Transcription ICANN Helsinki

Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Constituency

Monday, 27 June 2016

Note: Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or

inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to

understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an

authoritative record. The audio is also available at

The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar

page http://gnso.icann.org/en/group-activities/calendar

Rajesh Chharia: Hi. I'm Rajesh Chharia, President ISP Association of India and duly appointed
Executive Consulate Secretary of APNIC. Welcome.

Christian Dawson: I'm Christian Dawson. I am with the Internet Infrastructure Coalition.

Malcolm Hutty: Malcolm Hutty, LINX, the London Internet Exchange with EuroISPA, for the
Pan-European Association for Internet Services Providers in the EU and
European economic area.

Tony Holmes: Okay thank you very much. If we could just quickly go on in the back row that
would be helpful if I could just ask you quickly.

(Joseph Alberg): Hello. My name is (Joseph Alberg) from Elisa Corporation, local Finnish ISP.

(Careit Oala): (Careit Oala). I'm a Minister of Transport Communications.

(Deplus Karfiet): (Deplus Karfiet) from domain in Europe.club. We are the users of your services.

Tony Holmes: And we very much appreciate you. Thank you. Okay so to get into the agenda that's circulated we do have a couple of issues to pick up under AOB but we'll do that at the end. We'll need probably five minutes or so for that. Tony, sorry.

Tony Harris: I'd like to present a motion that we congratulate Akinori on his election.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: And (unintelligible).

Tony Harris: We've done that. We've done that Tony.

Tony Holmes: Well I congratulate you then because I was late.

Tony Holmes: Thank you. Okay so the first series of issues we have are around this meeting for ICANN 56. And a number of people were at the Workstream 2 meeting on Sunday. So I'm going to open the floor up for comments because this is certainly going to come up as a discussion point as we go through the next few days. So if I could ask Alain perhaps and Olivier to bring us up to date with where we are now after the discussions on Sunday. Thank you.

Alain Bidron: Thank you Tony. Yes there was a four day meeting yesterday on the Workstream 2 accountability, where a few from the SPA community attending this meeting. (Unintelligible) was a - Malcolm was here, Olivier and myself, maybe (unintelligible) was attending part of the meeting or the meeting I

think. For those who don't know on accountability is a work positive (unintelligible) to stream or Workstream 1 which was dealing with accountability measures that had to be put in place before the (unintelligible) happened on the Workstream 2 dealing with actions that could wait until after the transition and be addressed after the transition or that was not necessary to implement a transition.

So Workstream 1 was achieved in Marrakesh and Workstream 2 was prepared between Marrakesh in this meeting. And the meeting yesterday was the first (record) meeting of the Workstream 2. What will be changing and Workstream 2 in comparison with Workstream 1 regarding members and participants I don't see (unintelligible) and observers. There is no major change. We have members that were appointed to the working group by the community, the chartering organization. And my understanding is that people that were appointed will continue to follow this to be members of this working group. But wouldn't need to be a member to participate. You can participate as a participant. So in this thing you have to do is to feel a (unintelligible) of interest and register with the ICANN staff to able to purchase it to attend the meetings, to attend the conference call and to express your views.

The only real difference between participant and members is the same than with Workstream 1. If we raise from all the votes only members has to vote. But we tried to reach consensus and it will not able to - something that was not needed in Workstream 1. Second different is that participants normally are that is funded, that traveling is funded, no members said traveling is funded. Participants traveling is not but otherwise there is no difference.

So you can participate. Of course you can register and participate in this working group. And this is something very interesting in my view. What was addressed yesterday as the – is a pending proposal work what we need then to do. What was mentioned yesterday is the is the - is a new way of working. With Workstream 1 is a work that's really divided into different topics. Now it's different. Nine topics were identified and so where there will be some

subgroup for addressing each of those nine topics. So topic diversity in human rights, jurisdiction, (unintelligible) manners, SO AC accountability, staff accountability, transparency, reviewing the CEP, CEP for Comparative Engagement Process. And my understanding this is a face to face negotiation before prior to an IRP process. So they will be reviewing that. And (unintelligible) for standard vote conduct. This is in nine topics. And each of those topics will be addressed in the specific working group.

