements of potential ambiguity that we are specifically concerned about that we would wish to urge GNSO council to issue an interpreter statement at the same time?"

Although alternatively, are there issues on which we feel -- or we suspect -- the others -- and here I am thinking particularly from other chartering organizations the GAC now? (Unintelligible).

The - that we - that they might issue an interpreter statement we might tend to disagree with, but we would want to preemptively often deal with alternatives. We also told them this morning's CWG meeting that the IPC is planning issuing a statement about (unintelligible).

So we would need to think, "Do we need to be prepared for that? Do we need to have a view that might cancel some of the statements that they've made interpretatively?" Or certainly how will our GNSO council representatives react to a proposal from IPC -- or for that matter from the NCSG -- which is also possibly listening? Often interpreted statements -- do we oppose the inclusion of that? Do we counter it? How are we prepared for that eventuality?

I think these are matters that we need to consider then.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thanks Malcolm for raising these points, but it's really essential, I think, so - because it's just as in any such kind of projects, you know, you will still - every time have people who are on each other's side and try to consult their un-satisfaction to the next step, yes.

So in (undergoing) implementation right now, and so you - especially if you have - so a variety of different interests like governmental interests and the - and our interests -- commercial and non-commercial interests -- well, in the scene. So it's critical, certainly and it's questionable whether you can really achieve an (unintercritical) level of understanding.

However, what we could do -- what I understand from this process is the following. So tonight when we will have the council meeting and the informal one at 6 o'clock today.

So where the deadline is given that any party who has concerns could bring it to that meeting in written form. So - and it's expected that there will be no surprises tomorrow in the council meetings that additional interpretation is going to be given at that meeting on the spot -- but while then that - what already is available.

So we shall have time to look at this so I will immediately share that after it's available. So we shall have time and look at this and we can internally -- as on the list -- coordinate and discuss that - how we shall deal with that tomorrow -- so it will be helpful. What the GAC is doing -- we never know -- so it is expected that the GAC is going to a final comment on the proposal today. So we will be better informed tomorrow morning, I think so.

So that's the process and that's how I see how we can deal with it and it will be very helpful for - in case if - shall we have the opinion that one or the other comment or interpretation is not what we can follow on. So we put it to the table throughout.



((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Yes, so we have - I see Christian.

Christian Dawson: Thank you. So my first comment was going to be that we should make sure that we as a community know how we want to instruct our counselors to vote in each subsequent round. But given that we don't have all the proper information right now -- and that a lot of it's forthcoming -- it's going to be difficult to do that.

I think as an alternative, we definitely are clear on what we want the first vote to be. And I would feel most comfortable if we also empowered Malcolm as our most active leader on accountability in this to work directly with our counselors to help us form an interpretation of what the subsequent round should be after today's GOBG -- after today's call - GNSO call.

And I also think that because we aren't positive that there won't be surprises having that council in the room with you guys during the actual meeting would also be smart for us.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thank you Christian. Well, before we talk about if this is final direction rather than to be given others -- we shall see very clearly, you know, about this process and what could really happen to this.

So and - should do - should go through that step by step, so I'm really open and I was asking if it was a council member - if we would like to get comments on that -- how we should -- Tony and myself should deal with it tomorrow -- and do it.

So as it is a council meeting tomorrow -- so it's up to the counselors to vote and it's - it will be put for discussion on council level. So we should be prepared and be asking as council members -- you yourself to prepare -- as

we have to take the load, you know, to - in order to comment on that -- on council level.

So shall we not a big amount of discussion -- I think so -- and we should be clear about this process. So - but let me - let's go with there - are there any further questions or comments on the process itself -- and then we go for the next step? I see your hand - Tony? No.

Tony Harris:: Sorry. I'm the usher.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So, yes okay. I see you people stepping in, so please hopefully you find your seat here -- please take a seat. So I see Tony Holmes in the Chat -- he's raising his hand -- Tony please.

Tony Holmes: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. I did ask a question on the Chat. Certainly, we'll know tonight whether or not anyone has got any issues with the voting -- within the GNSO.

My question was, "Will we also know if they're going to make statements alongside that this evening or not?" So that's one question and just a couple of comments on other discussion that's taken place.

I think if we're going to have a small group to help make a quick decision or quick reactions on this -- on behalf of the Constituency -- it should certainly involve Malcolm -- but also it should involve Olivier and Alain, who have also been involved in putting together our comments on this as well.

So I appreciate -- it can be difficult getting hold of everybody at short notice. But if those three people are around -- and our counselors -- then we've probably got a nucleus of people who are involved in that.

In terms of stepping through the process, I think we could actually look at each step of the process. And we could ask ourselves, "How are we going to

vote at each part?" And we can say, "Well, if everyone's on-site, we vote this way. If there are some dissension voices, then we would probably vote this way."

Now it may be difficult to stick to that because we aren't sure of everything or every circumstance that can arise. But if we step through that, I think it gives a pretty good set of initial guidance for our counselors. So let's plate that as well as we can. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Tony. Any more comments, question on that? So then let's look towards the part of an end to these several steps and what - would - could be done so far from the present perspective.

So tonight each council member is expected to declare which of the recommendations they would like to have subject to an individual roll call. So tonight it shall be clear at the council meeting about that.

So I will immediately share to do - to the comments and then we are going for the discussion. In case it turns out there shall be recommendations -- which I invite you - which I expect there are some where people like to vote separately on -- then it's going the way that tomorrow at the council meeting.

The other recommendations which are not on the spot are putting aside - are be put aside. And the final three or four recommendations are going to be discussed and then going to be voted on.

So including the comments which will be - shall be on the table that time - though what I would like to have in this suggestion is -- Tony for you -- is well taken about to have this small group, you know, on experts, you know, available on short term on the list or whatever so that we can exchange our views on the comments and find the final - a final position of us.

So the first question would be about voting on the recommendations itself. Or the first question would be, "Do we have, from our point of view ,any recommendations that we would like to have separated from - on the package and to comment on?"

That would be first question, "Are there any recommendations we would like to see to be separated -- discussed and have already done?" That's my understanding there are no -- Tony, I -- is your hand still up or is it an old hand? Tony Holmes?

Tony Holmes: Sorry, it was an old hand.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you. So that's what I expected. So we don't - BVI in favor of voting as a package -- so we do not have any single one -- so that should be fixed. Tony Harris?

Tony Harris: Yes, Tony Harris. I'd just like to refresh where we were before this discussion. Our instructions were to vote for the entire package -- which our colleagues from the commercial side -- the IPC and the BC -- have also agreed to do as far as I know.

And I take that as a default position that there's some - that quick comment that we have to address this evening unless I'm mistaken. And getting to what will probably be the conflict between the IPC and the NCSG -- they had this discussion in one of our meetings.

I don't remember if it was Recommendation 9 -- but they were disagreeing about something on there, which - and I think these two comments will probably be between them and not affect our position at all. But I'm just speaking from what I've heard. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Tony. With regards to the potential single separate recommendations to be interest and to be voted on. The recommendations --

to fully make it understandable -- the recommendations as they stand at the time being, are not under discussion to be redesigned or to be - in any detail - - so they stand as they are.

So the question to us at first is - and this found - so and then I expect a policy answer -- are we happy or are - do we approve these recommendations? We do. Okay, so we do. So that will be the first question.

And now - then it's going to be voted on and so I understand that we get the direction to vote in favor. However -- I would say however -- so these recommendations are all subject to potential comment by others. So we are -- what I understand is -- so we are in line, well, to vote in favor of the recommendations.

And if it comes to the question of the comments attached to that, then there may be some discussion around that. Is that my understanding - my correct understanding? Malcolm?

Malcolm Huty: What you mean by discussion?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Well, the discussion itself, you know, the council is going to discuss the recommendations -- the status of the recommendations. And then there may come up some comments from the others. They would to have attached those comments. During that time, there is discussion about the comments.

So...

Malcolm Huty: I mean I...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So it should be...

Malcolm Huty: I am not terribly worried about statements of preference from others. Now if the IPC or NCSG say, "Well, we'll go along with this, but we really think that

there's a real concern here and we're not happy with that." I don't think that amounts to very much.

What I think is potentially significant is if any of them propose, "We support this, but we understand it to mean this." Because there -- depending on what they say -- we might be either very much in favor of that interpretative comment -- or very much against it.

And until we know what the suggested comment is, I couldn't really say.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay, Malcolm, my understanding is your process -- the comment -- yours -- shall not be part of the approval and the proposed one?

Malcolm Hutto: You know, what I mean is so those comments shall not be taken by CCWG or - I don't know -- how would I deal with that? But in order to submit those comments to the NTIA. It's not about submitting them to the NTIA -- it's about how they would be used potentially by the lawyers drafting the implementation -- that would be the concern because there are some things.

For example, that, you know, say I believe that there's already been the one specific one that's been on the table for some time now from Brett Schaefer's Heritage, that states that when - in terms of adjusting the threshold if the state - that it's understood that where it says these thresholds may need to be adjusted if the numbers (unintelligible) will change.

So actually there's - this is a statement saying, "We understand this to mean that this creates an expectation that they will be adjusted in the event that the balance has shifted." But there may be other proposals and others because we do not know at this stage yet.

We know that some people have -- in some courses -- have continued to advance other interpretations -- actually IPC and NCSG in particular. And if they do so -- if they opt for that to be recorded not as a statement of NCSG or

IPC -- but as a statement of the GNSO Council -- not as a rejection or concern or whatever -- but as an interpretive statement -- so this, we understand that this means X. Then there is the question of how that will be taken.

