ICANN68 | Virtual Policy Forum – GNSO – ISPCP Open Session
Tuesday, June 23, 2020 – 15:00 to 16:00 MYT

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hello, and welcome to the ISPCP Open Session on June 23, 2020. My name is Chantelle Doerksen, and I am the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During the session questions or comments submitted in the chat will only be read aloud if put into the proper form or captured for follow-up after the session, as I will note in the chat momentarily. I will read the question and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of the session.

If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please be sure to raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone to take the floor.

With that, I will hand the floor over to our chair Wolf-Ulrich Knoben to begin. Wolf-Ulrich, please go ahead.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: [inaudible]

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Wolf-Ulrich, yes we can.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, can you hear me?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Yes, we can.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thank you. Good morning to you all. Good afternoon and good evening to Asia, and a [really good] early morning to the U.S. and the Americas. Happy to have you here at our ISPCP meeting. We will have one hour to go through the agenda. For that, we have sent out the agenda you have on the screen. I would like to ask whether the agenda is approved or you have any amendments, any additions. That's not the case. Thank you very much.

One other formality is the question of statements of interest. Are there any disclosures with regard to that? It's not the case. Thank you very much.

So then let's directly step into the agenda. We have allocated 15 minutes for the EPDP discussion, but it may be that we don't need that time in total. It's depending. I would [see] a short status update from Thomas at first, and then we are going to talk about the draft paper which was sent around by Rafik Dammak, vice chair from the GNSO Council, with regards to the future work around the EPDP. That paper was also circulated in our email list. We should [discuss that] and think

about whether [it] could find a position with regard to the future of the EPDP.

So with that, I would like to hand over briefly to Thomas. Just give us the latest news.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much, Wolf-Ulrich. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. I'm going to keep this very brief. We are [still] working through the remaining discussion points from the comments coming out of the public comment. I have sent the link to the wiki page where the documents can be found. Those are input tables for the respective recommendations where all the respective groups can formulate and inject their positions. But there's also a redlined version of the entire report.

We have discussed earlier in this group whether there are any "cannot live with items" in the report, and obviously there were no issues that were so grave that the ISPCP would withhold its consent to approving the entire report or object to the adoption of the report, which I think is good news. I think that's in part because some of the issues that we're discussing at the moment are issues that concern the position or the liability of the contracted parties or that are in particular of concern for [rights owners].

So we chime in when it comes to making suggestions for wording that could bridge the gap between the different camps that have evolved

during the work of the EPDP, but other than that there's nothing that we really complain about at this late stage.

So I think the more important point is probably how we're going to wrap up, whether our group is able to converge to consensus. I think that it will likely be rough consensus that's going to be seen.

In terms of timing, our group is funded through July, so the hope is that we're going to get this done in July. I'm cautiously optimistic that we're going to be able to do that because ICANN and its community have proven to work best under pressure. And we're now losing our second chair who is not available to continue the work, and we're also running out of funding.

So I hope that we're going to be able to come to consensus on the report, and I hope that we're going to be able to get the report through council. And I hope that the remaining items that still need to be discussed will either be dealt with during the implementation phase, and we're doing a lot of implementation guidelines that we're working on to be put into our report. Or in the alternative where it's actually policy matters that we can't cope with at this stage, that these need to be dealt with elsewhere potentially in new PDPs.

For those who want to chime in, I would recommend that you take a look at the documents on the wiki page which are quite enlightening. Just note that we should not go back to topics that were closed by now because we're now sort of in the final run of trying to resolve the areas that some groups [in] our team cannot live with.

So, Wolf-Ulrich, I think I can leave it here. I'm happy to take questions from the group, but other than that I would suggest that we discuss the remaining questions with respect to process in particular when we come to Philippe's session because the destiny of the EPDP pretty much lies in the hands of the GNSO Council.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much, Thomas, for that. As we have heard, this paper was circulated around. I also had a look to that and saw still many yellow fields in that. But before we come to that, I see Tony. Yes, also Tony Holmes has raised his hand. Tony, please go ahead.

