ICANN78 | AGM – GNSO ISPCP Membership Session
Tuesday, October 24, 2023 – 1:30 to 2:30 HAM

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Hello and welcome to the ISPCP membership session, which is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

Questions or comments submitted in the chat will be read aloud when requested by the chair, Philippe Fouquart. To ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand, unmute your microphone, state your name for the record and speak clearly. Mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

To view the real-time transcription, please click on the Closed Caption button in the Zoom toolbar. And to ensure transparency of participation, please sign into Zoom sessions using your full name.

And with that, I'll hand the floor over to the ISPCP Chair, Philippe Fouquart. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Natalie. This is Philippe Fouquart speaking here. Welcome to our ISPCP session in Hamburg. Welcome, everyone. Welcome to the ISPs and the observers. This is an open meeting; recorded, as you can tell.

Before we go through the agenda that we have on the screen, I'll just ask, as usual, whether anyone would have to update their SOI,.

Okay, seeing no hands, let's move on then. Point 1/ Point 2: As you would recall, the Board approved the revision of the charter a few weeks ago. Quite an achievement for this group. It's been the result of years, I should say, of work by the ISP community with this vote. And even if what we do here is informal, I would say, that's the opportunity for us to acknowledge this vote and also to put this new charter into practice.

And just as a way of a formality, I would like to have a show of hand as a ratification of this new charter, which we will put into practice in a few weeks from now. There's a number of new elements in terms of onboarding, of new members, et cetera. So if we could just have a show of hand as an approval of this new charter?

Thanks, everyone. I'm looking at the ISP members just as normal practice. So this is ratified. We'll take the opportunity of having a drink during the reception. We'll try and find a location. We'll let you know on the list just to have a small informal get together at the reception. I think it's tomorrow, just to celebrate this.

I would also acknowledge the new members of the ISPCP. Some of them are here. Welcome, Houda. Welcome to Tunisie Telecom, and thanks for joining.

We also have … I don't know if our colleague is online. I don't see him remotely, but [Vodafone] recently joined the ISPCP as well.

I think you're both great additions to the group. We'll make sure that the work we do here is relevant as far as your activities are concerned and we're looking forward to your contributions to our work.

On this item two, I'd just like to open the floor for any comment you would have. And as a last note, you would remember that in the new charter there's an emphasis on outreach and a new role, and we'll need to take that on Board moving forward. Christian expressed his interest for the role, so we'll discuss that. But just I want to note that unsurprisingly, given the amount of work that we put in it, there will be … "changes" is a strong word, but new elements in the way we proceed with our work within the constituency.

Any comment on the new—Susan?

SUSAN MOHR: Thanks, Philippe. I just want to recognize Christian and the work that he's put in to move this across the line. I think this is something he's been working on and really driving for several years and I think it was a really collective effort within the constituency to support that work and get it to today's ratification and our celebration tomorrow.

So thank you, Christian for your work on that.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: I appreciate that very much. I want to defer appreciation to the entire drafting committee that has been working for, like, six years to try and get this finally done. And so those of you who are in the room who have been working on that—Malcolm, Lars, and, Susan, yourself.

And Tony, who actually initiated this process six years ago, I'm glad that you're here to actually see it through. So a special thanks to you for actually kickstarting this. Wonderful thanks.

Yes, Houda?

HOUDA CHIHI: So I want to say congratulations. My name Houda Chihi with the onto fellowship program but I started the approval of my membership with ISPs. I am so happy working with you, and I want to know, what is the next steps?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Houda, for the question. And before I address your question, to the list of those who contributed to this piece of work, I do want to add Wolf-Ulrich's name, who couldn't make this meeting. But as you saw, probably on the list, I shared Wolf's note, and I just want to acknowledge that [inaudible] and the fact that he considered it a really important point to cover for the group. And the work of the team resulted in the appreciation of the Board as well, with their characterization of this as being an outstanding piece of work.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: One of the best they've reviewed, they said.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes. I didn't want to say that, but thanks, Christian. Okay, thank you. Thanks, everyone.

With this, let's move on to point number three on the agenda and we'll have a look at the council agenda for Thursday, both for part one and part two.