So is a request now to register as participant of each of those working groups or as an of observer. The difference between participant and observer of participant can post on the mailing list. Observer has no right to post on the mailing list as they receive the mailing list but don't post. So if you want to express a view you have to be registered as participant into a working group.

What was discussed yesterday is a proposal to prioritize what Workstream 2 topics into simpler lighter topics, intermediate topics and topics that lead take a long time to reach consensus. So there was a proposal. Even if a working group we will be working in parallel that it's is necessary to prioritize in order to save time.

There was a suggested timeline. The plan is this month's during that meeting to agree on subgroups. But I think it's already agreed in my view. The first discussion with the CWG Workstream 2 will be in August 16. So we will be starting very quickly. On October the plan is to have - to agree for public input and to have a public input period, the first public input period between the 20th of October and the 3rd of November in order for exhibiting thereabout to receive some first feedback. The plan is to analyze public comments in December 2016 to refine the proposal of the comments in January 2017 and to add the first reports in February 2017 for simpler issues or by mid-2017 at the latest. So the plan is finish its work, finish the work for working to around June 2017 but it could take longer.

What can I say? Yesterday it - there was also a way to brainstorm on the issues. And people were – some people are to provide some lightning talks. Lightning talks were short presentation made as a way to brainstorm and generate ideas. And it was a very interesting lightening talks specifically on diversity, on human rights and on (unintelligible) election. Among the nine teams that were selected I think there is one attracting is the most participants was (unintelligible) already resisted in the subgroup. And this is one diversity (unintelligible) and jurisdiction.

So we are an early stage. And if you are interested please register. Please participate. It is pretty open.

Tony Holmes: Thank you very much Alain. So open for comment Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Wolf-Ulrich speaking. Thanks Alain and the other members or participants of that group. So if you look at nine issues, nine working teams, sub teams normally you know nobody can cover that right? And so the question for me is from your point of view for the participants in Workstream 2 are you – do you have any recommendations or what is most interesting to our group? So for example SO AC accountability I think that there is one point I would say. But the others I'm not sure about it. Do we have any recommendations? So and then we could try to find out how to share that work. Thanks.

Alain Bidron: Yes it's possible that some works. So if it won't be part – I want to dedicate some time to participate in these working groups. So we are to select the one. There is a way to select so one where you think you have some ideas to bring we are more (unintelligible). But also we have to select these working group with the idea to have enough participant in single working group. So even if your choice is diversity if you think you can bring some good idea for your other groups diversity is already very, very well. There is a lot of people having – expressing (unintelligible) as a group in diversity and human (unintelligible) relation. So if you can resist actual to one of the other groups it would be very, very much welcome.

(Unintelligible) ideas is that as ICP members we can cannot cover everything. But we can show the – bears the load and shares a load to try to see if we can cover the maximum of those working groups and share together to the ideas and inputs. So that's going to be an idea to be efficient.

Myself I have already registered as a participant in diversity and jurisdiction. I know that it's Malcolm has also already registered in some working groups. I don't remember which one but…

Malcolm Hutty: (Unintelligible).

Alain Bidron: Yes Olivier also.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Alain Bidron: And I know so as what Wolf-Ulrich you have also registered in one or two working groups already.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Did I?

Alain Bidron: I think so. I've seen your name. So it's okay. Does it respond to your question Wolf-Ulrich.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: My question is so if you have - you are very much involved already so you have recommendations which course we – which issues we could put aside more or less, you know, because they may be not of so important interest to our group and others which are more of interest and which are not covered yet by anybody of us. So if that – if you could help us to find out, you know, then we can talk about, you know, how to cover the remaining months. We are still lacking people we want to hear from. Thanks.

Alain Bidron: There's a quick risk onto that because it really it – each - it is (unintelligible) as it's interesting. So I don't think there is a single group whereas as ASPs we are not interested at all.

Tony Holmes: No I totally agree with that Alain and it's something we need to discuss because there is a need to have coordination and for us to track each of these working groups. And it's how we engage in – how we spread ourselves around. There's a bigger issue as well I think. And that is that we need to have some CSG coordination on this as well. So that has to be a topic for when we meet with them.

One of the things I was going to pick up on under AOB but it's probably appropriate to mention it now is that we have the use of a pop up room facility as ISPs. It's on Wednesday and it's 9:15 to 10:15. We have another hour for ISP CP discussions. So I know it – there's an overlap on the agenda but wedging things into this particular schedule has proved difficult.