TONY HOLMES: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich, and hi, Thomas. I wonder if you could just say a few words about the position toward the final report of the other GNSO policies, the other constituencies and where they are. You mentioned the ISP position, and I thank you for that. But just a few words of where the other stand. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Before I hand over to Thomas, that is connected to what I have seen. Because the many yellow fields in that are comments from the IPC. I saw that [around that]. I would like just to know also from Thomas how you estimate. What is the meaning of that yellow field? What does it mean with regards to the [inaudible]?

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks, very much, Wolf-Ulrich, and thanks very much, Tony, for the question. Well, I think this is a difficult one to answer because I think all parties—and I would include the ISPs in that bucket—all parties reserve judgment until they see the final report. I guess that has been practice within our group and the wider GNSO in recent history if not in ICANN's entire history that we need to take a look at the overall package when it is done.

When I mentioned the ISP position, what I was referring to was when I asked whether there any "cannot live with items" spotted by ISPCP members there was no response which I took as an encouraging signal. That has been confirmed by Wolf-Ulrich who specifically stated that he does not see any "cannot live with items." So I think we would be okay with the work product as it's likely going to be.

From the discussions that we had both inside the EPDP plenary as well as in the CSG, I think it is likely that the BC, IPC, and ALAC have the biggest issue with the report in its entirety. The GAC has also voiced some concerns, but I'm not sure whether their concerns will go as far as voting the entire report down.

I think a lot will depend on the outcome of the discussion in a small team that has convened yesterday and I think again and I've reported on that during the last ISPCP call. And I think that the small team will report its findings to the EPDP plenary in our EPDP call coming up in a few hours today. That's on the evolution of the SSAD.

I think that one of the areas of most discomfort with IPC, BC, and ALAC in particular stems from the fact that there is, let's say, too little

automation, too little intelligence going on at the central gateway. And they would hope that more work that needs to be done in the SSAD to function for working on disclosures and actually making disclosures happen should take place centrally.

The contracted parties for the various reasons that we've discussed previously, foremost the liability questions, have said let's start with a smaller setup and let's evolve things over time and add to the central body as we move on and as we find more comfort in what the SSAD can do without exposing the contracted parties and ICANN. ICANN has also raised some concerns [about] putting those parties at risk or at undue risk.

That's too little for some, and it's unlikely that the contracted parties will easily say, okay, we will have an evolution process that just allows for adding more and more stuff without really reflecting on it. So I think that's going to be a crucial point. I think it's not unlikely that if there's not enough in it for an expedient adding of tasks to the central gateway, that BC, IPC, and ALAC might vote down the entire report.

Which I would find unfortunate because I think that there is huge potential for evolving the process. I think that we as a group have chimed in earlier to recommend that the evolution should be outside PDPs as long as the evolution is within the policy recommendations of the EPDP so that the SSAD can evolve as quickly as possible based on the legal possibilities and case law or other guidance that we might receive.

So, Tony, that has been a wordy response which I hope is satisfactory for you. So in sum, I think the biggest risk for parties to vote the entire thing down stems from the outcome from how the SSAD is going to evolve. That I hope we will get more clarity on this afternoon or at one of the upcoming meetings. And then I think we will see more clearly where we stand on this.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much, Thomas, for that update. Philippe had a question, but I think you touched on that, on the question of the GAC letter. That had been taken into consideration, had been discussed on the EPDP team. Thomas, you covered that already in your remarks here. Is that okay, or is there anything to add to this?

THOMAS RICKERT: No, just that [inaudible]. Sorry, there was an echo. Now maybe I should say this [last]. Wolf-Ulrich and I, we're sitting in the same room and we're having a cozy little convention here which is great so we're having our little ICANN meeting while honoring social distancing in this room.

The GAC has sent a letter to the EPDP team offering some thoughts on the current status, and Philippe was asking whether that had already been discussed in the EPDP plenary. And I offered to check the agenda for today's meeting because I thought that it would be on the agenda. It has not been explicitly mentioned, but I trust that we will touch upon it during today's call maybe under AOB.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thank you very much, Thomas. So let's move over to the question of what the EPDP team shall be about in the future. As I mentioned before, there was this letter circulated on council and also within our constituency with regards to three options they may have for the future. I hope you found the time now to look at this.