I haven't seen anything that precludes that from being considered by GNSO council -- if that is tabled. Now it's possible that the chair will rule that out of order if it hasn't been received by - or it hasn't been received yet since the time table said that the close for that process was 9 o'clock this morning.

But I don't know how that - and - would go and I -- and I say -- I think that this statement of impression -- I don't think's important -- well, not terribly important. The statements of interpretation are potentially critical and we need to very careful on that.

And so I would certainly - I think if it's possible -- if we can say for example that no statements that haven't been received by the informal meeting this evening should be considered. That would be something that I would certainly support.

So they gave us open nights at least to review them and to see whether we would wish to support them, remain neutral and oppose them. But I certainly feel -- given the enormous influence that the lawyers are going to have in influencing implementation -- in drafting the words that will make this happen.

I would feel very uncomfortable about being bounced into an interpretative statement that we haven't properly considered because that could have a real impact on the result.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you Malcolm -- very helpful. So I take his point to the meeting in the - later on in the evening and will express that view. My question is here in - if there are any point where this could affect our position on the recommendations itself. So that means when it comes to the vote about the

recommendations so that we have a - depending on comments - so that our business is pending or contingent to the - to those comments.

If there are any - is there any point where you think that we would not be in favor of the recommendations because of comments are going to be made?

Malcolm Huty: Well, in principle, the interpretative statement will sufficiently outline the standard, of course, it could completely change the meaning of the proposal. But I think that our proper response there is not to reject the recommendations -- but to reject the interpreter's statement, so that we can continue to support the recommendation.

And so then this, well, this interpreter's statement - we simply - well, we can't accept that -- we absolutely oppose it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Olivier?

Olivier Muron: Yes, I agree with what Malcolm said. I think we should try to minimize what (unintelligible) statement is going to combine the vote tomorrow. Because first I mean - as we see the diversity of the GNSO and if there are statements from some parts of the GNSO and then don't think that would be many statements coming from the whole council.

And what's expected really from the process is to say, "Yes" or "No" on the proposal, then that's exactly the vote we have to - the main vote tomorrow is to - do we vote for the package or not -- that's the only thing that we - very important to me.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Akinori, please.

Akinoria Maemura: I totally agree with how - with all we are responding. Meaning, meaning no comment here tonight. I understand that this, you know, that



recommendation by recommendation approach. The only thing as to, you know, represent some nuance of the constituency -- that's okay.

But what we should do is to lead the other constituency in terms of the, you know, the approving the - any recommendation. Then the expedite the process propose is not (unintelligible), you know, not slow down the process - - but expediting the process -- that's my point.

Christian Dawson: We have in the Chat that Tony Holmes is agreeing with Malcolm in his statement.

Malcolm Huty: It was announced to Wolf-Ulrich to - that - would anything cause us to vote "No" a recommendation and it says, like, "No, we don't vote no on the recommendation -- we vote no on the interpreter's statement." Yes.

But I think - I mean we could take it further -- we could say, for example, that to mandate our councils now -- the informal statements at the informal meeting this evening -- to say that it is now too late for any statements to be added on behalf of GNSO council.

And that anything that is added can only stand in the name of a constituency or of the counselor -- and must be made very clear that this does not reflect council's position in any of it because it's out of order to consider something early.

That's a possible position that we could take. Can I offer this group any (unintelligible) to whatever you would support that as a position for the counselor to take?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, we'd agree with it.

Malcolm Huty: Okay, thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you so much Malcolm for - we appreciate any supporting direction from your side in this regard. It is - it shall be an informal meeting tonight, so there is no question of voting about any process tonight. So we can clearly make sure and concern our positions with regard what we are going to do.

So there will be a kind of polling, you know, tonight to see where are the concerns. So - and also there will be a kind of polling about the whole package. So the (unintelligible) right there - so all this on the council is already voiced its questions. So we should also be with a question.

Are we supportive of the whole package? Yes, so there is some decision on that, so and we will really go that way and do this. Well, anyway for all of you here, so the very last one - so we are not - so if you are going to vote on this separately - so we will not vote. The consensus not vote on the whole package in the end -- if that, you know, if all recommendations pass.

So - and to be - well, from my knowledge with regard to council members on the council -- especially in the non-contracted parties house -- so it comes down to the question -- what is threshold question. So on that we have a simple majority to achieve.

So that means if one part of his house -- either the Commercial Stakeholder or the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group is voting against one of the recommendations -- this may be not enough because in case the Non-Com appointee is going to vote in favor -- then the motion is going to pass and we will have the majority.

So neither the commercial part, nor the non-commercial part has the power to - well, to offer-- bringing the vote to the majority alone, you know, by its own. So we need at least one around - one single vote from the Non-Com party and as far as I know we have invited also our Non-Com appointee to the meeting. So I think from that side there shouldn't be a problem so that's our expectation. Yes please Christian.

Christian Dawson: We have a need to reconnect - Mark McFadden saying that. I think what Malcolm just suggested is a very good idea. It is too late for the GNSO council to add statements. Instead there can only be statements by constituencies and individuals.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you. So I think we have a way to go so we are in support of any recommendations. We are in support of the whole package or separate recommendations but we will insist on closing the comment timeline by today in order to give the constituencies space available to think over and clear out their own positions with regards to that. I think that's a good way. Thank you for this discussion about this item. Very helpful and we shall deal with them. Thank you.

Our next item is Universal Acceptance, IDM implementation. I'm happy to have Christian here. So we shall give an update and you will be invited as well to comment on that with any questions. Please Christian.

Christian Dawson: Thank you very much. I am right now trying to switch the slide deck so it's going to be one moment on that and thank you for your patience while I do that.

I should be able to talk and work here. It's ridiculous that I - you know what - here's what I'm going to do. It is easier for me to switch the slide deck that has ideas and implementation so I'm going to go ahead and do that.

First I'll give you a general overview of the topic of Universal Acceptance. We're talking about the - we actually have a formal definition now so I'm going to use it - formal definition of Universal Acceptance which we did not have before. The process by which an email address or domain name is received or admitted is checked - wait a second. No, this is not it. It's right here. What does Universal Acceptance mean? Universal Acceptance is the state where all valid domain names and email addresses are accepted,

validated and stored, processed and displayed correctly or consistently by all internet enabled applications, devices and systems.

Due to the rapidly changing domain landscape many systems do not recognize or appropriately process new domain names primarily because they may be more than three characters in length or in non-ASCII format. The same is true for email addresses that incorporate these new extensions.

And so we're talking about making sure that the world systems are going to update to accept, validate, store, process and display all modern TLD sets. We're going to talk about the work of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group which is working on getting that done but I want to start by talking about another working group that I'm operating in on behalf of the ISPCP and that is the IDN implementation guidelines working group.

IDN is internationalized domain names. These are the non-ASCII code domain names. These are new domain names that are in Cyrillic or Mandarin or some non-Latin character script and it's very important that these domain names are able to be accepted, validated, stored, processed and displayed but it's very hard to get that done and make it happen.

And so the IDN implementation guidelines is trying to solve some big picture questions that will make it easier for internationalized domain names to be accepted. They are asking for our feedback and I want to very quickly go through the topics that they're considering spending their time on and I want to actively solicit the group before moving on to updating you on the Universal Acceptance steering group.

I want to ask if anybody has any opinions as to whether these things should be relevant and in scope for the idea and implementation guidelines group. The first is transition and terminology. So we're trying to identify terminology through label generation rules, relevant RFC's and additional IDN work at ICANN.

The second is the format of IDN tables, total machine readability format, little generation rules or LGR - the consistency of IDN tables, IDN variants, similarity and confusability of labels and registration data. These are probably things that are fairly highly technical for this crew which are probably coming to talk about policy today.

What I can say in general because I don't want to spend too much time on this is that if IDN's spark your interest - if it's something that you wish to engage on - and if you wish me to walk you through these various topics, I'm - I welcome that. I don't however want to spend, you know, 15 minutes spinning people up on highly technical topics in this room and bore everybody to tears when we should be focused on what it is we need to accomplish.

So if anybody does have - is spun up enough on IDN issues to know whether all of these things should be in scope, I would love to hear your thoughts and recommendations in that area. I'll pause for a minute to see if that's true. If not, I can move onto what's happening with the Universal Acceptance Steering Group.

Vicki Risk: This is Vicki Risk from IOC. I have a comment. It's not specifically to whether or not it's in scope but I'm responsible for probably the most widely used open source DNS software that Bind DNS system and I have been asking ICANN for any kind of funding or technical support to improve our IDN support and anybody who wants to lobby for such a thing - it would be welcome.

We accept technical contributions as well so if somebody would like to implement some improvements and contribute them, that's how open source works. We'd be happy to accept that. And I'm even aware of some of the specific problems that do need to be addressed.

It is a very complicated area for implementation so it actually really makes sense for a few people who are focused in this specifically to help improve all the implementations rather than ten different organizations trying to spin up that capability.

Christian Dawson: That's a very good point. I am a huge fan of bind and I didn't know that we were in the presence of a celebrity. Thank you for joining us. I want to talk to you specifically about this effort and I want to speak with you specifically about what it is we're doing in the Universal Acceptance Steering Group to see what relevant points of action we can have there.

There may be - either one of those groups may be good ways for us to engage ICANN with some of your requests. Tony Holmes says in the Adobe Connect room that it may be useful to walk through some of these issues in more detail on a future constituency call. I think that that's absolutely true.