One of the items that we need to discuss when we get together on Wednesday - and that meeting also is in Veranda 1 as I mentioned 9:15 to 10:15 that should be part of our discussion at that meeting, how we're going to engage and go forward and what are the key things as well as I'm aware that Malcolm has certainly had some thoughts on some of the issues around that. I think we need to spend some time discussing that and get in some initial focus as to where we engage as a constituency and what are the key elements of the arguments that we need to put forward. So we should do that on Wednesday morning. Are there any particular comments at this stage on that point?

Okay so if not I'm going to move on to the second item that was under this heading. And that is the CSG open meeting that takes place on Wednesday. It's in Hall B. Again it's quite a tight schedule. It's from 8 o'clock to 9:15. And there is a lot on the agenda for that meeting.

And just to run through what those issues are for people who may not be aware there's going to be some discussion about policy coordination and the three processes underway. I think that's where we can also raise a reference to this last discussion and how we coordinate on these particular issues that we've just discussed. We're also going to talk about how we move forward in terms of Workstream 2 coordination and transition across the piece. The second item is one that's been initiated that's been discussed a lot within this constituency and its auction proceeds. And I know Tony has shared some thoughts with us on that. Again we haven't had any real discussions on the detail around the work that's going on regarding auction proceeds at the CSG level. So that again is something that we need to feed some initial thinking into. I don't know whether you want to say anything on that now Tony just before we have that CSG meeting.

Tony Holmes: Yes just to mention that we're actually - the procedure right now is part of the drafting team which is drawing up the terms of reference the charter for the working group which will be convened. And once the working group is convened they will actually begin to define the possible uses for these funds. We're talking about more than $200 million and of course there's a queue I think it extends from Finland back to Greece or something of people interested in using that very productively. So I t- that should be an interesting process. But right now we're just drafting the charter.

Tony Holmes: Okay thanks. The third item on that agenda is what we've referred to as GNSO moving forward into the new era as well. And that's going to be quite a hot topic here because there is a proposal that basically came from the IPC initially. But it's going to be discussed in this meeting as to whether and how we can take it forward as a Commercial Stakeholder group which is a proposal about the creation of the GNSO ExCom. And there is a (fear) around that counsel currently is dealing with a lot of issues which aren't specific to gTLD policy a far wider range of issues. And maybe council isn't the best way to do that. There may be another way that the GNSO has to come together. I think there's a motion going into the council meeting on this

issue as well for this meeting. So there'll be some discussion around that. We're also going to talk about the GNSO futures work which is something that's been running in the non-contracted party's house basically chaired between (Rudy) and I, (Rudy) from the noncommercial side of our house. And there's a set in the agenda where we're going to have an NCPH focus section to bring people up to date where we are, what's happened in that group and where we go from the future. There will also be an opportunity to comment and make contributions that will shape the direction that that work actually goes in.

And following on from that is a related discussion around the GNSO review that was undertaken. Where do we go with that now in terms of short term requirements and short term recommendations that come out of that and then the longer term recommendations as well?

And then a final point on a very tight schedule is some discussion around the issue of the GAC liaison from the GNSO. Wolf-Ulrich is there anything you wanted to say on that? I don't know whether there's been any more thoughts or discussions since this ICANN meeting but that was an open issue when we arrived here.

Wolf-Ulrich Knoben: Yes Tony, Wolf-Ulrich speaking. This is on the agenda also for council I think so because it's about the process on selecting the candidate for this liaison. You know, that was implemented I think two years ago to a liaison between GAC and a GNSO and Mason Cole with that job until now. So the first call for interest which was sent out in June or in May even I think so the evidence was not that much which was expected yes because - and there may be different reasons of that. So the outcome of all this discussion is right now that it was postponed until the annual general meeting of this year because then there will be a change of membership in different groups. And may be some people have then more time to apply for that job.

So that is decided while that's we – and a new liaison will take place from the AGM of this year. And the procedure well to find it out and do the criteria of that that is stipulate down during the next time. So it is under discussion. And I think so why it's on the agenda of this year's G is because well there is an interest of several stakeholder groups and the other constituencies also to maybe to nominate somebody from there. And this is – there was some discussion on how to do that and this is topic is on the agenda in order to coordinate a little bit on the CSG level. That's it so far.