Option 1 is a reset of the EPDP. And maybe Thomas [inaudible] to chime in or Philippe also here if there is a new update on that from the council discussions, for example. So the first option would be a reset of the EPDP because, for example, the present chair is going to leave. He has to leave at the end of this month, and then they have to find a new chair. And then a refreshing of the EPDP team membership could also be done. That would be Option 1.

The other one could be the Option 2, the termination of the EPDP and then an initiation of separate related efforts in a different kind of format.

The third option was a kind of combination of the above. So if there are some topics to be further discussed, then after the reset some of these topics might be addressed in a separate way.

So these are the options on the table at the time being and should be discussed on council. And I think also our councilors would like to have input from us if possible to that. But at first I would like to refer to Philippe and ask him whether I put it in the right way and how to see that. Please, Philippe, go ahead.

EN

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich, and good morning, everyone. Or afternoon, evening. Yes, your description is quite accurate. Just to summarize very quickly, Rafik's post is both of form and substance. On the form, that's just what you described, those three options. [A light] reset of the EPDP versus a complete revamp/rechartering exercise or a mixture of those two options.

And there's substance whereby he identified three topics that would need to be covered by this exercise. The top of my head is the natural versus legal identity. There's accuracy and there's another topic which I forget. I should probably check what it is. [Uniform] contacts with anonymized email addresses.

So that's the matrix, you have form and substance. So, obviously, the EPDP will be discussing that. I'm sure council will have to make a decision, and input would be welcome. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah, thanks for that, Philippe. Okay, one question would be, Philippe, also to you, is there a deadline for the council to come up and that means a deadline for us? How do you see that, please?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks. Well, I think that by the time we have the report from the EPDP Phase 2, we'll start discussing the future. And it would be good that by that time, which as Thomas said will come very quickly, we

ICANN 68
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM
22–25 June 2020

have an idea of how we can do. And I think it's good that we have as input things that definitely are non-variables that should be taken, such as the change of the chair, etc.

I think those elements will have a role in what I describe as the form, the way we organized these things. Bearing in mind that, as Thomas said, I think we get to the end of a process where there is if not exhaustion at least decreased interest from some of the members. So we need to change the team somewhat. So that's the sort of input that we'll need to have [at] the council. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thank you. That means on the one hand you will have input from the team [or from the] team members [and they have to get their voice]. But on the other hand from a perspective [inaudible] with that discussion around if you have something open from a work which has to be done, it would be good if you could rely on the experience and the knowledge of those who have been working already on that on the one hand but maybe also injecting some freshness, some limited freshness to that.

And I understand in this situation where the team is [for the ICANN to be discussed its position], and it's not easy to do that. I understand on the other hand all these people having worked for a long time and several meetings a week to some extent so that they are not that keen to continue in that way.

So I understand, so you will have to discuss at the council, but just take into consideration what I have said and what also others may input here even if not yet here directly in our meeting maybe by email to that question and then that could be. [It's up to you] [inaudible] and depending on the council discussion.

So, Philippe, I have a question. Would [inaudible] ISPCP members be [inaudible] for a new term? No need for an answer now, but this is [inaudible] to be taken into account, yes. So that's a question to all.

If I openly speak and if I look back [on all that] we have experienced asking for people for volunteers it was really critical in the beginning. I wonder whether we have a better situation right now, but we have to take that into consideration.

So thanks a lot for that, Philippe. I think we are running a little overtime with that point, and I would like to move over to the next item which is an update on GNSO Council activities up till now and maybe what you have in the pipe for your meeting this week. Who would like to step in? Philippe again?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: I'll just start and let Osvaldo follow. I sent the agenda on the list and, as you would expect, the EPDP is on the agenda. I don't think we need to take too much time for this. There's going to be a vote on an issue report on the transfer policy, which I think we should support. The other items are discussion points on SubPro, on the independent review process standing panel, and one item on the usual item on the

work prioritization. So I sent the email. I think regarding the vote, I think that's something that we should support, but it's open for discussion, obviously. So I'll leave it to the group to provide any input they would see fit. Thank you. And please, Osvaldo, add anything you would like to. Thanks.