What I mostly wanted to achieve by going through this quickly is if there was somebody who was really following what was happening, had certain desires with ID and implementations and saw something there that they thought should be out of scope or that they had a problem with - I wanted them to get a chance to raise their hand and kick and scream if they wanted to.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: I see Mark McFadden on the Adobe Connect. Mark please. Mark we cannot hear you. Are you on mute? Mark it looks very small here so your voice is also really small. We can't hear you Mark.

Christian Dawson: Oh he's - Mark writes in the chat room sorry, audio not working. I have a question about this for Christian. Earlier there was a working group in the UASG that focused on metrics and measurement. Has that been set aside or is this - is there a different focus? Metrics still seem important because you want to be able to have a data driven way to see if you are making progress. I do have some opinions about these six items.

Okay, so I do want to be clear. This is not the Universal Acceptance steering group. This is another matter altogether. And the specific goal of this working group is to figure out ICANN's role within - from policy - engaging in a policy perspective and a standards perspective when it comes to IDN implementation whereas the UASG is an outreach group. This is a standards group. And so we're trying to get what is happening with the USAG's outreach efforts in a moment. This is - these are standard efforts. Mark does that make sense?

Tony Harris: I have a question. Tony Harris speaking. Yes, this is Tony Harris. Hi Mark. Your question about the - was it the metrics committee or group that is still functioning in the UASG. It was offered to me actually to chair but not being a very technically efficient, it was taken over by (Mark Sponsarik). Mark is from Microsoft. I think that was your question and I'm not sure if Christian answered it. Thank you.

Christian Dawson: Thank you very much. We actually - we had a more siloed approach to how it is we were dealing with Universal Acceptance when we started out and we had a number of different sections where each individual group was going to have - going to have their own calls.

We frankly didn't have the level of participation necessary to run six calls and so we started working on - we started using single calls and single lists for most of the things that we - that we are doing in the Universal Acceptance steering group but we still have a few key people that are focused on metrics and measurement.

(Mark Sponsarik) of Microsoft has not only taken on the lead of building the CIO implementation guide but he is also the head of metrics and measurements and is working on - is working on that effort.

Mark McFadden says on this slide four and five might be out of scope. Well this is good information. I am going to be able to go back to this group and

indicate that we have one issue that is potentially a solved problem and two more that may be out of scope and I'm very comfortable reporting back to the group so Mark and everybody else, I thank you very much for your efforts in this. I want to...

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Just a question - just a question before we're speaking about - I'm not sure whether it's related to this. We had over the last years an effort within ICANN with regards to translation and trans-configuration of information. So it's - the question comes to me so is there any connection. Have you been - I know from some of the - some countries here talking about this effort to implement it or start with this so called project with regards to that.

These may be or these are countries using IDN's so if you have any interconnection between the service tools - so what we are doing with IDN implementation and those projects.

Christian Dawson: So far there has not been but we're about to near the stage where the answer is going to be yes, right. The Universal Acceptance Steering Group is - first let me give you a little bit more background.

The Universal Acceptance Steering Group started three meetings ago in Singapore and I'm a vice chair of the group. The goal is to basically go out and tell the world that they need to update their systems to accept all modern TLD's. That is basically the remit of the group. We're trying to get everybody who has a system that validates third level domains and, you know, to tell them that they're a lot more out there and that you need to - you need to modernize your systems in order to meet the modern needs of the modern internet.

And our goal is to convince them to do that sometimes with economic arguments, sometimes with ideological arguments only we haven't really done any of that yet because before we could embark on the outreach



component of our outreach endeavors, we needed to know what we were going to say.

So when I said we've now got a definition of Universal Acceptance and I read it out of this little quick guide, this is something that we spent a lot of time on trying to get the wording right. We needed to know what exact things were similar in systems that we could point to that people needed to look into.

If you want to go ahead and address a problem that exists on everything from peoples' web browsers to peoples' email clients - peoples' shopping cart solutions, the web mail forms that they have - it could happen in video games and all sorts of areas in which there may be Universal Acceptance noncompliance internal network systems. You're not going to be able to use - you don't have that many pathways that say well you do this step and then this step and then this step because software is so diverse - the ecosystem is so diverse.

So we've had to spend some time figuring out how to make recommendations that made sense across the board for people no matter what type of system they need to update. So we've done so. We have spent a lot of time on a CIO guide. We just had our third workshop. Each ICANN we have been doing a workshop on Sunday all day long where we're working on advancing the efforts of Universal Acceptance and during this week's workshop we brought a near final draft of the CIO guide to the community and we went line by line to make updates.

There were a significant number of updates brought to the community this time in the CIO guide and it was really remarkable to have a whole bunch of people in the room working together to make this highly technical document better. It was pretty cool.

In addition to that before - before this conference we were able to get a smaller version highlighting the topline issues and topline recommendations

out and I can pass this around the room for people to look at in paper but you can go online and find it now. It's the Universal Acceptance quick guide. I would send that around but I'll quickly walk you through it. So what we've got here is we talked about how Universal Acceptance is - you are UA compliant if you can accept, validate, store, process and display modern TLZ sets.

So, the quick guide walks you through each one of those. We've got recommendations around accept. We've got recommendations around validate - a number of them. Actually a validation is a huge issue. A lot of people validate like in a web form or something like that based on whether it's basically (unintelligible) or something like that or they may have a few more criteria in there but it's relatively ridiculous.

How many times do you try and fill out a web form and, you know, even a dot info address doesn't work. You know, we have ispcp.info as our web address. If we have ISPCP email addresses, there are lots of web portals that wouldn't work with that and that's been around since...

Man: (Unintelligible).

Christian Dawson: Yes, forever. It's been around for ages. People haven't updated their system. So validates a big issue. Store - we have recommendations there. Process - and I won't go through them but you can go online and you can take a look at each one and display. We have recommendations around all of them and some high level tips on being - becoming Universal Acceptance ready.

This is a good start for people that run systems to get their mind wrapped around what it is that they need to do and the CIO guide goes into a great deal more depth than this on each one of those subjects. So if you are - technically you are going to have some really quick start guides on exactly where you go to find the right standards and the right steps in the process to analyze your own systems and figure out what needs to be updated.

What you need to know is that we needed some content and some real recommendations before we can go out there and start talking to the world. Now that we have these - actually in about a month when we have the CIO guide - we're going to start being able to go out and do that. So we're at the end of the process right now of hiring because ICANN has given us a budget which is fantastic. They're supporting this effort.

We're hiring a PR firm. The finalization of what PR firm we're going to choose is still - it has not been formally decided and it won't be formally decided for another week or so but in early April we're going to start working with the PR firm that we choose and we're going to give them the goal of reaching out to the most critical people that we have identified that need to get this message and we're going to task them with doing that with our recommendations and content.

So I'm pretty excited that we're finally moving into the outreach section of the outreach group because it's been a long flight to get there and that's my big update.

I will say that a lot of the people in this room and in this constituency have helped lead these efforts and I want to - I want to give a shout-out to Tony Harris. I want to give a shout-out to Mark McFadden and Lars Steffen has been particularly remarkable in the efforts that he has put into outreach.

When I say that we have not been doing much outreach yet as the Universal Acceptance Steering Group, it's true because we've been waiting for this content but Lars hasn't been waiting. He's been creating relationships. He's been going out there and telling the world that these things need to happen and I really respect the efforts that you have taken and the leadership that you've shown in starting to ring the bells that need to be rung.

Man: So thanks very much for this comprehensive overview. Thank you Chris and thank all the other people that are participating in that process. My question

here is right now you are talking about recommendations this group has put to the table so these are recommendations not related to ICANN. They are recommendations related to, you know (unintelligible) the outside world - what they should take into consideration and what it shows mainly to my understanding it means that they have to take money into their hands and do something.

So did you get so far any reaction? So if you approach people and tell them we have a nice product here although if you would like to do it in this way, you would like that you going this and that way but it costs you something. So I would be - I would be - I would like to know what the reaction would be.

Christian Dawson: So what we've got right now is Maven's. Maven is somebody who sees value in something and wants to be one of the people that go out there and do it first. And Maven - they're giving us case studies. We're in the process of developing case studies and, you know, if we certain leaders in the community at our case studies for us saying, you know, we are doing this and we're seeing value, that's good. ICANN themselves - they're being a case study for us. Microsoft is being a case study for us and we are hoping to develop more case studies over time.

The truth is that it's really hard to make those - to make those - get people to go ahead and put their wallets and their time into doing these things and that's one of the reasons why we're hiring professional help to get it done.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you. Very helpful. So I'm going to - I don't know whether Mark your hand is still up or it's an old hand. It seems to be an old hand. I'll defer it to him, please.

Carsten Scheifer: Thank you Christian. I just wanted to know about the level of detail you would go down to talk to companies who are software manufacturers and (unintelligible) for example - got that level of outreach and compare say going to the workforce maintainers talking to them like the workforce maintainers.

There is a 40 email verification routine in Word Press version this, that and the other. Maybe you just want to do it the other way around like digging into the DNS for validation whether it has a valid (unintelligible) record present for that particular email address or the domain part of that email address. Is that the level of detail or is it more on the more broader level?

Christian Dawson: Oh no, it absolutely intended to get to that level of detail eventually. In our outreach we've - the goal isn't just to sort of blanket the world even though the world needs to hear this message. We have had to create a hierarchy of people to go after based on what we are seeing as the major issues out there and CMS providers to content management system of which Word Press is the biggest in the world - they are high on our list.

CMS providers are also high on my list for other reasons of things that we want them to update their systems to do as well so we are going to be doing that outreach with the help of the PR partners.

Carsten Scheifer: Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thanks very much. Any more questions to these presentations or question?

