
ICANN70 | Virtual Community Forum – GNSO - ISPCP Membership Session
Tuesday, March 23, 2021 – 09:00 to 10:00 EST

BRENDA BREWER: Hello, and welcome to the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers (ISPCP) Membership Session. My name is Brenda Brewer, 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 this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments allowed during the time set by the chair of this session.

If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

This session includes automated real-time transcription. Please note this transcript is not official or authoritative. To view the real-time transcription, click on the closed caption button in the Zoom toolbar.

With that, I will hand the floor over to Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen, chair of ISPCP. Thank you.

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: Thank you very much, Brenda, and hello, everyone, to the meeting. As this is our official meeting at ICANN 70, it's an open meeting and it also fits to our schedule when we have monthly calls. The difference here is that we don't only speak about policy and internal matters but we have also a guest speaker today who is coming in later on and is going to introduce himself, Andrew Campling. Thank you for being here.

We have only just 60 minutes today, and we have a fully packed agenda to discuss. As usual, we'll be discussing matters in relation to our friends from the Commercial Stakeholder Group and its preparation for meetings within the Commercial Stakeholder Group which we will have tonight together with the ICANN CEO as well.

So first question formally for me is, is there any disclosure needed for statements of interest? This is not the case. Thank you. Is there any additional comment to the agenda circulated? Not the case. Thank you very much.

So let's go ahead directly with the preparations for the GNSO Council meeting this week. I've picked up a sample of items which have been already brought up at the closed CSG meeting last week and where we should take a view on and may have an opinion on that as well. For that also, I'm happy that we have our councilors here available who can support us with that.

Philippe, my first question to you would be is that a comprehensive list of items which you would be expecting that we talk about and have a view on that we can put forward this view onto our councilors for their meeting? Is that okay? Philippe, please go ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Can you hear me?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes, I can.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Hi, everyone. That's certainly one possibility. My proposal would be to take a slightly different approach. I note that, for example, EPDP Phase 2A is definitely something that we need to cover. For the others it's no secret that some of them were originally in the AOB and were taken as discussion items.

And as I think I mentioned during a Council meeting, there's some likelihood that we will have an extraordinary meeting that would include the framework for continuous improvement, for instance, the SSAD discussion follow-up. So my proposal would be to focus on two things. On those motions that are up for a vote, there are two of them, and EPDP Phase 2A. That would be my proposal as items. The others I think are not urgent. It's just my point of view. Is that okay with you, Wolf-Ulrich?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much of that. Well, we follow you. That's great, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: [inaudible]

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes, go ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Happy to. Thank you. And, Osvaldo, please chime in whenever you want. I'm sure that it will only be partial. So as I said, there were two items, two motions. One of them, the first of them, is the IANA naming functions contract amendment which was originally in the consent agenda and was taken out of that for procedural reasons. It so appears that we need to vote on this and have a full vote. So that was a bit of a cock-up, if you see what I mean. So my suggestion would be that we should support this. There's no issue with this one, with that amendment. The ccNSO Council has voted on this. There was a public comment period that I think ended yesterday or the day before. And so I think we should support this. That's Item 4 on the agenda.

The second motion that's up for a vote is on transfer, the review of the transfer policy and the associated charter. I think we had the opportunity to discuss that within this group. This is to some extent CPH's game and to a large extent a registrar's game as well, so that's

obviously something to do with the consensus policy that deals with domain name portability just to cut it short.

I don't think there's an issue with the charter itself as far as I can see. The one item that we should be cautious about is the team. The leadership will be proposing a number of seats for the various SGs and Cs and for the ACs as well. Our proposal would be to have two seats for GAC and two seats for ALAC. They offered three, so that's sort of a balance between what we can offer reasonably and what they suggested.

Bearing in mind that there is, if you look at the charter, that with the fact that they have two seats, etc., does not change the consensus call. That's an important thing. There is some language in the charter such that the call is not the number of members basically counted but it's essentially weighing the various constituencies' positions just to cut it short.

So again, the proposal would be to support this, but I don't think there would be any suggestion to go further than the two seats. But we think that's a happy medium.

So this is for the two items that are up for a vote. The third item that I'd like to talk about is what you have on your list, and it's indeed an important milestone. It's EPDP Phase 2A and the report from the chair and the liaison to Council. Formally, it's essentially for discussion noting that there were comments during the last two Council calls, I think, to the effect that in the absence of consensus within that group

there may be a decision to take by Council to suspend or to terminate the PDP.