OSVALDO NOVOA: No, I don't think there is any other issue. I'm trying to see. No, we are just considering EPDP on the recommendations and the planning. So, no, it's basically what you said, Philippe.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Good. Thanks for that, Philippe and Osvaldo. So the council is not as critical, it seems to be. Are there any questions from the floor regarding the council meeting? My question would be, Philippe and Osvaldo, you are supposed to have also a meeting with the Board, if I'm right. Could you just briefly say something about the agenda on that? Just thinking what is the format of that? is it just council questions toward the Board? Was there any approach from the Board?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yeah, I'm not sure. I would have to double check. Did we have an agenda for that?

OSVALDO NOVOA: I don't think so.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: We do have a short meeting, but maybe some of our Board members could [try for that]. But I don't recall having a specific agenda for that. Let us just check.

OSVALDO NOVOA: I don't find it also. I didn't find any.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: That seems to become an interesting meeting. Usually, the Board [inaudible] a Board meeting they are keen to get questions from us weeks in advance. But here maybe they have something in the pipe, so let me have a look to that as well. Thanks very much for that.

MSM model from [inaudible] writing with regards to DNS abuse, oh, there is something. A lot of things from coming in here which could be discussed with the Board, DNS abuse, IGO/INGO [access]. [Oh, Thomas, know that.]

Okay, so the next thing is the comment in the chat with regard to NomCom review, we'll come to that later on under AOB. Thank you very much.

So let's move to the next item then which is the ISPCP charter. A lot was done over the past two weeks with regards to that. Chantelle was so kind to put all the pieces together from the old charter with regards to the new comments and the new draft charter pieces.

It is a little bit still in a raw status with regards to the structure of the charter. But what I found, I personally and Lars, we are checking through the charter. I have also sent it to Tony to have a look to that, so I had some comments from him as I well. I forwarded the comments to you, Christian and Chantelle.

So now is the question of how to deal with that, how to get that in a format that we think from its structure it is not confusing and not duplicating things. So that is from my point of view one of the major important things to be done. Christian, could you chime in here?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Absolutely. Thank you. That's a good summary of where we are now. Let me go ahead and take us back though so that I can highlight the amount of effort that we've been able to overcome in the past year.

Just to give people an overview of our overall goal with this project, the ISPCP is looking to go through a process to renew its constituency charter and have that approved through the ICANN multistakeholder process. This will be the first time that we have had a charter put through the process of multistakeholder review since our charter was approved in 2009. We did go through the process once before of doing a charter update, but it has not gone through this entire process.

So we began the conversations in late 2018 about how we were going to go about this and ended up formalizing a subgroup in early 2019 of a group that was going to break this down by section and work on it by section. I agreed to be the member organizer of this group and have

been working with Chantelle to build a workplan and operationalize a workplan that has our volunteers in the subgroup breaking down and working on things by section.

We have seen a lot of activity since the beginning of this year from our members within that group, and I want to thank the people that have worked really hard to create sections and get us to a point where we have taken the various components that we've gotten from members who have worked on their sections and pulled together a master document that is now redlined, filled with comments that detail consistency issues and things that have to be worked through operationally.

We basically received all of our topline comments as of yesterday. So what we have now is indeed, right now, with redlines I have a 34-page document broken down into ten sections of which the three that are most important that break down who we are and specifically what we are here to do are the first section which is Mission and Principles, the second which is Organization and Constituency Leadership. Those are specifically how we are organized and what the rules and regulations regarding our leadership are. And the third which is Membership which breaks down the criterion by which you should be a member.

At that point, the remaining groups are focused on a lot of operational work that we've built in regarding how GNSO Council representatives work, how other communities and working groups work, decision-making, elections, and policy positions, communications requirements, meeting requirements, outreach requirements, and

ICANN 68
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM
22–25 June 2020

then how we go through the process of amendments, revisions, and version control.