Tony Holmes: Okay. Thank you. Any questions from that? Everyone's aware of the issue around that. Okay the final thing I want to cover of the third point on this particular agenda item is that we'll also have a meeting on Wednesday between the Commercial Stakeholder Group and the contracted party's house. Now this is quite unique because we've never had that meeting before. It's a long, long overdue. And we have three items that have been identified on that agenda.

The first one is that about guiding the GNSO into the new era, the post transition and the issues that come out of that. And some of the focus of that will be on identifying the difference in the role of the GNSO and how we interact with that. It also relates back of course to the specific proposal about forming potentially a GNSO ExCom or some other type of means or way of actually facilitating a discussion on a bullet to set of issues rather than doing it through council. And I said yes there is no agreement on that. It's just an idea that's being spun out that is going to get a lot of attention here and there's going to be a lot of dialogue around that point. So it will be interesting when we actually meet with the contracted parties house to see if they share that sort of approach or even recognize that there is an issue there in exactly the same way.

The last item that's on the agenda for that session and again just within now it's going to be difficult to I think to quickly cover some of these things but it's going to be around the proposal to send a letter to ICANN from the GNSO

constituencies on the issue of public meetings and some of the issues that have arisen would be cancellation of now of the venues and what was the thinking behind that what is the strategy from ICANN, how did they come to make that decision. A draft of that letter has been circulated that's – I think it was drafted in by the BC. But it came about because initially there was thoughts that there should be questions asked around that from the contracted party's house. Tony over to you.

Tony Harris: I think I was part of similar letter sent by the Latin American community where average at having two meetings canceled in the region the same year. And basically as this letter does point out something which we said at that time. And that is that the meetings seem to be canceled without any consultation with organizations or stakeholders why should we live and work in the area? So I mean yes exactly. It was sort of a decision taken by ICANN without involving the stakeholders who are in the region or in the country involved which doesn't seem very logical because people who were living and working in the region are probably more aware of the risks and if they will exist or not. And this point was also raised in the BC letter. I just wanted to mention that. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Okay so that will be an interesting debate, I'm sure. Yes please?

Man 2: (Unintelligible). To whom is the letter addressed?

Tony Holmes: The – it's a draft letter at the moment and it would go to the ICANN board.

Man 2: Can I suggest a better audience would be your – and I say that simply because the board doesn't actually engage in the location decisions or any of the factors that go into I think concerns that are being raised. The (unintelligible) employee looks at it from a financial standpoint ensures that the costs are in line with, you know, budget and with prior meetings and that due diligence was done on you know, sort of the economic component of it, not the location itself. So that's probably a better starting point is to send it to

(Yuri). And then if that doesn't get resolved then certainly there's an appeal process there for, you know, to come back to the board to indicate you don't think (Yuri)'s doing his job.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. I think it is an interesting issue as well because I assume that whatever comes out of that group has to be endorsed at board as a board will be - board agreement is that not correct?

Man 2: You mean from a location decision, no. (Scott) makes the decision locations. The board simply looks at it like I said from a fiduciary standpoint.

Tony Holmes: Malcolm?

Malcolm Hutty: I think what is being asked for in this letter is there should be more policies to govern the choice on these matters and there should be more clarity about how those policies should be developed and about how they're implemented. That sounds like a board decision issued to me. It sounds like asking for the board to set a clearer framework for the staffs to implement. So to that - I mean if you were just simply asking the staff to do their work a bit differently then a letter to staff seems appropriate, more essentially appropriate. But given what's being asked for here it strikes me that it's a board issue.

Man 2: Yes that adds a slightly different color to it and I would totally agree with you. If it's about why the decisions were made around specifically these two cancels that's a staff question I think should be – perhaps there's two sections right, one that's addressed to that and so there's a clear explanation. And then secondly like if there's a request to how to we change the process and is there a new way we want to do this and that – you're right, that would be a good board consideration.

Tony Holmes: And I think the outcome of this is probably that it should be focused towards both of those entities as well is the right thing so we'll make sure that happens. Thanks.

Man 2:   Well maybe it's addressed jointly.