And I'll turn to councilors. Osvaldo, Thomas, who would like to help us go through this?

Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA: Okay, the first issue is the review on the statements of histories requirements from the committee overseeing and implementing continuous improvement. We talked about that in the last call, I think it was. Basically the proposal is to change the statement of histories to two parts; one a general one, another one specific to the work group or the part where the person is participating in ICANN.

The reason it wasn't approved the last time is because some of the councilors required a presentation to their constituencies, not because they were [getting a seat]. When we talked about it on our last call, we all agreed that we saw it as positive and we should vote in favor of that. That is my understanding.

The second issue is a more complicated one. The pilot holistic review revised draft terms of reference. This is going to be presented for feedback, not for comments. There is no decision going to be taken on this.

First, I may say, as a [preamble] to this, when ATRT3 decided to propose the change of the organizational review, substituting that with continuous improvement programs and proposing a new holistic review of all ICANN, we with our constituency, with the Business Constituency, presented the minority report against this initiative.

Anyway, it was approved, the Board approved it and decided that since it was so complicated to consider a holistic review, the idea was to do a pilot holistic review, and they presented the draft of the draft terms of reference for that. That was the first presented. It received many observations from the community. There were a lot of them. And the principal observation was that the scope was unclear, that there was a lack of independent examination in the holistic review, there was a lack of identified dependencies and that the community might not have the ability to support the holistic review work.

Due to this, the Board decided to revise the draft terms of reference. And this is the second issue of the draft terms of reference. There are big changes here and I think that not all the observations of the communities were considered. For example, there is a lack of independent examination. What the people that proposed this draft terms of reference answered to this was that each SO/AC has the ability to contract any independent expert they wanted for the continuous improvement program, but not for the holistic review. That's one of the observations.

Besides that, this pilot holistic review is not a review in itself, it's to prepare the work, the path forward, for the first holistic review. So what is the results of this pilot holistic review will be a list of requirements for the holistic review and the results they want from them.

So that's my view because I was part of the ATRT3 and participating in the draft terms of reference. I don't know if you have any questions.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Osvaldo.

Any questions or inputs for Osvaldo on the four questions?

Sorry, Tony?

TONY HOLMES: Well, to start with, I'd like to thank Osvaldo for all the effort he's put into this. It's been a really tough ride for him.

But I think the outcome of this is really disappointing. It's miles away from what it was first set out to be. It's not meeting any of the goals that we have, and particularly the last remark from Osvaldo that it's really, even now, just going to form requirements, it's not going to go anywhere. And we've submitted our comments into this a number of times, and they've not been taken account of it. In fact, I would suggest they've been totally ignored. We submitted that minority report.

Whatever happens, I do think we've got to go back on this again and reinforce the points that we made before. And also I would suggest that we're not enamored with the process that's been set out. It seems as though it's anything but a holistic review of the organization. And this organization now is over 30 years old. It's never had a root and branch review. We got to the stage where we had the stovepipe reviews of each part of the organization and we became overpowered by them. We couldn't keep up with the pace of them. So at a stage a little while ago, the decision was taken to stop. We're not going to have these stovepipe reviews. We're going to have the holistic review. And what we're left with is anything but a holistic review.

So for ICANN to maintain a situation where it's considered fully accountable, this really brings it into jeopardy. And I think we should put back a really strong response from the ISPs on this, that it really is a really big issue for this organization. It needs to be taken seriously.

And the other concern I have (I don't know whether you can throw any light on this, Osvaldo) is the scale. So now we're talking about having the spirit of comments. We're going to get out of that, at some stage, a set of requirements. I don't know what the timescale is for that. And then we might possibly have a review. It can be years away still. And we're left in this situation where it's not addressing the issues, it's not addressing the structural requirements or the structural issues that have been round for 10 or 15 years.

And if I go back to the last time we had a GNSO review, we were told at the time because the GNSO was not really accepting what came out of that review. We were told by the Board (and I can remember this), “Live with it for a year, and then we'll review it.” It's never been reviewed.

So all of those points I think we need to put back in the form of quite a strong response. And it would be good if we could have a few members come together to try and draft something that puts our position back to the Board.