One of the things that we've really accomplished in the past couple of months in the drafting that Jen and Tony have been so kind to have done for us is to take the transparency and openness requirements of the modern ICANN and to make sure that they were embedded in the text of the membership section so that we didn't need to create our own particular section.

What we have left is at long last a document that has all the building blocks for something that we can put up for the next stage of our process. To walk you through what the next couple of stages are, once we take this document that is now redlined and we resolve the remaining comments and we clean it up and we get it into a shape that this group has one more meeting to resolve, we're going to be able to quickly move on to our next stage in the process.

The next stage in the process is to put this up for member review where we basically turn to the entire membership and we get them to mark it up and comment on. I think that there are going to be people who challenge our assumptions around mission and principles, who challenge our assumptions around membership criteria, who challenge our assumptions around this and that, and that's fine.

So we'll go ahead and we'll engage that process. Within the workplan, we've got a certain amount of time in which we can have people step up and basically put this to the test from within our own membership. At that point, we'll go ahead and turn what we have over to ICANN

staff, and ICANN staff is going to double check and make sure that we've checked all the boxes to make sure that we meet the criterion that are required by the bylaws and the processes that have been approved by the GNSO Council. They'll get us back any notes of things that we will need to change in order to meet basically macro community guidelines.

So that will be step number two. At that point, it will come back to the membership. We'll get those notes and we'll resolve them and we'll have one more look before we go ahead and put it out to public comment. And there will be a period where the public can go and they can tell us whether they have any issues with what it is we have presented.

Now that we have this redlined document, we are in a position to be able to move pretty swiftly through those stages. So even though we've been working on this since late 2018, we're going to see a lot of activity toward that over the coming months.

That's the end of my status report here, and I stand open for questions.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, Christian. It looks like we have a plan to [cover] the last steps, but there are still some [heavy] steps. I think one of the greater workload is right now on the shoulders of Chantelle, you, and I'm also volunteering now to help in structuring that document in a way that it is comfortable to all of us in that sense.

And then with regard to the several steps, Christian, I'm a little bit [inaudible] to ask but I would like to know whether it would be possible to have a kind of timeline with regard to those steps. It is helpful to have a timeline to set some milestones on it as you have mentioned the parts: ICANN check, member review again, and then public comment, and the first member review. So if we put some times behind that, it would be helpful and give those who are dealing with that also a deadline to see, okay, that's it and then we are going to finalize it. Would that be possible for you?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Yes. Actually, when we first started this project we wrote a workplan for this project. We haven't met all our deadlines, so we need to update that workplan. But I think that once we have gone through the comments that now exist, once we resolve the redlines, once we have gone through all the work that you see now in the 34-page document, Wolf-Ulrich, it looks complicated because we wanted you to see the work of the combining of documents. But it's not actually that far, I don't think, from where it needs to be.

Once we've resolved all that and turned it into a cohesive document, I think we will also go back to the workplan and we'll update the workplan. And we'll put in these sections and we'll make sure that the members understand the timelines of each section and how long they have to review each section so that we update the original workplan to reflect modern timelines and use it to set easily understandable

ICANN 68
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM
22–25 June 2020

timelines for the stages as we go through our subsequent review processes. So I'll work with Chantelle to get that done as well.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thank you very much for this. Thanks so much. We have a second item to be covered by you, Christian, with regard to the CROP program. I know you were working on that with Chantelle. Could you just briefly update us on that?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Absolutely. This is just real quick. We are currently in the process of working on our FY21 outreach plan. That gives the ISPCP, as long as our plan is Board approved, it gives us the ability to receive funds for outreach.

Basically, what we're looking for is a workplan that updates the things that have been going relatively well for us. I've got the workplan up in front of us. It would give us three in-network abilities to go out there and go to a conference or a speaking opportunity to have a member sent to go ahead and do that and also to pull somebody into a meeting.

So we have three travel slots for FY21. It could be for a meeting. We also get to provide financial support for ISPCP members to attend outreach and recruitment events related to ICANN-sponsored meetings or ICANN meetings that they wouldn't otherwise be able to attend.

The problem that we've run into that has left CROP material on the table is that oftentimes we will see opportunities for outreach and we can't match it to a member that is willing to go and speak that is in network.