Tony Harris: Christian just has a question because I wasn't able to go to this meeting on Sunday - excuse me.

We have detected a large network in Argentina of 6000 - they call themselves sys admins and they go under the name of geek.la and they seem to be a pretty good target to get this message to because you've got people who are handling bank systems and portals and all kinds of different animals. Would these be possible targets for what you want to do?

Christian Dawson: Really good question. So they might be targets in a number of different ways. First of all once this content is out there - you've got the quick guide now but

you'll eventually have the CIO guide. Anybody can go out there and start to disseminate that information and try to spread the word. We're looking for as many people as possible to go ring as many bells as possible just like we were saying that Lars is actively doing on an ongoing basis. And we would love if people would do active outreach to those groups.

As far as the outreach that we're going to do as guided through the PR partners, it's going to - so we've got this sort of hierarchy. It probably fit into one of the first groups - yes of like associations of organizations that are affected - some place where we can sort of touch people once in a broad tech community and get a lot of hits. That's going to end up being an early part of the process.

One thing that I'd like to do eventually and it's not on like the immediate radar but maybe we'll get closer to it by the time the next meeting rolls around. I'll say Helsinki - can we say Helsinki yet? Okay, by the time Helsinki roles around is I would like to make part of what UASG does like getting - helping people in their own regions spin up panel discussions or summits to discuss this where we're going to get them the content. We're going to get it translated into their languages and we might even be able to gift them some funds to help them get started with, you know, some sort of thing that's going to activate their community but have them do it.

Like we don't want to go around and have like our limited resources go to a whole bunch of trade shows. I would rather it, you know, have all the stuff and empower other groups to do it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thanks Tony. So can we finish with that point? Any more questions? No. Thanks very much Christian. I think it's good well to have at any ICANN meeting and follow-up on this and be very close to that and there's much interest shown in this topic. Thank you very much.

So we'll follow-up with the next item which is about the GNSO review. Could you go to the - I think it's one of those - number five or so - the slide. Yes, thank you very much.

So some of you may know that the - so ICANN is undertaking reviews of its own organization and so the GNSO has been part of the organization is since I think almost two years it's under review of its effectiveness of its processes, policy development processes and so on. So and the question for this review is rather how to deal with that and this is one part of it.

So this review has been done over in by a consultancy company and independent advisor to ICANN in corporation with the GNSO community. So so far they have delivered the final report and there are I think around 35 recommendations of this report towards ICANN to deal with that and now it's up to the community that the working party (unintelligible) on that and to deal with that and then to structure it and to make recommendations towards the board and the implementation group dealing with this review - how to do that.

The status on this is that the group - the working party itself recommended not to deal with at least three of these recommendations but to reject them - object them because it seems it's not in line with this - our - with the - what the team is always thinking about. But still this is under a discussion process. It's possible it's not finalized. There will be an outcome I do hope at one of the next council meetings that there will be a road on which of these recommendations to be forwarded to the council.

So now but coming to the point it is all this review which has been done so far did not incorporate a structural review of the GNSO itself. That means taking into account all the concerns related to the composition of the GNSO, how it is structured in form in terms of commercial and noncommercial - no - contracted and non-contracted parties and commercial non-contracted stakeholder groups and so on so all these items have not been taken into consideration so far.

And there is also a push from our constituency during the last meeting in Dublin when we had a discussion with the board similar to what we had this morning to make the board aware that we are very keen on that to very soon start discussion on a structural review. Right now in between after that Dublin meeting and now there was a so-called non-contracted parties house - NCPH intercession meeting in (unintelligible) where the both parties of the non-contracted party's house and the GNSO sat together and discussed policy related aspects as well as GNSO review, structural review, aspects and how to deal with that.

And that was the first time that it was taken - this item was taken in a positive way by both parts - the noncommercial part and the commercial part and it was said, okay let's sit together and think about how we can deal with it within our house and what we can do towards making or making to developing a precision of this house in regards to that.

He was then seeing that the house may be too small well just to put a position to the table but it must be taking also other inputs from other communities within the GNSO, even outside of the GNSO which I am in contact - in close contact with the GNSO with regards to that.

So there is an effort going on and so we also make the board aware this morning about this effort and we were also requesting support to take into consideration when it comes up to the board or when the board is going to follow that process that we as a constituency have a very, very strong demand to be taken into consideration as a constituency, not just to be seen as a part of the GNSO or under a roof of a commercial stakeholder group because we are very diverse in certain aspects from the other parties which are in this stakeholder group.

Now I do hope this is taken well by the - by the board this morning especially by the board members given this structural affair. They're so called structural



improvements committee led by Renalia the board member and she was overtaken this way.

So we have to - what I would like to say here before I hand over to Christian - he was also very active in this respect - that we have to follow-up and to deliver something to the community in terms of what this house, the commercial partner and noncommercial partner is able to discuss and to deliver on that. It means we have to follow-up in setting up a common working team or I don't know if you would call it that. We have to be cautious in ICANN terms here to call it the right way.

And then we have to discuss all the matters and the results to bring up as soon as possible to this community - to the GNSO community. I will stop here so Christian if you have to add something more so on the status. Maybe also Tony Holmes: from the chat and then we can start discussion but Christian please.

Christian Dawson: I'll start with going ahead and reading Tony's comments. Tony says the first call of the non-contractor party as ad hoc group is planned for the end of March - final date under consideration. The plan is to appoint co-chairs from the commercial stakeholders group and non-contracted parties house and the call will be open to all within the non-contracted party's house or NCP is - I'm sorry. Do the CSC in there.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Christian Dawson: Okay so this stemmed out of a series of conversations at the Intersessional and Tony and Rudi who were leading the conversation did a good job of empowering - empowering me to actually go out there and try to build people a framework to do something about this and so I handed them back a draft charter to consider and Tony worked very diligently to try and get that up to snuff - something that would work to have the ad hoc group consider.

I'm very excited for his leadership in moving this forward - he and Rudi whose hands this is now in. And I'm glad that we had the opportunity to brief the board on it today and agree that there - it was good that we had positive response.

I wanted to highlight some of the thinking - my thinking as to why it's important that we look at structural DSO reform and I would like to actually raise a concern with this group that I don't want to necessarily raise on the - in the ad hoc group and I'll explain why in a second.

So one of the roles of ISP's is we're intermediaries. We hold content that is not ours for the - Triverse is our network but it is not our property. And sometimes, we are therefore, at odds when it comes to policy with the Intellectual Property Group who is often times trying to pin down intermediaries of which we are and trying to find ways in which to - in which to make it easier for them to track down their intellectual property.

Now I'm very, very sympathetic to the point of the people who have intellectual property on their networks that they need to protect but sometimes when it comes to implementation, we end up being at odds when it comes to policy. What we've got is a situation right now where we've got a house that is relatively divide and there's been a tremendous amount of gridlock.

Now and so we've got a situation where we often cannot have our voice expressed because IPC votes one way, ISP's vote another way and the BC is sort of stuck in the middle and if we cannot get consensus on anything, we never have a voice. That's a problem.

Now to the personal concern. Part of this I wish to express in the group once it's formed and part of it I'll keep within this community because it's our community's business and nobody else's and that is that my organization is the example of an organization that has a diverse number of members. We

house not only at a trade association that houses not only ISP's but also cloud providers, web hosting providers and data centers - also intermediaries. They don't fall into the definition of the ISP groups so I can't bring my data center and cloud guys here to participate in this group.

The BC is a relatively generic organization - and I'm not characterizing the group as generic in any sort of derisive way but it is for those people who generically operate businesses that use the internet and we do more than that. The data centers and cloud providers of the world invest in the resources of the operations of the network, in the same - in similar ways that we do and the non-contracted ones that are out there that want a home here - they don't really have one that fits very well.

One of the ideas that I have - one of my goals is to try and find them a home and there are a couple of ways to go about doing that. One is to actually start another constituency focused on those specific groups. There is - that's something that will be raised as a possibility when we're talking about GNSO restructuring.

The thing is if we have four groups within the CSG then we're going to get into a situation where we remained deadlocked because we've got, you know, two over here and two over here. I think that it could be a good opportunity for this group.

While we are - while we are trying to be leaders in driving GNSO reform to consider a community review of our own charter to take a look at the definitions and see if they're appropriate. Rather than building another constituency, it may be worth looking at other ways in which we can build our voice and build our community and increase it.

It may be something that we decide not to do. I would certainly advocate for it but I'm completely open to the idea that I may be a minority party in that. The point is that I would like to actively pursue as part of GNSO reform

addressing the concerns that we have about not having sufficient voice for the people that build the infrastructure of the internet that we are (unintelligible) invest in and my hope is that one way or another my concerns - the concerns that everybody else has around the room of not being heard is something that we can try and get through this process.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you Christian. I think several of our participants still have a similar problem, you know, with this - their clients in the backyard because we have associations like Echo so we are also diverse in this sense, you know, and not only just representing ISP's in the pure sense but others as well interested in all telecommunication companies for which, you know, this business is compared to their main business is very small part of it.

So it's reflected in the participation here as well, you know, very differently in a different way. So we - I wonder whether we can overcome that problem really so and how to do that. Well it could help and we should discuss it throughout this process really so and then find a way so all in discussion with others about how we can improve.

Christian Dawson: My - what I was formally recommending was that in addition to this group which is very needed and very important and that I'm excited to move forward to that I would never call for internal charter review of our group within that group. But I think that asking within this group - within the context of our own community - asking if internal charter review would be a sufficient and leaderly way to approach this group would be a good path forward. I think it might be.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, thank you Chris. I see Tony Holmes. Tony please.