So just to summarize where we are, the chair will be describing the situation in the PDP. The fact that there was a legal subteam that came up with a number of questions that will determine how the group can move ahead, there is good opportunity for this team to reach consensus down the line. There's a chance, let's put it this way. I forget what language Keith would use, but that's essentially what he will be saying. And given that there is that opportunity as well as pending questions that were sent to Bird & Bird, the consulting firm, for guidance as well as if not a consensus policy but possibly a BCP of sorts, a best common practice for the registrars, there's some possibility for this group to come up with a useful output—it's a broad term—and produce the initial and the final reports in a reasonable timeframe.

So that's the essence of the report that Keith will be making to the Council. And although that's a discussion item, there's no need, there's no ask to Council to support this. In essence I think we concur with that. Obviously, those of you who would be part of that team would be welcome to intervene, but I think we concur with that approach and I think in all fairness that report is faithful and reflects the actual state of the EPDP Phase 2A. And the next step will then be for the initial report to be published and at that time determine the consensus.

So that's just as far as I think I should go. I'd be happy to take questions or comments for the EPDP members within the ISPCP. But I think those

are the three items that we should be focusing on. Thank you. Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much, Philippe, for that comprehensive input here. Let me just go briefly through and maybe we will come to an...maybe we can finish with the first two ones very quickly.

The first one was the amendment of the IANA agreement. So the question, well, I was also reading that do I don't have a problem. Is there anybody who would like to chime in and add a comment to that? It doesn't seem the case, so we can accept that then and the councilors note they have support from us to support that. Thank you.

The second one was regarding the IRTP team. Philippe, you know it's good to have the possibility to fill two seats. It's not as easy to do though with our small team here. So what I'd like to ask the colleagues here is really to think about volunteering for that team. It is an important team. It is mainly focused from the contracted parties house on this matter, but if we have people here also who are interested or have also some business relationship to that part of the business in total, then I would be happy to get any answers, any volunteers from here. I would say [inaudible] if you are directly people you would like to volunteer, please let us know here in the chat. If not so, please feedback on the list. Thank you.

So the third one regarding the status of the EPDP Phase 2A, Philippe, I understood that there is not a kind of decision to be taken about the

question of termination of the PDP. I know there are requirements for that from other groups. But do I understand there will be a discussion around that? Is that the case? Did I understand that correctly?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. That's exactly that. So there is no formal vote. I think procedurally if anyone...if a constituency would like to suggest or promote the idea of terminating a PDP, any SG or C can propose that through a motion to Council procedure wise. In this case, we're not at that stage yet. It's the report which was originally planned. There might be comments along the lines of, I don't know at this point, but we might have to terminate this. I don't know. That's [inaudible]. But there's no...formally, it's a discussion item and it's all in that term. It's a discussion item, a formal one because it was planned for the EPDP Phase 2A. And in that context, there is an opportunity for comments, and people might indeed suggest terminating the PDP. And in that respect, Council based on those comments may have to take action, if you see what I mean. If there are no such comments, so be it. So my proposal would be indeed that we support and concur with the report from the chair and the liaison to Council. I hope that I'm making sense. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Yeah. Thanks very much, Philippe. Is there any comment from the floor to that? I don't see hands here. I would also agree because we have supported the EPDP [2] outcome as well, and so I think that is a good way forward. I personally would like to also support what Philippe has

said. If there is no objection to that otherwise, we should go for that. Thank you.

So okay, is there anything else from the floor regarding other points here? Just asking again, Philippe, with regards to the GNSO framework for continuous improvement, I may say we had a [inaudible] discussion about that as well and you have seen what I have put forward to Julie from staff. They are waiting for an answer from our side.

What I will formulate still today to put forward for that is that in principle we could agree with such a step forward as we did in the past, but we have some issues with the question of the number of the teams and how to fill those teams in parallel. So that's one thing. We have some issues with the question of the prioritization of those teams. As you know, we have a big discussion about GNSO review, the holistic review, and would like to have that be seen as a priority.

And it seems to be from the form of that program that might get to after one or two years to come up. So it is something not really clear to that. But that's an issue for us to be discussed. And then the voting scheme if it comes to votes in the taskforce is referring still to the incumbent voting scheme on Council where we have problems with. So that is what our concerns with that should be discussed on that, and I would like to put that in written form today to staff.