So one of the things that we were thinking about is to start collecting expressions of interest from members within the group that are interested in doing outreach ahead of time so that as opportunities come up to us we know which members are interested in going out there and speaking on our behalf and interested in giving presentations about the ISPCP and about joining the ISPCP so that we have a better shot at being able to match opportunities to the people that we can actually send who are in-region.

I said in-network; I meant in-region. Because as we know, ICANN is broken up into geographic regions. And in order to qualify for CROP funding, you have to be able to send somebody that's in the same geographic region as the networking opportunity.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thanks very much for that, Christian. One question [inaudible], thanks for that, is supposed to work to be able to be managed if we overcome the COVID-19 situation. So that is my question, how that impacts the entire program. What does it mean? Is that meaning we are going to shift it just then we know depending on when the COVID-19 will be over, or how can we deal with that and ICANN is dealing with that, the entire program?

ICANN68
VIRTUAL POLICY FORUM
22–25 June 2020

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: That's a good a question and there may be others that have answers that are more informed than my answer. But my understanding is that we are building a budget to make sure that if there are travel opportunities, that we are able to get those travel opportunities funded.

It may be possible within this realm that the only opportunities that we end up doing could be there are remote conferences and some of those remote conferences do require registration costs. If you were to do that, you could get those registration costs covered by CROP and you could use a slot. If we determine that that's the only shot that we're going to get in that fiscal year, then that's what we would do.

But right now, my understanding is that whether it ends up being a situation like that where we're asking for meager funds but still funds nonetheless in terms of to do something from a remote perspective or whether we end up getting into a situation where we actually could put people on planes, we want to make sure that ISPCP has done its due diligence to have its slots available during the fiscal year.

I don't believe that these slots will push out. We will actually need to file a FY22 outreach plan for 2022 slots as these aren't just going to roll over without more labor.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thanks. Very helpful. Thank you very much. So let's move to the next item, Ajay, universal acceptance update. I'm sorry. I would like to

ask you to keep it about five minutes for this update because we have really to stop the meeting at the top of the hour because [inaudible]. So, Ajay, please go ahead.

AJAY DATA: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Thank you, everyone. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Five minutes will not be at all justified to have an update for the whole year. However, I will try to be as crisp as possible because I have a presentation to make, but I think the time is now allowing to do so.

But [majorly] has happened is we did a study of 1,000 websites globally and the results for arabic@arabic [are what you can say at] idn@idn and idn@ascii is below 20%; idn@idn is around 10%. So that's the result of universal acceptance [accessibility] for top 1,000 websites. A very important study. If you are interested, it is available on the website and we can share that directly with the members

Another thing is we also did a study on how many email servers are configured which are supporting EAI. That's a very interesting study in 2019 we did, and this is almost 10% of the email servers which are configured to support EAI. Of course, that also is very, very important to understand that Google servers and Microsoft servers all are EAI ready. That's good news to know. It's not very new news, but it's a very important thing to [inaudible] so that other people also get [inaudible].

Another thing which is very important which we have is a unique opportunity which we created to create local initiatives. I am very happy to share that the Commonwealth of Independent States in Europe (CISE) is active [in India and China]. They are in place, so we have [valid] contracts and we have [valid] chairs in these regions: India, China, and CISE. These are the local initiatives which have taken place.

Local initiative means whenever [inaudible] group get together and try to take a UA mission in their region. When I started as a chair, the first thing which we started discussing is sitting at a central location three vice-chairs, one chair, and a few other working group chairs. We cannot design the whole [world department]. We must have people on the ground who know what is required in that region, what will work, what will not work, what is required to be done. That's how local initiatives work [from].

I chair the local initiative working group, and we are heading toward that to have local initiatives in as many countries and as many regions as possible. Two working local initiatives are already [inaudible] for discussion [inaudible] Thailand and Turkey. We have [the complete plan] with us, and we are reviewing them to approve and initiate there in these two countries too.

Another thing which is very important, we have started training for how to configure EAI and how to build Java software with UA readiness. The [inaudible] training program is happening. We are doing a Train the Trainers program. We are training volunteers who

can train. If you are interested in EAI, [inaudible] we have a trainer in that region. So this is one initiative which we have started.