Tony Holmes: Yes (unintelligible). I just wanted to make everyone aware that the starting point that's been agreed for this group going forward is around the slide set that was presented at the Intersessional so the starting point is to raise issues

that were on the presentation that was given there and to ask those questions.

In terms of certainly embracing more parties, that needs to happen. There's no doubt about that because clearly at the moment there are parts of the community that have nowhere to go. Christian's absolutely right.

One of the things we shouldn't lose sight of though is even if we did that - if we revised our charter overnight and said all these people are now (unintelligible) constituency, it doesn't solve any of the structural problems at all so the focus of this group should be to look at the structural problems and take that into account because if we go down that path, we haven't solved any of our problems whatsoever. We probably made it worse so just throw that into the house now. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Christian is that connected to that or because Malcolm's up on the queue.

Christian Dawson: I'm sorry. I do have a reaction but I can hold it.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, please.

Christian Dawson: My only reaction to that is I definitely don't - I think that this is the most important thing - what you're talking about doing - and I want to drive towards that.

One of the things that we get in each of these parties doing a charter review is we get clear delineation of who does what and for whom and that allows us to be in a better position to do property and SO reform because we're going to see the lines better than we see the lines today.

And so I think the goal of charter reform - a charter reform review committee or charter review committee - something like that - can be directly in line towards trying to achieve what it is you're trying to achieve.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay, thank you Christian. Malcolm please.

Malcolm Hutty: Yes, thank you and thank you Christian. That was a very thoughtful introduction to this subject and I think the two things - the two issues - the issue of our chart and the issue of how the structures and charters are being housed and (unintelligible) the GNSO - I think we did well considering them hand in hand.

We can't - I think that it would be dangerous for us to go into an open discussion with everything open about the future moving forward, the house and the GNSO without an idea of how that might impact on our influence and on essentially the politics of it and the alliances that we can form.

To offer just a couple more comments on how these things fit together as I see them - I think - I mean the - my vision as to what this group is for, I think we have a couple of distinctive features. If you look at the IPC, it's pretty clear what they stand for. They are the people that have problems with what other people do and they come here to complain about it and to try and get some mechanism so that they can get those things addressed, you know. It's pretty clear what they're about.

And just within this - the comfort of this group and the point of this group - quite frankly the NCSG is pretty clear what they're about as well. They're representing the interests of the people but the complaints weigh them out. They're concerned of some things like freedom of speech and due process and privacy - all of which are impacted by precisely the complaints that the IPC came along with.

Now where do we stand? Well we are the people that sit in the middle as intermediaries between these complaints and this is a common experience that we have in disagreements between the NCSG sort of people - the sort of

people they are - the interests they represent and the IPC group outside of ICANN in ICANN context.

But we have also something else in that. We are also entities that when things break, we have to face the consequences and we have to pick up the pieces and we have - we get the calls from the customers saying that this isn't working for me and even if it's not our stuff that's broken, we're still the ones with the customer relationship and we still get the calls and we still have to handle that and that's significant but think about how that lines up.

What that means is that in some respects, you know, sometimes we have to - with a particularly sort of adventurous IPC demand - we might be more sympathetic to the NCSG types with a particularly aggressive human rights interpretation. We're more sympathetic to the IPC guys but also sometimes we're not either of these things, yes.

The registrars and registries are both intermediaries that have demand put on them like us to the (unintelligible) not the subject of it and there are also people that get complaints when things break. So while the distinction between contracted and non-contracted is very important in the ICANN context in terms of certain things, particularly how you relate to the organization itself and the particular (unintelligible) you have to put on in order to affect change at ICANN.

Actually I think that there are times when we would want to be building a common cause on a particular issue with the IPC or with the NCSG or with registrars and registries but within the CSG and house structure we're actually limited in doing that and that I think is a problem.

I think we would actually have much more influence if we were - had more freedom to be able to be in the roll to which I think naturally comes to us which is somewhere in the middle that actually acts as a balance and preserves the balance in these things. And so well this makes sense. Why

don't we do that? No, that's going too far. Why don't you need to stop there or that's out of scope?

We have I think a very valuable role to play in that and the structure that we have impedes that and so I would certainly welcome the opportunity to review that structure so that we were able to play that role more effectively and I would certainly be open to the idea of reviewing our own charter so as to more clearly be able to welcome people into our group that were part of those core interests so that we could build that together which is - I think we are somewhat limited at the moment.

Now I don't have solutions to this here. I wouldn't dream of that but I thank you for bringing this up. I would say that if that - if this group shares that interpretation of what we're for and where we would be best placed to evolve and to develop to improve our influence within this community then we should be possibly a little - certainly (unintelligible) review but very careful how we approach it so as to insure that we actually advance that position rather than end up being further marginalized in a way that (unintelligible) I think a new constituency. I would regret if there's a need for that.

I would hope that we were able to insure that all those interests were properly represented and we had a part in that without the need for that. So I mean (unintelligible) but I think we need to have a little bit of a vision and an eye on the prize, the opportunity to actually do more and be more influential in this community. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thanks. My comments. So before I give the floor to Tony Holmes and then some comments from Tony Harris just to make a long story short for me to - I would say we are blamed anyway because we are the closest one to the users who are - who get any access to those services and to the networks where the (unintelligible) is run on.



So this is anyway a problem to us so and I don't see - not yet anyway - to overcome that problem by restructuring reform. So we say that we are a little bit so here in this environment - in the ICANN environment, you know, where the business and the interest is a little bit in the side - on the side of our main business and maybe but we should discuss that. We should bring it up.

And one of the points I would point out here is how are we going to organize that. I have - there's one point here - one bullet point here called BOF on future on the GNSO, which is a session which is going to be provided or is organized by ICANN tomorrow. It was discussed as well today.

So what we don't like to have is that this discussion is taken away from us, you know, and this is what we are a little bit confused about how ICANN is dealing with that and I raised this point this morning to Renalia and I think it's taken that this is an approach which the community is doing and performing by themselves in the first - in their first approach - and then it's the question how to implement that.

So we will make this point tomorrow morning in that session. So just while Tony - pardon me?

Tony Harris: Is there an opportunity to get ahead of that (unintelligible)?

Malcolm Hutto: Right. Is there an opportunity to get ahead of that if you think of this box potentially getting away from this? Should we be doing - realizing that this is coming up even if we - even if we start that box and starting maybe a review group or a working group or something to consider how we should approach that ourselves. Is that a possibility?

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Well it's fully open. I don't expect that this is an ongoing work so it just started so it may be a platform to discuss that. So you will see reactions and we can also react on that tomorrow morning.

Macolm Huty: Oh, I didn't mean that actual. I meant within this group (unintelligible). It's rough to create some group that would come up with some ideas as to how we would approach these developments.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sure. Sure so if that is required, you know, we're just starting a little bit from coming from the Intersessional so we do it with the other parties but if, you know, I would appreciate if you have volunteers, you know, also, you know, he did already provide some input here for the structuring and how we do that.

So if there's some input where we - which could take in here internally in our group so I would be happy to do so. So maybe I can turn over to Tony Holmes: and he might have some ideas to that. Please Tony.

Tony Holmes: Thanks Wolf-Ulrich. I do have some pretty firm ideas around this. I think that we are potentially getting in a situation where if we're not very careful, we could actually find that we start floundering on this.

As a Constituency we are in no position to go into that box with any constituency views and trying to do something at the last minute is not at all helpful.

The reason we setup the group within the non-contracted party's house is because they are the part of the GNSO that has problems, we have programs on the CSG that have been pretty well articulated, I think, by Christian others. They have problems on the non-commercial side. So, we have a different set of issues but the overall problem is the same. That the current structure isn't working with them.

And the dangers of going into this both, if start expressing views from our constituency or even from our house is that we are going taint, and temper, and alienate potentially some of the people we need to work with, who are on the commode - non-commercial side. So as a constituency we certainly

shouldn't be going in there and expressing any views whatsoever. If people want to put their own views in, that's fine, but they should make clear that it's their own views because we're going to have to move forward quite carefully on this.

I'm absolutely convinced already that the solutions that we would want to put forward probably aren't going to be well received even within the commercial stakeholder group overall or even within the non-commercial part. And it's a shame the other side, I think some of the things they'll want to see we'll struggle with.

So, we've have got to handle this carefully, we've have got to go forward in the right manner. And the problem with this box is that we didn't ask for it, it was setup by ICANN staff. They're now expecting us to participate and at the constituency or at the house nobody is in a position to go in there putting views. So, I would urge caution on that and we need to treat very carefully. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, I have two last comments, is from Tony Harris and from Christian. Please come in.

Tony Harris: Yes, Tony Harris. I've been around in ICANN since it was formed and before that, 1998. And I've always felt that we have been a little bit disenfranchised or perhaps not recognized as a sector. I mean, we're the infrastructure, right? If you add LTE operators, ISPs, and connectivity providers. And we're sitting at the table with some groups of people, that are perfectly respectful in their opinions and positions but, I mean, the size of what we represent is so different, it is a different scale.

And basically the critical result is that ICANN has an admission to coordinate, run on our infrastructure. If that's not there, the critical resources are useless. So basically, I can say my personal agenda -- let's call it that, I don't think we should take this forward in this instant -- I think that in the future we should be

positioned a level higher as a supporting organization and audit constituency. I am sorry, I am a little ambitious, but I do think that that question should take place sometime. Thank you.