I don't know what the timescale is, Osvaldo, for the review; how urgent that is.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Well, the idea is for the pilot holistic review … Initially it's about 18 months. They said it was too short a period. Since they reduced these terms of reference (it has a reduced set of the previous one), they say this might be done in a year, but we have, I would say, six months to start it. So it would say 18 months. That's unrealistic in ICANN. I don't think we will be able to do it in a year.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: I simply wanted to point out that our window to give them feedback that this is inadequate is November 27. Correct?

TONY HOLMES: 22nd.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: November 22nd. So we've got a month and three days to write something to tell them this is inadequate.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Christian. As a side note, and just to react to your characterization of the fact that the pilot is not a review but intended to facilitate the end results, it somewhat reminds me of the discussion we've had on the ODP, which was a formalization of the guidance to the Board, which is expected to speed up the process of both the Board's votes but also, eventually, the implementation, which didn't quite prove to be the case. So that's the same sort of reasoning there, I think.

So more on the case at hand, I think for the council discussion, we're relying on you to use the elements that the ISPCP put forward in the minority report.

But also, separately, I think we'll take an action point to convene very quickly a small team of members to come up with some text to react or to provide our comments, or just, at the very least, to note that some of them are still relevant to the pilot. And this would have to happen very quickly.

Tony?

TONY HOLMES: Just one other point on this. I don't know whether Osvaldo can provide any more information, but where are our partners in the CSG on this issue? Do you know that?

[OSVALDO NOVOA]: No.

TONY HOLMES: Because I think that this is probably a discussion we should have with the CSG. Certainly I think it would be polite for us to let them know that we're going to respond in the way we're going to respond. And there may be some additional strength in knowing what their position is if they're in a similar frame of mind and whether there's any additional benefit from trying to work closer with those to try and get a view on this. I don't know where we are on that, but I think it's worth following up, if I could suggest that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Tony. And just to note that during the day zero meeting, I think we discussed a number of topics that were considered as having dependencies with the holistic review, one of them being NomCom rebalancing, although that's not strictly within scope. But you can tell that the holistic review and our approach of the NomCom rebalancing, saying that we should look at the broader perspective, creates a dependency with the holistic review. So I think there's going to be some sympathy with the notion of approaching that topic together as a group. Not sure the timeline will help, but just in the corridor, I'm sure we can let our colleagues know that we will be working on this and we'll see whether we can develop something together for the due date.

Tony?

TONY HOLMES: I don't want to dwell on this, but just to say that, on the session this morning that took place with the CSG and the Board, I felt the way they dealt with the issue that was raised for the NomCom review wasn't very satisfactory to our other constituencies in the CSG.

So I don't know what the best way of tackling this is, but it may be a good thing. Philippe, if I could suggest you, as chair of our constituency, maybe raise this with the chairs of the other constituencies. And if it would be helpful to have a broader CSG call on this topic alone, I think it might be helpful for us if they support that. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Tony. I'm happy to do that.

Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA: For the record, just to bring it to attention, when we presented the minority report against the holistic review, it was the CSG, not just ourselves. It was not only us.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks for the information. So, yes, there shouldn't be any problem with us moving together on this topic.

With this, I'd suggest we move on with Council's agenda on the other points.

Osvaldo or Thomas?

Thomas?

THOMAS RICKERT: Yeah, I can continue. The next point on the agenda would be the report from Jeff Neuman, who is our GAC liaison. I think it's probably not the right time to read out the report or go through the contents thereof. I think all in all, we should hear what Jeff has to report. But the general notion of having a GNSO liaison to the GAC, I think, has been proven very successful. And unless there's anything alarming in the report delivered by Jeff, I think we should just applaud Council for having put that function in place almost ten years back. And I think it helped bridge the gaps between the two organizations inside the ICANN community. So I think that's just a report and then a discussion.

Then a more contentious issue is what we call the dot-quebec discussion, where it's not only the Germans that have the funny dots and the umlauts, but Quebec has a diacritic and they could only go for the ASCII, or they've been asked to only go for the ASCII string in the last round. And the problem is that if they apply for Quebec with the diacritic, chances are good that it will fail because it's a confusingly similar string.