Tony Holmes: Yes. Yes I – points well taken. Thank you. Okay so we've managed to get through the agenda roughly in time so far as to where we are. And the next thing on this agenda is the ICANN accountability and the IANA stewardship transition. And of course after many, many hours of work and hard labor by the community which it has been an absolutely fantastic effort we managed to reach consensus on a proposal. That proposal was endorsed at board level. And we're very pleased I think to hear that it's also proved acceptable to NTIA. The issue as to where that goes now is somewhat open to debate still in the US more than anywhere else. So against that background I'll ask Christian to bring us up to date as to where we are from that perspective.

Christian Dawson: Thank you very much. I appreciate it. I have spent a lot of time over the past month or so up on Capitol Hill trying to talk with many of the people in the US Senate and the House of Representatives about the work that we have done here and why it is good. So specifically Senator Ted Cruz and a congressman named (Sean Duffy) came up with this particular bill called the Protecting Internet Freedom Act and they're trying very hard to push the Protecting Internet Freedom Act. I think that some of you actually may have seen a video that Ted Cruz put out just a couple of days ago where he talked about how President Obama was giving the Internet away to Russia and China.

Man: YouTube?

Christian Dawson: I believe it is on YouTube but you can go see it. And that's the framing that their giving to the general public within the United States. Ultimately we have been doing a good deal of outreach to the community of jurisdiction in the Senate where this bill is first. That's Chairman Thune of the Committee on Commerce and ranking member Bill Nelson. And we've been talking to them about how they shouldn't bring this bill to a vote. We've been specifically

talking to a number of congressmen about why they don't want to sign on to this particular piece of legislation in - on the House side. And we've made the case that especially to the congressmen that have good technical (butafides) that it will be a black guy for them if they go ahead and support this bill.

The thing is that of any of the groups there in the US that have a good deal of influence the one that is pushing hardest is the Heritage Foundation. The Heritage Foundation has actually changed their position pretty dramatically from one in which they were fully opposed for transition to one in which they now say, "Let's wait. Let's give it two years. Let's see how this plays out and whether we can take the training wheels off in about two years." So they've gone from saying it's a bad idea to seeing - saying that it's an idea that just needs two years of delay.

So we've been talking about the problems with delay to a lot of these congressional members and seeing whether – and trying to move them off that position. I spoke directly with a certain Texas legislator just a couple of days ago and he said I totally understand what it is you guys are doing. I totally understand why – how impressive it is that you have come to this nexus. But you have to understand I want to get reelected and this is a very big – I read this – be that catalyst. And the idea that we can move Obama off of this position is something that my constituents would love to see me support. I'm not saying I will but they would love to see me support. So you understand my position now. He has not taken a position this particular congressmen I talked to. But he told me face to face, "Here's what I'm up against, craven political machinations." So that's where we stand at the moment.

At the end of the day I think that the Protecting Internet Freedom Act ends up moving forward it will be vetoed by President Obama. So I'm not sure how much we need to fight this battle except that we really want as clean a transition as we possibly can get. And the way that we do that is to not have to deal with this. So anyway that's my update at the moment.

Tony Holmes: Thanks Christian, craven political machinations? I think we've heard of that over the last few days a few times.

Tony Harris: I have a question.

Tony Holmes: Tony?

Tony Harris: Did you talk to Frank Underwood?

Christian Dawson: I did talk directly with Ted Cruz the staff. And that was interesting because they are extremely intelligent and they understand these issues so well. The what - the message that they're putting out there into the world is not the detailed nuance message that they actually understand. And that was an eye-opening to me to know that they actually have a very nuanced view of this.

Tony Harris: I would love to hear more about that. Do we have time?

Tony Holmes: We can allow a couple of minutes if you want to say more about that quickly if you…

Christian Dawson: Sure.

((Crosstalk))

Tony Holmes: …you can say more.

Christian Dawson: Sure. So when we sat down to talk to them and I expected to have this conversation that was focused on Obama's giving the Internet away to China and Russia. And no, it was on US ownership of .mil and .gov which is something that I believe will be addressed here at ICANN. It was they bylaw on human rights and how they think that that has the potential to force ICANN

into a position through lawsuit to start to deal with content, domain level takedowns of content based on human rights issues. And there was a third. I'm going to need to refer to my notes but those were the ones we spent most of our time talking about their concerns around.