Christian Dawson: Christian Dawson. I don't disagree with you. I think that what we do is extremely important. We build the infrastructure of the Internet, it's extremely important. I completely agree with Tony, about how we need to handle (this) - I'm sorry Tony Holmes: about how we can get to handle Birds of a Feather. That is - and my goal, my primary goal is to engage and resource and be respectful of the process that Tony has laid out with the charter that I help put together for this group.

And to work lockstep with the rest of this community in order to achieve exactly those goals.

My goal in trying to add that -- I believe a - even and informal group -- put together to examine internal charters. Will - I believe would have the opportunity - give us the opportunity to strengthen our voice. My - I do have - one of my many agendas at ICANN -- most of which are focused on trying to drive forward the good things for this community -- but one of my goals is to find homes for the rest of the people that built the infrastructure on the Internet, the rest of the people.

When Malcolm described the Internet operators, and when you described the Internet operators, the other people that I'm trying to find a homes for, they met every single one of those criteria. And so my belief is, that even an informal group that just sat down and tried to make internal recommendations to our internal community to quietly talk about this issue before I need to go find a homes for them elsewhere by - and in a way that might be more disruptive and potentially creating a new constituency -- muddying the waters even more. I think it can aid us in these goals.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Thank you Christian. Tony, is this an old hand? Or still up?

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: No, I came back in.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Pardon me?

Tony Holmes: I'm back in the queue buy maybe you should let Malcolm go first. Thank you.

Malcolm Hutty: Tony, I must say I agree sort of 200% with everything you just said there about the concerns of this BOF. The idea that this discussion is going to develop before we've got ourselves a position or a view or even a vision amongst ourselves as to how we would like this to develop. It's very worrying and that's sort of thing that could get us -- as you say -- it's mishandled though even - or even almost if not mishandled just is inherently dangerous position for us.

But it - I do see an opportunity though in what Christian is laying out but, you know, if there - if this discussion is getting started then handle it well. It could be made into an opportunity for us. But it needs us to do the work and we can't be in a position - I mean, it's the also the same that this keeps being thrown there, I cannot completely be on board with that. But, this isn't a subject that's just going to go away.

And we keep silent forever than other people will make the decision. So we need to, I think - everything that you just said Tony, I agree with it completely but it seems to me it speaks for the need for us as a group to start thinking about what we would actually like - how we would like to see this evolve amongst ourselves -- not amongst everyone else but amongst ourselves -- to get our own view point together.

And I would be, actually, I'm increasingly keen on the idea the more I think about it. The more the discussion goes on, that we should get together and

start thinking about that for ourselves and get ourselves in a better position. So, that we - this box turns into a future work program -- or something like that -- we've got a clear idea of what we're about and what we want to achieve.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks Malcolm. Tony please.

Tony Holmes: Yes, thanks. I think Malcolm and I are in agreement. And I think Christian and I are in agreement on most of it as well. But we need to think about what we're doing here because Christian raised the issue of having some entities if you have nowhere to go -- and some of those are his members and he obviously has a concern about that, and it's justified concern.

But at this stage opening up the charter and reviewing our charter in ways that potentially put those people into the constituency is too far ahead of the game. Tony mentioned, for instance, that there's another way of crafting this. And one of the issues we have around this is that currently with sit within a commercial stakeholder group, we might want to think about totally different model where we sit within an Infrastructure Group.

So, opening up the charter and reviewing the charter and pulling other people in by making that charter wider it solves the problem for everybody else but it doesn't solve the situation that we're in where we're still part of the CSG. So, that - there will come a time where that needs to happen but it's far too soon to start looking at that as an option before we've explored other structures and other ways of doing yet another linkages with outer groups as well.

I think some of the points that Christian made about the relationships we have with other groups -- or it might have been Tony -- but that's pretty much a very valid part of this discussion. So, yes, there will come a time when we need to look at that. But that time isn't now and we shouldn't be herding down that path before we've had a wider review looking at the potential

relationships with other parts of ICANN, looking at the way we work, looking at potential other structures, and pulling other people into that argument.

Because if we start to go down that path it may solve one problem but it certainly isn't going to solve the biggest problem that we've got which is about representation from this sector. So again, just a word of caution there.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoen: Thanks Tony. I think this a good start, you know, really to be discussing. We should allocate some time during our calls, next calls for - to these items specifically, I would say, you know. To make it more clear, so on how we are going to deal with it and also in terms of activities you just started in order to have first call within the NCPH about that and so. Then we could really make our position on that. I think that will be helpful if you do that in the future. I don't think we can solve it that way, yes.

But for me is the question right now, is how we shall deal it with it both tomorrow in this session. So, I have got a feeling so in discussing that with Renalia- this between now (unintelligible). So there are also still different views on that, so those stuff that all - (unintelligible) David has told me that he's following our approach and all and Renalia told me she seems to be stepping back from her platform where in detail things are going to be discussed.

And we now we have, seems to be stepping back a little bit, you know, from an idea to have a big platform where all these things are going to be discussed because he realized that some confusion in the community about that, how shall we (see) is that and the somebody would like to push also. So, it might be tomorrow but the setting shall be that way, then nobody is going to sit on stage, you know, just everybody is giving statement to this kind, more general statements. I could do that on behalf of ISPCP.

Not going to the details, just laying out these things but everybody knows about that, that we are dealing with that in the non-commercial parties' house

and it's part of that house. It also has - it's doing some plans or some deliberations about that in this way. So, that they see there's something going on, so - but the mature message towards ICANN should be, "Don't bypass the community approach." And so, we are going to deal with that. So, that is a great in general. I would like to end - come to an end of this topic. But Tony, you may have the last comment to that, please?

Tony Holmes: Will you referring to me or Tony Harris?

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, well your hand is raised. So.

Tony Holmes: Sorry, that was an old hand. No, but just I will take the opportunity to say that I endorse so much of what it's been said here, we do need to spend a lot of time getting our heads around this. And I would suggest that in addition to our constituency cause, we need to setup a call on this very urgently, I think, to have an internal discussion. Particularly, as we're going to move forward within the non-contracted party's house group. So, if you leave that with me, I'll speak with Chantelle and we can setup a date to have that call. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Great thanks, thank you very much. So, we are I think not too bad in time here. But let me take the opportunity that in between that came a lot of newcomers in so if you are not known to our community here. So, I welcome you all to this - to us here and take part in our discussion. So, it's really amazing, so that you have so much participation here. Thank you.

So let's go to the next point which is - oh.

Christian Dawson: Adiel wants to say something.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes. About that. Please introduce yourself and comment please.

Adiel Akplogan: Yes, thank you, I just want to make the quick comment. I'm Adiel Akplogan, Vice President of Technical Engagement at ICANN. I have - I'm very, you



know, pleased to see the discussion that just happened because my first contact when I started was with a few people from the ISPCP -- Tony, the two Tony's, and also with Christian -- about how we can make the ISPCP play a more active - you know, as (unintelligible) within ICANN.

And because it's something that, I think, it's important, not only because I was in ISP myself and contract with ICANN back in 2001 within the ISPCP but also because I believe that the ISP have an important role in all of this. And I just to say that, in my responsibility at ICANN, if there is anything I can do to support such an effort, I'm very, very more than happy to support, to work with you. Also that it's evolved into something that can positively contribute to policies that are coming from other constituencies but also guiding ICANN with its role, sometime technical related to this policy. Thanks.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you Adiel, very much appreciate it. So, I see you in this capacity here around, thank you very much. And we are happy about to - to engage you, as well as in other needs we have here. Thank you very much.

So, let's take the other - next point is, we are talking about the next -- is this new meeting structure?

Christian Dawson: Yes it is.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, so, we do have one slide. I think so. Yes. And maybe, if that is (finished) we can also refer to the presentation which was given - we have in the background, I think so -- did I send it to you? It's taking on the other - but just let me ask for - if it is needed or not, you know. What is behind this topic is ICANN is standing a new meeting structure which was discussed, you know, the development of that structures since two years or more.

The meaning that the so-called B Meeting, which is going to take place -- it's the second one in the year -- it's going to take place this year in Helsinki, should be of a different structure as the other meeting used to be. So, that

meeting should focus on policy development and related activities mainly. And should - in this regard encompass all the so-called SO-ACs, supporting organizations and advisor committees who are dealing this policy development.

And they should be given space for these communities to discuss internally their issues, policy development related issues, as well as to interact with each other and to give floor all (unintelligible) in a kind of -- what's it? -- town hall meetings, to present their views on policy related issues. So, this is - has been presented by staff, you know, but it was elaborated in a working team or a meeting structure in - together with these communities thereof.

So, it was presented that it should take place in Helsinki and should have a duration of, I think, four days, you know. Each day giving a different direction of discussion, may be inter-related or intra-related to the groups or just related to the different constituencies. So, discussion started already here in this meeting whether this is applicable or not.

There were concerns raised that it might not time enough there to discuss matters that something is going to meet, especially some kind of meeting which the GNSO usually takes bigger meetings or the so-called weekend meetings. They have to hold a discussion of all the policy related aspect stuff that's in the GNSO. So that, this is going to fail and (unintelligible) to do so. So, there's a lot of discussion

And there are the arguments coming across from others, especially who developed them, say, "Okay, let's test it right now before we are going there to get rid of it." You know, so it's planned which has been developed as a community and why shouldn't we go with that? Test it, learn from it, and the decide later on to accommodate or not.

I understood from the presentation made that there is still potential change to extend that meeting by one day in order to meet the requirement for the so-

called GNSO weekend meeting. So, that would mean that it could start then on Sunday and last until Thursday, the week of the B Meeting. But this is not taken as a decision right now, I think, I understood that the staff and all of the board is collecting opinions on that and if they push ahead there could be a change that they accept it and it's going this way.