We have now 40+ volunteers in 17 countries who have already identified to help [one of] these trainings. So this is a large number which we have achieved, 40 volunteers in 17 countries. So we are doing this activity globally. It's a very important aspect which we are trying to do.

Another thing [is] FY20 [inaudible] and we are into now [FY21] plan. And in FY21 we have created a very [adjustive] readiness plan, what we have a achieved, what we have not achieved, what is in progress, what has [not just] started, and what we intend to do new with [our learnings]. So [adjustive] working group plans are in place.

One other new thing which has happened in last one year is we have [valid] working groups. So if anybody who is [hearing here] is not part of UA or you are [inaudible] to become a UA working group [inaudible], you can simply apply. Just visit the UASG.tech website and come to the bottom of the page. You will see "Join UASG Working Groups," and you will click. Everybody is welcome. There is no selection or rejection process, so you are free to join any working group.

We have a Technology Working Group. We have an Email Address Internationalization (EAI) Working Group. We have a Measurement Working Group where we measure the EAI and the UA readiness on the Internet. We have a Communications Working Group. We have a Local

Initiatives Working Group. You have a choice which working group you want to join in.

There is a lot of content available on UASG.tech website. The most important which you would like to read is Universal Acceptance Readiness Framework. It is UASG026 if I am not wrong. Just search "readiness framework." It should be UASG026.

If you are interested to see that report which I just talked about, Universal Acceptance of Email Addresses in 2020, that's the document. It's a work in progress, but the document is available on the website UASG027. So you can actually see that document, and there can be many things which are there.

Very important thing if you have not gone through, ICANN is [inaudible] UA ready. They are trying to become UA ready. There is a case study published by UA on ICANN UA Case Study, very fascinating to know the adoption, the process which they have followed, and how they are moving to become UA ready. If anybody out of ISPCP is interested to become UA ready, that's one case study which you would like to have.

This month we have approved six more UA ambassadors across the world, so this is also very, very important to understand that these ambassadors are our mission forwarders. They take the mission to their region and promote, propagate, advocate. All those things they do in their regions.

So now at the end just as I am supposed to be in five minutes, I am completing in five minutes. Please join Twitter on social media. It is the UASG.tech handle on LinkedIn, on Facebook. Please join a working group. Please apply for the ambassador program. Become part of our discuss list, and send us an email at info@UASG.tech if somebody has an inquiry. And my email address is [inaudible] if you are interested to talk to me. I will be very, very happy to support and take [inaudible] further. Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich, for providing this opportunity.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much for this comprehensive and very good overview of that and the update. Thank you, Ajay. Sorry for the short time allocation on that. We could also [inaudible] to have once in a further meeting, later meeting more time to discuss that. Thank you for that. I take from it that you have a big program. The program is also funded, and that [was discussed] with ICANN so that there are at the time being no big problems now to get this program run. You are engaged now in engaging people. There are some, a lot, in 17 countries more than 40 people for that. So it seems to be it's on a good way, and that's what we have seen in the past. To some extent in former times it was really on the top of the [inaudible] ICANN structure and [inaudible] by the Board. And we and you, we have to keep that connection very good in order to have continued support for the UA efforts you are doing. So thank you very much for that.

We come to any other business here and have left six minutes right now. So I would just stick briefly on the DNS over HTTP, but just briefly. And mainly then to coming to the question of the NomCom review and things to be done. And Philippe has maybe a short notice on TLDs for private Internets. ATRT3 was discussed and we can in our smaller circle further discuss [inaudible].

[inaudible] just Lars, DNS over HTTP.

LARS STEFFEN: Yes, thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. We don't go through the slides. I think this will take too much time. What is currently going on about DoH within the ISPCP? The ISPCP recently put out a statement on DNS over HTTPS which was also already circulated in the ICANN community and we also already received a number of emails of feedback on this that it is interesting and the ISPs created their own statement.