Tony Holmes: Okay so I would suggest if people want to have any more detail around that you speak to Christian off-line. We do need to move on. And the reason I was able to allow a few more minutes for that was because I was actually taking Christian's time.

And the next item is universal acceptance. This is something that's incredibly important for ISPs. And we need to engage a lot more I think as a group with the excellent work that's been going on in that group that Tony and Christian have been involved with. So Christian over to you. I know that there's a session running directly after this meeting I think on universal acceptance almost directly after. But if you can bring us up to date with where we are on that that would be excellent.

Christian Dawson: Absolutely. I also sent a four page document around to the private list so you can get a more detailed view of exactly what it is we've been working on and the Universal Accepting Steering Group since Marrakesh. I will say I'm extremely excited that our Web site went live today. If you go to uasg.tech it is a collection of resources that we've started to develop for the universal acceptance community in order to basically marshal our resources and have people grab the things that they need to go and push them to the right places for people to make. So this is not to convince a layman what universal acceptance is. This is for volunteers and volunteer resources. So go to the uasg.tech and learn about what our latest volunteer resources are that you can take to your communities to push the goal of universal acceptance.

We in addition to launching that Web site have in the past couple of months hired a PR firm to help us drive engagement at the CIO and CTO level. The biggest accomplishment that I think we've had -- and I'm going to read this

directly from the sheet that I sent you -- is working on clarity of audience. Since we ultimately need to convince pretty much every coder in the world to make sure that their systems are up to speed accepting all modern TLDs that's a heavy left. Trying to figure out narrowly what our focus is and who we need to hit first has been a chore but one that we've been up to the task of.

So it says as much as we love the ICANN community by and large is not who the UASG is trying to reach. Universal acceptance as an issue for applications that leverage the Internet. Our audience is people who could make this happen, developers and system architects and consultants and contracting firms, people who can direct this to happen for CIOs, people who can influence the staff and C-suite, board members, government officials, ministers, consultants, media industry influencers. That said we're still keen for the Internet industry registries registrars, ISPs and hosting providers to get their own systems UA ready.

So the firm that we have contracted with is collaborating with us on messaging to CIOs and CTOs in Fortune 500 companies and specific individuals that we have put forward on a target list that we consider low-ish hanging fruit, basically people in technology companies that we can get to specifically see the merits of making their systems UA ready. In an effort to do that we've published our first ten documents. If you go to uasg.tech you can download our first ten documents which are now in a number of environment, UASG 001 002 and so on and so forth that detail various aspects, quick guides quick references and overview documents that will allow you to find the thing that you need to know about universal acceptance for the audience that you're trying to reach.

There are two measurement projects underway. I know that (Mark) you're keenly interested in what it is we're doing to try and to measure the effectiveness of what it is we are doing. The first is to look at 25 browser and operating system combinations determine if they're UA ready. And the second is to look at determined list of hundreds of the largest Web sites to

see how UA ready they are. Over 90% of our Web sites that have been tested so far except our ASCII new four character TLDs like they'll take it out photography. But less than 5% are Unicode at IDN based addresses. We're going to continue to provide quarterly updates on the things that we are measuring there to see how much of a change we're seeing in our established lists so to determine how effective we're being.

In addition to that we've done some events. Tony did one, I did one. I guess we can briefly talk about what we've done with those. I did a universal acceptance session at M3AAWG. M3AAWG is the Messaging Malware and Mobile Anti-abuse Working Group. These are the people that spite - fight spam and malware. And I brought Ram Moham with me from Affilias who's also the chair of the Universal Acceptance Steering Group. We had an excellent engaged session with a lot of the people that I think could actually go in drive the universal acceptance to carry the flag and move it forward within their organizations many of which – many of whom are telcos and ISPs.

Tony Harris: Just take a minute.

Tony Holmes: Sure.

Tony Harris: So I mean I'll be very brief.

Tony Holmes: Thanks.

Tony Harris: I did the other event that Christian mentioned Buenos Aires which was with a network that I covered by - but I didn't discover. Actually they came and called it my office. And it's amazing. It's a network of 6000 system managers, people who works in banks and companies. And every online and Internet and digital systems of all these organizations and companies.

And they had an event and Buenos Aries which we - ICANN sponsored. We gave out – this is a Spanish version of the Quick Guide for Universal Acceptance. I think Christian has this been put in English also do you know?