So, that is in brief the - an explanation of what's going on and I would like to open the floor on questions on - opinions, comments as usual, please. I see, two, yes. Are you from staff?

Tanzanica King: Yes I am.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Oh, yes, as before, I gave you the floor. So please, (let's give a welcome) to staff and take in on this, thank you. Yes.

Tanzanica King: Hi Tanzanica King, I'm asked - yes, no, no worries, you took a lot of pressure off me -- I'm Senior Manager at Meetings. The meeting will not be extended but the four days which before had one full day of outreach, that day of outreach we're not going to be doing specifically in Helsinki, not moving forward always. So, that will be an additional day that you will have to get your work done. So, that's to answer that for us, I think you covered everything else pretty well.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you very much and sorry about that, not to introduce you, Tanzanica King from ICANN Staff and dealing with - preparing all these meeting structures. So, fully understand, the meeting, it stays as four days? Meeting but, you know, entirely is one day is going to be restructured at the end?

Tanzanica King: Correct.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay.

Tanzanica King: So, it's a total of four days all for policy work, so there will be no welcome ceremony, no public forum, no high-interest topics. All of the time we'll be there for policy work to get done.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: All right. Okay, thank you. So, Tony Holmes are you still on the queue or not?

Tony Holmes: I don't think I am not because my question was about the extra day and not we're not having that, so I'll spare down. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, next on is Malcolm, please.

Malcolm Huttly: Yes, my question is, if groups such as constituencies or indeed others, would wish to have a meeting before the meeting starts, is ICANN able to (unintelligible) at least putting side room bookings?

Tanzanica King: So we are committed to not doing pre and post meetings. Part of the reason of the new strategy was developed by the community, was to try and eliminate all of the extra days, no breaks, no enough time for networking, a myriad of things. And so one of those things for us is to eliminate the stretch, so, you know, where we have a six day meeting (unintelligible) it turns into eight days. Four meetings in four days turns into six. So, the idea is to get all of what needs to get done during those four days.

Malcolm Huttly: So, if groups wish to meet more than they do at the moment, your recommendation then is for us to push for more intersessionals?

Tanzanica King: It's not to add more, and to work until midnight to do webinars, to do a lot more work ahead of the meeting. We know that face-to-face time is the important part of the ICANN meeting but it's to - we think by eliminating so many extra things that were causing conflicts and issues and creating a new schedule, it's going to be new, it's going to be different. But though, you should

be able to fit a lot of work into those four days without all the other distractions.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thank you very much, Malcolm I do have, not a question, but a comment. We also would like to talk about the locations and that it's just (unintelligible) impact on decisions, locations. So, we thank you very much, you know, the - has been seeing, you know, you put a lot of effort to shift the Panama, where else in the world? So, yes, so and you did it very well. So, and as I (unintelligible) from many people they appreciate it. Helsinki is located the next location for the next meeting. So, thank you very much on your efforts on that.

But there are still, you know, comments on the question which we got to (unintelligible) week or the meeting is it going to, you know, all these bias, affections. So, is there any discussions still going on that or is that fixed?

Tanzanica King: So, at the moment we don't have any plans to change Puerto Rico but it is a distance out. So, it's just a discussion that's still ongoing that we'll see - still continue to pay attention to what's happening and obviously address if we determine there's an issue. So, we'll be working with our host and everyone else to figure that out. But for now, we're still going to Puerto Rico.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes, Tony Harris? Please.

Tony Harris: I hope you don't cancel Puerto Rico, but if you do, don't send us to Iceland, maybe we could go to Miami or something like that.

Tanzanica King: I'll do my best.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, do you have - is still Tony on? Tony please.

Tony Holmes: Yes, thank you. Just a question which I probably should know the answer to but I can't remember. The meeting that was planned for Puerto Rico, would

that revert to a meeting or is that a meeting C? Which is another new version that we haven't had.

Tanzanica King: Puerto Rico is a Meeting C, so it's an extended meeting, it's seven days. The additional time is supposed to be for more outreach and capacity building.

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you very much for joining us Tanzanica. Thank you very much, yes, very helpful. So, the next topic is new GTLD subsequent procedures. This has been around for a while in ICANN to develop a array of how to do this at. And I just would like to make you aware about what's going here and then we should briefly think about it here in this round whether there is an interest rather to participate in that, because it's just at the beginning of the discussion.

So, if you look at this - what is is about there is a PDP has been a Policy Development Process, to develop and process has been initiated by the community well to build this, the subsequent procedures on the implementation of new GTLDs. And so, there was just - there was - as it used to be on GNSO level, and issues report and then report what shall we dealt this. So, next slide please. It's coming on or not? So, this is the (unintelligible) slide.

Christian Dawson: That seems strange, that it's the next slide.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay but, so...

Christian Dawson: Oh see, I see what the problem is, here we go.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you. A state of this is there has been a working corp established, a cross community works group, I think so, yes. So, were interested parties can take part and we have, there are no names here for

this - for the leadership of Avri Doria, Jeff Neuman and Steven Coates here. And so, it is now in a status that this work group takes up about to develop a PDP on the issue itself and well, organize its work and reach out and to the SO-ACs for participation and for input in that.

So that is more or less the coverage and statehood of this work group. The question is here as ISPCP, as any members here so, this is work group is open for participation, is there an interest - well it is definite of interest of the whole community is to ship the interest for us, well, that we should think about to send somebody as member as this group. SO, this is my question here and I'm open about - waiting for discussion on comments here.

Any idea, any opinion? There is not - well, it's not a must but to participate is just a question so for that - I think it could also belong in that way just to get on the mailing of that group, that is normally the case. But if you're interested you can do that, you just approach the secretariat or the leaders of the group so you will be on the mailing list and that will be also in us, so. And that is of concern to us, to one - to some extent somebody could or report to, you know, so we can invite people of this group now to report on us.

So, I don't see at the time being a prominent necessity about to appoint somebody here. But so, I'll leave it up to you about to join and - from the information appoint with you the list of this group. Thank you very much. Do we any comment on the Adobe list? No. Thank you.

Going over to the next item which is housekeeping. Yes. Well can we, maybe just change the boast topics, AOB, and housekeeping. Because housekeeping is more, one some more internal things so in to do so. But we have - I have heard on the AOB if you - if we go through that topic right now. I thought we had a request and our gentlemen here, well to give us some specific topics, some insight.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Please come to the microphone, do you have a presentation also? I ask you - to whom – Christian, who are you? (Unintelligible).

Christian Dawson:(Unintelligible) a presentation, I guess I can...

Man: Yes.

Man: (Unintelligible) certainly.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay perfect, you can take a seat here. Can you get it there?

((Crosstalk))

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Just introduce yourself please.

Toshiaki Tateishi: My name is Toshi from Japan's NIC Association. So, today I want to make a short presentation about applied projects in Japan and if I - if possible I try to share, I accept your opinion and questions. So, next please. So, this the Japanese (unintelligible), so now - sorry, the number is not easy read. Now 4.4 terabyte 2015 (unintelligible). Download traffic is 4.4 terabytes and upload traffic is 1.2 gigabytes (unintelligible).

This is the total download traffic has increased 53.4% over last year. Upload traffic is increased 35.5% over the last year and (unintelligible).

(Unintelligible) is Japan's (unintelligible) provider that's (unintelligible) in 2000, (Amemba) is more than 150 companies. More than 100% - a 100% of speed increase including big (unintelligible) at this. For example in the communication (unintelligible) adjudicated, yes, (unintelligible) and local, small (unintelligible) few of those (unintelligible).

(Amamba) ISP has many complaints about the slow networks at a specific time and date from customer maybe about last Spring. So, we detected update traffic was increasing now. Then we tried to talk (Microsoft) Japan to



make improvements but the (unintelligible) that Summer as you know the (Windows) (unintelligible) rate has occurred and July, that's you know. (Unintelligible)

Then we made a question here to the (Amamba) ISP, so the left upper one is Windows update, 31% ISPs had congestion and complain from the customers. And only congestion but no complain 27%, nothing happened 32%. But Windows (unintelligible) from the (unintelligible) complaints 32%, and only condition (unintelligible) 29%, nothing happened 21%.

At about iOS, you upload. Condition, compliance, (unintelligible) and those complaints from customers 70% and only condition 34%, and nothing happened 42%. So, increasing of - as you know, the increase of the (unintelligible) Windows update and Windows (unintelligible) more than 60% as been reported is congestion and half of them have complaints on the customers. And about iOS, the collection was (unintelligible) but not complaint for now.

So, why the congestion happened? The point of the condition. Many experts think that the point is flat network, a point of (unintelligible) which operated by an (MPD) bandwidth but the network (unintelligible) Japan, especially the (unintelligible) network that are different from the countries. So, do we think is the thread point - thread (unintelligible) is hold the next (unintelligible) would come out in the near future.

So, them - so this is upload down - and download traffic from Monday through Sunday. The left one is (unintelligible) traffic so (unintelligible) - I'm sorry, next one. Sorry, next one.

Christian Dawson: Next slide?

Toshiaki Tateishi: Next slide. SO this the download and upload traffic. The left one is download traffic - I'm sorry all still Chinese character, the left side is Monday and the -

Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday and last one is Sunday. So, the traffic up and down day by day and by the time. So, you know, at night time the download traffic is getting the low and the upload traffic also.