Is there anything in addition? Philippe, is your hand still up?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Yes, it's a new hand, if I may. Thank you. Yes, just to say that these comments are very welcome. I think this is a work in progress. My personal, for what it's worth, not as a GNSO chair but my personal concern is overload and the ability for the community to commit to participating pretty much on an ongoing basis to such a committee or such a framework. And on substance, I understand that there's a question mark on GNSO [3] that should be taken into account. I think that framework still needs further work, and again that would be an item for our extraordinary meeting after ICANN 70. Those inputs will be very welcome as well as those from the CSG in general. I think we need to work on this.

Speaking as chair, I think I wouldn't like this to be yet another committee, if you see what I mean. I know ICANN is suffering from this, and especially in our remote working days, if you see what I mean. So we don't want yet another administrative layer so [inaudible] streamlined process. So thanks for this, and I think that will be taken onboard. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah. So thanks very much, Philippe. So we have to switch right now to the next item. I wouldn't like to cut any time from Andrew Campling's presentation [inaudible]. So I'm really happy that we have him here today to talk about a proposal regarding the European resolver policy. We've never discussed that here in this group before [inaudible], Andrew.

Andrew, you know we are a really diverse group. We are a global group here. We have also many non-European participants in this group. And I'm really looking forward to hear from you. The floor is yours.

ANDREW CAMPLING: Many thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. I'm hoping my slides will appear on the screen. If not, I can present them from my device if that is easier.

BRENDA BREWER: One moment, Andrew. We would have to make you a co-host to share your slides. One moment, please.

ANDREW CAMPLING: Okay. Whilst we're waiting just by way of introduction, as Wolf-Ulrich said, I'm here to talk about the European resolver policy. Just by way of introduction to me, my background is worked in the tech and telecoms industries for the last 40 years in a range of roles starting as a programmer through to public policy and public affairs. My company which I founded about two years ago is 419 Consulting which is a public policy and public affairs company focused on the tech and telecoms sectors. And of late, I've done quite a lot of work around encrypted DNS working with a range of companies from across the industry, particularly linking in to the activities underway in the IETF focused around those various new protocols that are emerging. Now let me see. I think I am now able to share my screen. Yes, it looks like I can. I'm hoping that you can now see my slides.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Very good.

ANDREW CAMPLING: So I've just covered that in terms of introduction. Looking specifically at the European resolver policy, this has been developed with input from across the industry from a wide range of both players within the industry, civil society, various regulators, government bodies, and a whole host of others, so quite a good cross-section of different organizations.

It was written partly in recognition that most end users do not know that DNS exists, what it does, what it's for. But it's coming to the fore somewhat with some of the developments around encrypted DNS and, therefore, starting to feature in some user dialogue despite the fact that users are ill equipped to knowledgeably answer questions.

And there are concerns voiced occasionally that somehow users are being tracked and their DNS data is being monetized, even though from my understanding certainly in Europe with GDPR that is unlikely to be the case.

So the intent as you'll see is to give reassurance to end users and other interested stakeholders that, in fact, personal data gained in the operation of DNS resolution services isn't being used for any other purposes other than those that might be required by law or regulation or where the operator has got GDPR level consent from the end user.

And the way that they use the data is clearly documented in an easily accessible transparency and privacy statement.

Now there are some current policies focused around DNS. Some of those if you're familiar with the current subject area with some of the developments around encrypted DNS companies like Mozilla have produced. In Mozilla's case, it's trusted recursive resolver or TRR policy. There are others, so I'm simply using that one as an example.

The ones that I've looked at are typically written from a U.S. market perspective and the U.S. market is very different to that that exists in Europe and indeed other major markets around the world. So, for example, there are no explicit references in many of the policies to the applicable legislation and regulations. Other local requirements can be problematic because they're not consistent with those requirements within the U.S.

And arguably with policies coming from applications companies then potentially the applications become gatekeepers to the use of DNS, and there's quite a clear risk of yet more centralization of core infrastructure as a result, particularly where those policies maybe only have a very small number of allowable resolver options. I think in the case of Firefox, for example, there are only less than a handful of available resolvers unless you do manual configuration, which hardly any mainstream users will do because that's not something that they understand.