Christian Dawson: Yes it is. So they'll probably be going that out in a meeting here. I'm not sure. And for me as a non-technical person to be waiting amongst all these tables loaded with these systems operators they were all doing exercises on different problems. And then we had some help from somebody from Microsoft who came over and gave a talk. And the big thing now will be the follow through with the whole network which will - I was going to bring this up in the universal acceptance meeting on what I think we should do with groups like this. They have groups like this all over the world by the way. Anyhow that was something which was pretty interesting.

Tony Holmes: Okay thank you. It is as I said a really important issue for us. And I realize there's a clash with GNSO part two meeting. But I think as a constituency if we can spare spread ourselves around between those two meetings it would be particularly helpful. And Christian it sounded as though you've made great strides. And at this stage I should probably say thanks to both you and Tony for the work you have done in getting out to the community. But it sounds as though you've made great strides on the messages you need to get out there.

And you've mentioned you've now got the PR firm engaged as well. But what about the measurements? The real crunchy part of this is making sure you get out to the people you need to and being able to measure how successful you are at getting those messages out there. And I know from the work we've done before in this constituency it's a really hard thing to do. So how are you actually going to measure that element of success to see that the work you've done is actually going to prove fruitful?

Christian Dawson: So the two areas in which we've established measurements before and the things that I was trying to detail their one is we've got that established list of big Web sites and determining whether all of them - right now 90% of them

meet our ASCII basically how we want them to behave for all ASCII TLDs. But only 5% of them behave in a way that we want them to behave with regards to IDN non-Latin character scripts. We're going to keep on monitoring that list of big Web sites basically as one measurement tool. And the other is specifically we now are going to have a list of groups, actual individuals who run actual infrastructure in actual companies. And they're going to basically maintain a list of touch points. And we're going to check in with them to see if they're converting.

Tony Holmes: I think we're aware that things break at all levels in this environment if you're not careful. So do you feel that that's enough? I mean it is hid in the smaller guys that don't get involved in ICANN that probably have an awareness of gTLD evolution but they don't necessary have the - this whole process that will take them down the path of actually checking that their elements are going to stand up to the test…

Christian Dawson: Yes.

Tony Holmes: …that these put there. Do you feel that's enough or…

Christian Dawson: I don't think any of the efforts that we're doing are enough. I think that we have identified the areas in which we can make the best substantive impact that current efforts allow. And we can significantly improve things by tackling the areas where we can most quickly solve the biggest problems. But the overall issue is going to linger for years.

Tony Holmes: One final thing on this Tony?

Tony Harris: Well I really enjoyed the question and I would add it's something I'm going to bring up in the, now in the Universal Acceptance Meeting. I think this has to be taken a lot broader which was something Tony was hinting at. We should call this updating the Internet and get attention, world attention. And then we should have a certification or universal acceptance compliant because if you

have a certification everybody's going to pay attention and they want to – they're going to have want to have it. And this should also be extended to IPv6 which is in the same position.

Basically we have two Internet critical resources IP numbers and domain names which are not being resolved uniformly across the community and the users which is insane. I mean everything on the Internet critical resources should work everywhere for everybody not just sort of, you know, be at different stages of I'm going to do it, I'm not going to do it. I know about it, I don't know about it. That's not good news. You've got Internet of Things coming down inside of everything. Everything's going to go digital. You have to get that thing in order. This is from a non-technical person speaking.

Christian Dawson: One quick note it's funny you say that because the subject of the presentation that Ram and I gave in Philadelphia at M3AAWG it was not solely centered on universal acceptance. We paired it with IPv6 and DNS SEC and we called it Eating your Broccoli because many people don't want to go ahead and eat their vegetables but if they don't eat their vegetables they're not going to grow. And that's basically the analogy that we use. You need to do these things in order to grow.

Tony Holmes: Thanks. I do feel pitching the message is so often the case all of this. It's been interesting the work we've done on GNSO futures. We spent some time looking at challenges for ICANN within that group and getting some feedback. And a lot of the feedback seem to come back about outreach. And a number of people there made the same point in different ways which was that when we go out to do outreach about ICANN we go out and we tell them how ICANN works. It's not the way to get people engaged. You need to tell them how it impacts them and what the issues that they need to think about that are being addressed through ICANN, completely different way of viewing things. And I think so some sort of challenges with universal acceptance. Anymore comments on this before we move on?