The statement addresses the impact of DoH on the ecosystem of ISPs raising some points on technical impacts but also on regulatory and policy considerations. If you're interested in the statement of the ISPCP, just go to the ISPCP.info website where you can download the latest version of the statement.

What we can say is that the concerns that have been raised in the statement refer to a current ecosystem where you see a limited number of DoH providers. [inaudible] representative I can also add that we are currently working on [our own] statement which is more comprehensive and will also offer a number of solutions how we can

address this and how to create an ecosystem where DoH can be implemented and also with ISPs being a vital part of this.

We are working on this to put it out in the summertime and as soon as it is available, we will share it within the ISPCP and also to all other stakeholders who are interested in this.

What I can say to those who are interested in following the discussion is not only to read the statement of the ISPCP but also to follow the work and the mailing list of the Encrypted DNS Deployment Initiative (EDDI). EncryptedDNS.org is the website.

You can also follow [inaudible] discussion. For example, two weeks ago at the EuroDIG but also at the High Level Group on Internet Governance of the European Commission where there are regular updates from different stakeholders giving updates on the DoH. For example, from Google or [Open-Xchange].

What is going on on the deployment level, Mozilla is already using DoH as a default in the U.S. Chrome is already offering an optional [same] provider [auto-upgrade] option to the [inaudible].

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, everyone. One moment while we get Lars back on the line.

LARS STEFFEN: Hello, can you hear me now?

CHANTELLE DOERKSEN: Hi, Lars. Yes, we can. Please go ahead.

LARS STEFFEN: All right, okay. So if you're interested in following the discussion, please reach out to ISPCP members or directly to me. And please feel free to download our statement from the ISPCP.info website. Thank you very much.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you for that, Lars. We are looking forward within the ISPCP also for what's going on within our [inaudible] membership on that [inaudible] will be looking forward if that document is ready and you're going to share that with us.

We have still the very last minute or two minutes now to go. I wanted to take this opportunity to start to discuss a discussion about the NomCom review and the proposal which was done by the review team with regards to the future membership of the NomCom [on] the GNSO.

In total what they have suggested is to leave it up to the GNSO as a whole to fill the NomCom from their side with a set number of people. So the suggestion is not to allocate membership to the different stakeholder groups and constituencies in the GNSO [rather] and to leave it up to the GNSO to discuss it and come with a suggestion who should fill, who should be a member for the next NomCom and so on.

So this discussion that I will circulate the NomCom would like to have a reaction by the end of July to that. I would like to encourage you

because we have circulated on the list [in order to] have a look to that and to come back with comments.

We could have also a kind of smaller team to discuss it. In the beginning I think we will discuss it on the CSG ExCom as well and come up with some ideas to the list here. We have a contact to the CSG [inaudible] the CSG to our ExCom colleagues as well. They are keen to discuss that item because it may—the membership itself is not only just related to the NomCom rather than it's related to the entire GNSO structure as well, the voting rights and these things.

So just a question here to [inaudible], are there any early comments on that? I don't see a hand at the time being, so I leave it with that to say please come on, come to the list and comment on that with your ideas and we in the CSG ExCom will take it into consideration for it and further discuss it in the next call.

Okay, so I think the meeting is almost [inaudible]. Philippe, maybe we have a chance to hear you with regards to the TLDs for private Internets.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: I won't take too much time. Just to draw attention on an email I sent, I re-sent, from the NCAP mailing list relative to the use of ISO standard—I forget the number, 3166, the [CC] ISO standard—string [inaudible] can be used as private TLDs. I would encourage ISPs to have a look at that, especially in the context of [inaudible] and use of

the DNS. Happy to take that offline, but it's an interesting read developed by ICANN staff in personal capacity to the IETF.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. I have heard yesterday also from [inaudible] that they tried [inaudible] to put it as an official ICANN document. They are just [inaudible] to review it [inaudible] to make it as an ICANN document as well. So thanks for that, Philippe.

Thanks to all. We come to an end here. Are there any further comments? Not the case, so thank you very much for attending this meeting. It was well-attended. Thank you for that. I wish you all the best, good health, and have nice further meetings. Thank you and bye-bye. Thank you, Chantelle.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]