Also, looking again at the policies themselves because potentially they're being written at the application level, there is a real risk of

fragmentation, a large amount of inconsistency, and it's fundamentally unhelpful to users with lots of different policies that they, in theory at least, would need to understand before accepting. And we know that's an issue anyway with users actually reading user agreements, so providing them with yet more is an unhelpful step forward.

So with that in mind, we've produced a European resolver policy. It covers a number of areas. I'm not going to go through these in detail, but I've put on the slide some examples. So I've pulled out some of the key components that are focused on privacy, which you can see require the resolver operator to clearly document and publish details of their operational practices. And in the case of operational practices, that they should adopt those that are specified in the IETF's RFC 8932 which is Recommendations for DNS Privacy Service Operators. So there's good practice in there and, therefore, rather than duplicate that we simply refer to that as the right place to look for those recommendations.

Also on privacy, that operators should not keep or transfer data to third parties unnecessarily unless it's anonymized or aggregated as appropriate. They should not monetize data. So we're quite explicit on that. And they should not engage in user tracking through the use of HTTP cookies or other such techniques. The actual specific techniques will depend on the protocol being used for DNS, but HTTP being an example that's relevant for DNS-over-HTTPS.

We also looked at requirements for transparency. As you can see, fairly straightforward. The privacy notice should be readily accessible. It

should be written using plain language and should be up-to-date. It should be clear that there's an underlying requirement to comply with relevant [inaudible] both EU wide and national legislation. So that's things like GDPR by way of example as well as any national requirements.

There should be details of any personal data that is stored or processed by the operator so that can be easily found. It should capture details of any data requests from law enforcement agencies and whether those are acted upon. And importantly, there should be a complaints procedure should there be issues with any filtering that applies to deal with any false positives or, indeed, false negatives.

I think I may have skipped over one slide, so bear with me a minute. I'm just going to go backwards. Yes, sorry, I skipped over the slide, apologies, on security and filtering. If there is any blocking which could be mandated in national law, then there should be a record of what blocking is undertaken in terms of what categories are affected. If there's filtering, then it should be possible to opt in or opt out. And cyber intelligence should be shared at an aggregated level to not disclose personal data. But we very much encourage the sharing of cyber intelligence as that's for the common good.

And importantly, we believe that care should be taken if anyone offers DNS resolution services that don't provide malicious content protection or the blocking of child sexual abuse material. Great care should be taken if such offerings are made available to the mass market because where we've got non-expert end users such as consumers not

blocking things like malicious is probably not helpful and will expose them needlessly to harm. An important caveat there though is if it's unlawful to provide those protections, then clearly the resolver operator shouldn't. If it is lawful, then we believe they absolutely should as a default option.

In terms of use of the policy you can find the policy details at EuropeanResolverPolicy.com. I did notice, by the way, just before jumping on this call there is currently a glitch with the site which I need to talk to our hosting provider about, so I will provide you with an alternate URL in the chat in a moment.

Basically, it's not protocol specific, so any resolver operators whether you support regular DNS or indeed any of the newer encrypted protocols, be that DoT, DoH, or DoQ, or indeed an other that are in development, then the policy is still applicable.

It's very much targeted at resolver operators, be that ISPs or dedicated resolver operators, but other companies can certainly endorse the policy and encourage others to adopt it, such as membership bodies, industry regulators, legislators, software developers, and so on.

Very easy to adopt the policy. It's simply a case of making sure that company processes and transparency and privacy reports are updated to reflect requirements. And then we'll add your organization to the list of compliant companies. And there is no charge to adopt it. It's an industry wide initiative. It's intended to be easy to adopt, so there's no barrier in terms of ease.

So that's a very quick run-through to give you a sense of what the policy is all about. I hope that was useful. I posted in the chat an alternate link to the details of the policy which you're welcome to use. So at that point, I'd just ask if anyone has any questions that you would like to raise or any comments indeed you would like to make.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: First, thanks very much, Andrew. I think that gave us an impression of what this is about. That is helpful. As we did not discuss that earlier in our group, I would also be thankful for hearing from members whether their respective companies/organizations already have these kinds of policies in mind or have been thoughtful about that and what is the status about that. And also, as this seems to be a European policy, so hear from others from other regions, that is something you could think about or is already going on in your region. First is Philippe. Philippe, please go ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: And if you could introduce yourself to Andrew, please.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Certainly. My name is Philippe Fouquart. Hi, Andrew. I think we've met. Well, not met actually.