So, the traffic is (unintelligible) by the human activities, you know. So, but the generation will, as you know, (unintelligible) generation will come something happen. So, next please. The traffic is - constant increasing as, you know, streaming videos, and mobile (unintelligible) cameras increasing (IOT) -- (IOT) means Internet of Things. And sometime they are hacked to be attacked (unintelligible) you know, spam and (unintelligible) and something.

And the (unintelligible) has the information usage, you know, big data or something. And I think that this is a big program, I think (unintelligible) software development and the updates make traffic is increasing -- how many apps iOS has update every day, et cetera. (Unintelligible) to divide traffic or - and what can we do before (unintelligible) now we're thinking about, you know, association. So if you have some interest please give a opinion or question. Thank you very much.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Thank you very much for that. So, I think it's - it fits to the what you were saying before, you know, that the (unintelligible) anyway, yes. So, because our customers are blaming us, yes. And so, this is a problem. What is your expectation -- let me ask you -- in that the general way with regards to a disaster happening? So, what do you mean? So, when, you know, in this point of has - it's going to be reached, you know, what do you mean? Please.

Toshiaki Tateishi: The (unintelligible) you know, the (unintelligible) is increasing so rapidly so maybe 10,000 - 100,000. So, at that time, how can we stop the traffic how - which is the right one or the (unintelligible) attach probably the - from the home network and the wireless network that they (unintelligible) will come to the ISPs. So, as I told you the networks (unintelligible) the traffic is (unintelligible) created by the human. But the machine comes - the download with (unintelligible) machine will increase much more. So, how can I stop it?

So, we can stop the power when (unintelligible) the Internet network can stop (unintelligible) but the (IOD) cannot stop it manually. So, it's too many things.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Carsten, you had a comment, please.

Carsten Scheifer: Thank you Carsten, (unintelligible) again. I just wonder whether you could share -- possibly and hopefully -- could share a little bit more detail about his kind of measurement, whether for example they're in the trend or they're in the update traffic was intranet traffic or whether that was between networks, by exchanges for example, or whether that was through trended traffic, like coming from the upstream and default. Because I know that if we're talking about Microsoft but about iOS, that both companies are setting up CDNs in the various regions.

So, that would be - my first question would be kind of what kind of measurements you've done? Then the second thing is about Internet of Things, yes, from my point of view, as much as I understand the technology there is a lot of devices, very, very huge amount of devices, however, in average they are meant to only do -- and I'm not talking about hacked devices and so forth, with the security and how they are built is completely different subject -- but as much as I would know, they would only do a very small amount of traffic on a per day basis, per week basis, and so forth.

So, I just wondered how many of such Internet of Things devices you would need to deploy in your network or have deployed in your network compared to only a single person watching an HD or even 4K video -- that comes from Netflix, YouTube or other usual suspects. So, that kind of compares networks, I would like to see as well.

Toshiaki Tateishi: So, the (unintelligible) the (unintelligible) so now still are working about to research the streaming. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So, any more comments? Supportive comments or which maybe could help him? Question? Tony?

Tony Harris: I was going to suggest, maybe you could share this by email or send us your presentation then it can be circulated on our list.

Toshiaki Tateishi: Yes.

Tony Harris: And I'm sure then there will be more time to review it and send you some comments and suggestions. If it's to do with Internet of Things, I think that's extremely important.

Tony Harris: And we should have a look and see what your - exactly what you're telling us here.

Toshiaki Tateishi: Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: So give me your business card, I give you mine so you can send it to me and I'll share it to the list, yes? Okay. Thank you very much. Chris, yes.

Christian Dawson: I'm actually leaving the conference in the morning to travel to Austin, Texas where they have the large South by Southwest Interactive Festival. And I'll be speaking one time the IANA Transition and other about the Internet of Things. This is definitely of interest to our - to ISPs and I will say that we have been trying over the past couple of years with our outreach to expand the technical issues basically to try and be a place that merges the technical issues with policy issues, we're a policy oriented body.

The fact is that we haven't come across a whole bunch of content like this, that we can bring back to our ISPs and can bring it back to other people to allow us to interact in a way that you're interacting today. It's actually, it could be refreshing and so when he sends that, I'd like us to think about ways that we can be a center for collecting information like this and set of a way and be

a source to bring those back to our communities and how that might help us with increasing the technical (workshop) days of this organization as we grow.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks and (unintelligible) the last comment, please?

Carsten Scheifer: One more comment on the security part of Internet of Things devices. I'm not entirely sure whether that would be in focus of this constituency here or the stakeholder group. But in terms of hardware and software security, I think the group in - gathered here, individuals being gathered here should look after that as thought - probably we're ready in place to help, to really help by any means because if I look at, like, established software companies like those of Apple, and Adobe, and Microsoft -- just to name three -- they are used to have (patch) cycles and essentially is a patched Tuesday every Tuesday or every first Tuesday of the month for Microsoft products.

I just wonder if the usual (unintelligible) manufacturer would be able or even thinking about the deploying patch cycle for that deployment of Internet of Things, like the fridge buying the milk itself, as soon as it's empty and so forth. I just wonder whether that is not about to open up an even more gaping loophole than the traffic of like regular operating Internet of Things devices. So, in that instance I'm kind of curious whether that is an item for discussion for this group as well or should become one. The security of hardware and software of Internet of Things devices. Thank you.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Thanks for - oh, yes.

Toshiaki Tateishi: And I want to add also the scalability of this.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Okay, thank you very much. So, very helpful, thank a lot. So, we have the very last point is housekeeping. If we just put it here on the spot but the question is professional structure of meetings and (unintelligible) it's not the question whether we should hold some but - while so the (unintelligible) how

many if this shall happen in the future as well. And normally we have one - one month-to-month, which is okay.

So, but that also takes - took from this meeting today, that we should have as soon as possible a special one dealing with the reviews, talk to review aspects ones. So, my proposal would to hold that meeting in - after two weeks and normally the week after the ICANN meeting is for traveling and taking a break and getting a little bit more in distance from ICANN matters. And refreshing themselves, so I will take care to ask for a meeting on - for a call in the week after - now from - two weeks from now. That's one thing.

This regards to - that we have a lot of improvement, I think so. To announce it's going to be (unintelligible) with regards the Secretary of Service, you know, on behalf Chantelle since some months with us, so she is taking care for the Commercial Stakeholder Group as well as for the Constituencies. So, it's turned out is an excellent Secretary of Service, (unintelligible) to give us support in any direction. So, that is - that I would like to point out here.

I - in this context, I would like to make a point which with regarding to the application for membership this constituencies. Before - at the time where we have been secretary-less, you know, that was a mess, I think, (unintelligible) those matters because the people who were interested were approaching different people here from the community and then sometimes questions could not be solved with regards of the memberships and so on. It's now improved, if somebody is - has questions with regard to membership or has the intention about to applying for membership - so, you - please, I'm going to refer you to the Secretary of Service, to our membership and she will deal with that you will make a (unintelligible) from the leadership about that in this will happen in a better way. I hope - I'm convinced it shall happen in a better way.

The same is with regards to the joining the email list of constituency. I was just this morning in a - talk to Fiona Asonga who is our member of this. So,

she told me that former times it was a mess, it took almost two years for - to be put on the email list. So, that reminds me to my own application and when I joined the ICANN some eight years ago and so that was really a mess. I shouldn't happen, so really if somebody who applies for that, who is willing and has problems with that please let us know immediately so that they can solve any problems which may arise.

So this is from my point of view, some comments to this regard. So, the organization of meetings is there any further comment, anything else to the point of AOB, or so?

Christian Dawson: From the chat.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: From the chat, is - at first Christian and then you.

Christian Dawson: Chantelle our Secretary says after Marrakesh I hope to have a draft welcome letter based on feedback from Tony and Christian to share with new members. ICANN graphics design department is helping me develop the draft for review by leadership.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Sure, thank you. That is very helpful. And I think - thank you very much Chantelle. So, from the distance rather for your support and thank you very much. Yes. Tony Harris, please.

Tony Harris: Yes, it's the point of any other business AOB -- because some people may not be aware -- we have something we're just kicking off which is a drafting team to draft a (unintelligible) for the discussion of how to use the funds from auctions, auction funds from new GTLDs. That's \$105 million right now and ICANN wants to dispose of these funds. So, what's going to happen is -- it's Christmas time, yes, I said that already.

So, there's all kinds of people lined up, the queue goes from Marrakesh to France, I think. But the thing is we should pay attention to this because it

would be good it if these funds were used for something useful like Universal Acceptance, or things to do with - I mean, it's money which is being paid by applicants to be used for - to get an application for a domain name, so it would be good that these funds were used sensibly and maybe we can come up with some ideas. I know I have some, but I don't know if they'll like them. Okay.

Wolf-Ulrich Knochen: Okay, thank you very much. I wouldn't like to open that discussion right now here because Tony was referring to the process we are going through, to the (unintelligible) that's in community work group about dealing this out and they are going to also contribute our ideas, yes? To that group. So, it may be helpful, so if you're directed to Tony who is a member of that group, yes? So, to make some inputs to that.

So however, it's really - if you can see the jackpot is really full, yes. So there are less applicants as now as usually at a lottery, yes. So, but this doesn't mean that it is easier to deploy and to get access to that jackpot. So, if there is no comment like comment to that. So, I might close that item. Is there anything else, any point you would like add here? So, then I become to a close of the meeting. I thank you very much, so it was a very fruitful meeting, very open meeting, open-minded. And I thank all the participants in the room. So, here in to us, I do hope we attractive enough, yes, to continue. So, thank you very much and the meeting is closed. And thank you also for the recording.

END