Okay and so it's really been an interesting session that follows and would certainly encourage people to go along to that participating in it – within it. So we're done now to ARB. I have one item on that particular agenda item. And that is to make people aware that a late proposal that came up was to hold a meeting later today at from 3:00 till 4;30. And the challenge is it's a pretty small room where this meeting's going to take place. But the invite went out to the SO AC list for the GNSO. And basically the meeting's going to talk about contractual compliance with a specific focus. And that focus is that what is in those contracts that we could look to ICANN to enforce that stop a lot of the bad things happening around the Internet so some of the issues around fraud and misrepresentation? How far does the contractual compliance obligations from registrars actually go? So the meeting is between the registrars and a couple of – a few representatives from the other constituencies so sites where it was suggested that we – each constituency could take up to three people along to that particular meeting. So I'd like to throw that open. It's something we need to engage in and ask who would be interested in coming along to that? (Christian), okay that would be good. Any other involvement that would help take that along from an ISP? (Mark)?

Okay so what we'll do we'll go along to that meeting. And I mentioned we have this session now ISP session on Wednesday and we will report back during that meeting as to what happened this afternoon from that session. So we're almost at the end of the time that we have allotted for this meeting. I have one other issue to raise though and that is a question that's common on the list. And it's come in from (Shanader Hussein) who says so he has a simple question to ask us all. And that is how ISPCP members can benefit from ICANN's multi-stakeholder structure?

So I have an answer from that but I'd like others also to think about that and to offer some feedback whilst we're live on that particular issue. Does anyone want to help answer that? So the question is how ISP members can benefit from the ICANN multi-stakeholder structure?

So I think part of the answer there is that so much what happens within ICANN has a direct impact back on ISP CPEs but they aren't ISP CP issues alone. So if we don't have the ability to have fled dialogue at the multi-stakeholder level with all the other partners involved no matter how it impacts and more to what you (unintelligible) then I think we lose something fundamentally important that gets the right answer for us as ISPs in our industry. And this environment actually facilitates that. You can do it through that multi-stakeholder participation. Does anybody else want to help give an answer back to get around that? (Jahanga) you're on that.

So (Jahanga) you're welcome to follow-up with that. He says thank you for your comments in the chat. But if there's any more thinking around that I'm sure we would be all quite willing to have that conversation with (Jahanga) during one of our meetings. So thank you for the question. So with that I'll adjourn this meeting. There's other things following up quickly. Alain?

Alain Bidron: Just (unintelligible) to Russia. You mentioned the agenda that is quite challenging with the universal exit plans most route in parallel with the GNSO one. So there's also a session coming in the same slot with the annual ASO open session. And it is also open to (unintelligible) for the ISP communities. So your frustration to have to show between universal acceptance ISO narrow open meeting and GNSO where we are located.

Tony Holmes: That's a very valid point. And I think when we get to end of the next few days there is some sessions on the feedback as to how this meeting were. But there's been a lot of challenges around the schedule. And that was always going to occur. But we need to make that point during those feedback sessions that we absolutely struggle with some of the issues being run in parallel and to give examples of that. So we should certainly follow-up and do that. Wolf-Ulrich I thought you wanted the floor. Okay. Please Olivier?

Olivier Muron: Thank you. I just wanted to make one announcement in this round and inform you about that I am also a representative in the Registry Stakeholder Group

for the registry of .Hamburg. And first I wanted to make this transparent and on the other hand according to the bylaws I can only exercise my vote in one of the constituencies. So for the future I will exercise my voting rights in the Registry Stakeholder Group and I will put my vote in this group to my colleague (Lars Hoffman) who is also very active in the universal acceptance working group.

So just for the records I think it's important to have this in the minutes and to inform you. Part of that I don't see any conflict of interest but just wanted to make this transparent and inform you about that - the voting rights will be to Lars. Thank you.

Tony Holmes: Okay thank you for that and certainly that will be noted. I was just informed that we had two minutes to vacate the room and another meeting follows. I think we have no time at all now. So on that basis thank you everyone for participation and look forward to talking more with you across the next few days. Thank you.

END