ANDREW CAMPLING: We have indeed.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: I'm with Orange. French based operator, but we operate as an ISP in a number of European—but not only—countries. First to your question, Wolf-Ulrich, as Orange we do have that sort of policy. Although I think the purpose of this is to make it public, and as a rule I don't think we do. I mean, it's not as clear as what is suggested here, if you see what I mean. It's certainly something that we should do. It's a message that we try and get across to our operational teams and for various reasons it seems like it doesn't quite get across. But some ISPs are a bit [inaudible] sometimes a bit difficult, especially on DNS resolvers. In DNS in general, and probably even more difficult for DNS resolvers. So that's for your question, Wolf-Ulrich.

To you, Andrew, when you...and by the way, first question, is my understanding correct in terms of the goal being two-fold, i.e., the substance having that policy but also making it public? That's the first question. And the second question is more specific to, I forget which slide it was, but when you say blocking must detail categories of material, what is exactly the expectation? Is it a general statement that any material deemed illegal is blocked, say? Or is the expectation of something along the lines of here's the blocked list and here's the court rulings that are associated with it? I think speaking as Orange, but I'm sure that's pretty much the same for all ISPs, we don't block domain names. We apply what other people tell us to do, and the courts are one

of them. There are other specialized agencies who would have that power. But on the blocking, what are the expectations? Thank you.

ANDREW CAMPLING:

Thank you. Let me take those in order. Firstly, yes, absolutely the intent is that this is publicly available to give transparency. Because as I mentioned, there are some concerns that ISPs in particular are tracking user activity and monetizing that activity even though I have yet to find any material evidence that that indeed is true. But that is a concern that has been voiced in a range of public fora over the last few years. So by making this public it makes it much easier for people to see what your actual policies are and deal with those false rumors. So being clear, public, transparent is all very positive.

In terms of the blocking requirements, you're absolutely right. Much of the blocking that resolver operators do is typically mandated by legal requirements, be that court orders, national legislation, etc. But equally some blocking that's undertaken is driven by threat feeds that you may be used, particularly for things like malicious content. So the intent is not to list the URLs of all of the domains that you block because clearly that would be unhelpful and in some countries that would be illegal and it would be relatively straightforward to overcome that blocking. So the intent is to detail the threat feeds that use the categories of content that you may block rather than the fine detail of every site that you block.

We would ideally like it that where it's done by a court order that you could actually put up a helpful splash page to indicate why access to a particular site is not possible. But as you all know, given that most

traffic these days is accessed through HTTPS, that is technically challenging to actually do that. So at least putting the information in the transparency policy as to the type of sites that you might block access to will give some information to your users and probably more than they currently have.

I hope that answers your two questions.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Andrew. It does. Thanks very much, Andrew and Philippe. Are there other additional questions from others here or any comments to that? I think it's of interest also to Andrew who is deep in this [item] to hear what's going on maybe in other regions. I don't know, for example, from the U.S. Do we have a comment from that side or from others? I would say from the [Euro] side [we] often critically looking to what's going on with GDPR, with other related things here in Europe. And the question really is, and we understand there is a big discussion about whether ones who adopt such kind of policy or are thinking about a general policy in this respect.

Anyway, if there's no comment directly right now, then I would say we pick it up as it is of interest here of our members in the future as well and would say also that it could be possible to get directly in contact to Andrew with that. Andrew, if that is acceptable from your side, I would circulate your contact to the membership here. Is that acceptable to you?

ANDREW CAMPLING: That's completely fine. I'm just putting it in the chat as we speak. I'll put again the current URL whilst I get the hosting fixed on the main site as well as my email address. So by all means, come to me.

And for those people not based in Europe, although this is very much being driving by need for something for Europe and you will see announcements over the coming weeks of organizations that are adopting the policy. It's not specific to Europe, and I know that some of the organizations that are looking at it are envisaging adopting it for their worldwide resolver activities given that often the requirements in Europe around privacy are actually stricter than in some other geographies. So I know some organizations are considering adopting it worldwide across all of their activities.

But if anyone has any questions they'd like to raise offline or other points, comments, etc., by all means reach out to me and I'll be very happy to continue the discussion with you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much. Last question is, can we also circulate the presentation you have given to us? I think you may have provided that to Brenda, and she can circulate it with the membership.

ANDREW CAMPLING: Yes, that's absolutely fine. Brenda has the PDF, and you're very welcome to share that.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Great. Thank you very much again. You can stay if you like to hear what we are doing internally here. No problem. And thank you very much for your attendance and your presentation here.

ANDREW CAMPLING: Thank you for the opportunity.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah. We now move to the next item. It is regarding the ISPCP charter, and I would like to call Christian to give an update about that. Christian, please.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. Absolutely. Thank you so much. We are a bit over, so I'll try to be brief so that we can get closer to being on time. Since I last reported in a public meeting we've inched ever closer to having a completed new charter to present to the ICANN community for validation before enacting.

Just a little bit of a background, during the IANA transfer process all SOs and ACs it was baked in a set of requirements that they enact this sort of policies and principles in their chartering practice. Our goal was to get ahead of that. It has not been handed down that this is a requirement that people jump in and start working on their charter process, but we wanted to get ahead of it and not work under duress. So I guess in 2019 we started the process of reworking our charter, and we put together a charter drafting group that has been meeting

periodically in order to arrive at a new document that we're all happy with.

The procedure by which we will move forward from where we are right now is that once this charter group has together by a consensus policy decided on the charter language that they're all comfortable with, we will move that onto the membership for a vote after the members have had a chance to review. At which point, it will be reviewed by ICANN staff and then put forward as a public comment on the ICANN community pages for the community to address any concerns they may have. Once we have resolved any comments that are brought up by either ICANN Org or the ICANN community, we can then put our charter into action.

So where we are right now is last November we had our mostly completed document put before the charter group for a vote. And what we determined was—I can't share my screen, can I? That's okay. It's fine that I can't share it. What we determined, we have a document with ten sections. I'm going to read the sections to you:

Mission and principles; membership and organization; constituency, leadership, and executive committee; membership coordinator, nominating committee, delegate, and secretariat. A section on elections. A section on decision-making and policy positions. A section on communications, on meetings, on outreach. And a section on amendments, revisions, and version control.

Very thorough document that explains how all of the organizing and leadership mechanisms within our organization work. The drafting

group came to a consensus that we are comfortable with all but the composition and membership sections, where there continues to be slight disagreement around certain aspects of language. We are working on a forthcoming call to try and hash out a proposal that has been put forward by Malcolm Hutton to simplify that section where we had attempted to break out different types of membership, which has never existed before, into a format that might be more easily accepted by the drafting group.

We continue to also talk about definitions of what constitutes an ISP, and there have been differing takes on definitions. Some have seen some attempts at defining what an ISP is as an opportunity to expand beyond what our membership currently supports. And so that's another thing that we're going to be trying to address in our forthcoming call.

But as soon as we solve within this group issues surrounding composition and membership, in the coming weeks we will be able to pass the rest of the document which has already been signed off on by the drafting group to the broader membership for vetting.

What I've done to make sure that we are making the best use of our time is I've asked Chantelle to take the rest of the document beyond the two sections that we continue to work on and move them along to ICANN staff to have a preview of the work that they're going to have to do next giving us recommendations on any concerns that they have so that we have foreknowledge of the things that we will need to know in order to

make sure that we make the tweaks necessary to move us on very quickly to public comment period.

The one thing that I will note is that the drafting team received a first draft of a proposed new composition and membership section only in February, so we're about a month out. So even though we met last November to sign off on the rest, there wasn't a lot of work that happened between November and February. We're back in it. We are working diligently on solving that last set of questions. At which point you're going to see the document and I think you're going to be really happy with it and we'll be able to move on quickly from there.

I stand ready for questions.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Thank you. Thank you, Christian. Any questions directly from the floor? As Christian outlined, there is a plan. As usual, it's not a really big issue because we have made up all the big issues. But it's a delicate issue we have to talk about in the small group. So I would say I think we should get prepared in the small team very well by ourselves but also from us side, Christian, what is the last update on that. That we have an open discussion on that and then we really think about what to do in case if we cannot agree let me say to any of those proposals, how we should deal with that. We should really think to come to an end. We've had discussion about that.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Wolf-Ulrich, a comment on that. I think that you're right. There are two components that are outstanding. One is really the breakdown of different types of membership and what constitutes a voting and nonvoting member. I think we can reach consensus policy on that. I think it just takes a little bit more work and a little bit more talking between the groups to try and find the path forward on that. So I'm not so worried about that.

I think ultimately there's a difference of opinion as to what the definition of an ISP is, and that's going to be stickier. We're probably going to end up in a situation where we end up with a non-consensus definition that needs to be put forward to the wider group for a vote and will ultimately end up with some people unhappy. But if we have a document that basically one line is controversial, I will be happy even if—I'm attempting very much to stay neutral—even if the definition I like the most ends up not being the one to move forward because I'm really proud of the rest of the document.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thank you. You have a good plan. Thanks very much. So we have left the very last five minutes. I wouldn't like to cut that for our NomCom guests as we have available the NomCom Outreach Committee here which gives us an overview on what's going on on NomCom. Please, who is going to give the presentation?

BRENDA BREWER: Tola will give the presentation today. Tola, unmute your line.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Welcome, please. Tola, go ahead.

BRENDA BREWER: Tola, your audio is not working very well.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: I'm having issues with the network [inaudible], so I don't know if I'm heard. Can you please hear me? I'm trying to confirm if my [inaudible].

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, we can hear you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes.

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Okay, greetings, chair of ISPCP and apologies for my network is [inaudible] so I don't know how much you can hear of me, but I'll try as much as possible to make it as clear as possible. I greet everyone on behalf of NomCom 2021. We are making outreach to [inaudible] on the vacancy available for three different positions on the Board.

As you can see on the screen, the ICANN Nominating Committee, the NomCom is looking for leaders who represent a variety of cultural, geographical, and professional backgrounds while also striving for

gender balance. So we want to [inaudible] members of ISPCP of the GNSO on who could apply.

We want you to please make outreach to your members and members of [inaudible] to include [inaudible] that can influence global Internet policy, your members that can impact the evolution of the Internet. We have interest in people that have come on board to develop the professional skills and collaborate with a diverse group of industry leaders as you currently have in the ISPCP. And we equally want people that have the mindset and skills that can engage with the global community as we have multistakeholders in ICANN.

If we have members with critical thinking with cultural awareness [worthy] of the ecosystem, the Board or executive experience of different organizations they belong to either in the Internet ecosystem or outside the Internet ecosystem. And of course, they must have background in either legal, government, technology, or business, or nonprofit organization. Can I have the next slide, please?

Okay, so again we are looking for leaders. We are looking for people that can help us in the next phase of the deliberations of the Board of ICANN. Next slide.

[inaudible] set of leaders we request for those that will join in the ICANN Board of Directors, they are vacancies that we need to replace. And in this outreach we would like to present [inaudible] to all those we need to present. Next slide.

As we get [inaudible] the Board, we [currently] need people to join the At-Large Advisory Committee. We want those that will represent three members that will join the regional At-Large committee. Next, please.

We need [as it concerns us and the] GNSO ISPCP, the GNSO requires two Board members on the Council. So we require two people, and [by consensus] [inaudible] ISPCP are members [inaudible] we need to get to people that will join the GNSO Council. Next, please.

Then the ccNSO, the Country Codes Names Supporting Organization, we require just one on the Board. So whereas, we were more interested in the GNSO, we can as well reach out to people that may be interested in joining with the ccNSO Board. Just one vacancy exists there. Next, please.

So in summary, three members are required to join the ICANN Board, three members to join the regional At-Large, two members for GNSO [by consensus], and one for the ccNSO. Next, please.

For more information on this outreach I've made, interested members can please visit the ICANN website as displayed on the screen right now. And that will be all from us on the Outreach Committee of the NomCom. Thank you for the attention, and do enjoy the rest of the meeting. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much, Tola, for that. I have only one question with regard to the...

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: [inaudible]

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Can you hear me, Tola?

ADETOLA SOGBESAN: Yes, I can hear you. Please, go ahead.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes. I have just one question with regards to the Board slots. Are they related to specific regions? You know what I mean? So the question is with regards to the variety of regions which are represented on Board. Are these three Board slots allocated to any regions? Tola, may be on mute, but we can't hear him. Can you hear me?

BRENDA BREWER: Wolf-Ulrich, it appears that his line has disconnected.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, good. So we can look at this. Maybe it is here on the website which is here on the screen as well. I would suggest right now as we are over the top of the hour that we close the meeting. The items under AOB I will send out on the list about that because we are overtime right now.

So thank you very much for the participation for all, for the externals as well. We also will send out a Doodle with regards to the next meeting. I

will be in contact with Brenda regarding this. Thank you very much, and have a good time further on for the other meetings at ICANN 70. Goodbye, and the meeting is adjourned. Thank you, Brenda and team.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]