And I think it's problematic that we're now asking for an issues report to have the problem explored and then we might need to do policy development on top of that. I really hope that we can find a faster and easier way to make sure that Quebec gets the Quebec string in both variations. I think that probably we can chime in because this is not the only instance in which this issue might occur. There are ways to mitigate the potential for harm for internet users for being confused by strings.

So you can think about the concept of grandfathering to make sure that the owners of existing second-level domain names under the Quebec name are granted the identical string under the Quebec with the diacritic. You can think about bundles that have to be offered by the registrars to make sure that there's no distinction between one and the other because I guess there is a real risk of, let's say, a financial institution having the original Quebec name and then someone else registering for the name with the axon and thereby trapping or defrauding customers in phishing campaigns or otherwise. But I'm not sure. Maybe those who are familiar with ICANN processes have an idea of what we can present or propose, but I hope that there is an easier way than a PDP and then requiring them to go through the full application process to fix this issue. That was obviously not foreseen at the time.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Thomas.

Any comment on this?

I have one, probably not in my capacity as chair, but as a member of this constituency. So to Thomas's comment, I cannot agree more with this. I think to most native speakers this is a no-brainer. And this is going to be on record, but I do not want to go back home explaining that people here are working for two years to design a policy that we consist in convening an expert panel who will take 15 seconds to determine that this is the same word and this has to be the same registry, and there will have to be consistent policies underneath for [SLDs]. I do not want to do this because we will look foolish.

So to me now, more seriously, I have nothing (and again, speaking individually, not as a chair) [against] the issue report. I think there would be benefits in doing this, in having the across-the-board sort of evaluation. And on this, I think it would be useful if we could have not only the issue report part on the policy side of things, but also on the client side of things because I think most of the reasons why we ended up here is because of the lack of support by the ecosystem.

But I'm with you. I think if by requesting an issue report, it means that, as Sebasti[e]n put it very rightly yesterday with the GAC, we're only at the beginning of the Z shape. And then again it's going to take three years to develop whatever has to be developed. I think we can do better than this. And there are cases where, as you said, we grandfathered things that were done in the past. Certainly it's maybe not a one off. There are cases in 2012 applications that would be under the same regime, but really coming up with a policy for something so narrow, I'm sure we can do better than this.

Christian?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: So I agree with everything you said, but isn't the IDN EPDP already looking into these similar string questions when it comes to the issues as they apply to the next round?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Christian. I think the question … This and other things were subject to correspondence. Not sure that was formal correspondence, but certainly the IDN chairs responded that that was out of scope.

THOMAS RICKERT: They said they couldn't do it. And maybe just before we move on so that we don't lose your idea, to be clear, I don't have anything against understanding the issue, but an issue to report as the first step in the PDP. That's my problem. And I think that we need to think out of the box. Maybe the answer lies elsewhere. We have the IDN fast track that we did. So maybe this is something where we can suggest putting that into that route, to divorce that topic from GNSO policy or GNSO processes and just put it into the administrative part of what ICANN is doing.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: I'll take Malcolm's comment first and then I'll suggest something.

MALCOLM HUTTY: Thank you. My immediate reaction there is: but surely this must have come up before, hasn't it? I mean, on the word "Quebec" either with or without the accent, the diacritic is the same word. Has there not been any policy created? I mean, we've got string similarity policy. What about string identity policy to actually enforce an identity between these two? The last thing we want is actually to have a registry operator that is granted dot-quebec then asked to operate another registry for dot-quebec accented the other way with all the opportunity that creates for those two registries to become out of sync and the security issues that are very foreseeable that would fall from that.

It clearly ought to be (I'm speaking personally here) the same, as in literally the same. And it ought to be made so that it is entirely irrelevant whether you use it one or the other. You get the same result. And that should be a policy requirement that that happens when things are designated as being identical, which should be something that, at time when you apply for the domain to be created or the TLD to be created, you identify the identical ones and you get the batch and then you are required to make them identical and to operate them identically.

If this can be done in policy, surely this is what is needed. And if it can't be done in policy without some change to the DNS protocol and the way that the resolvers work, then we should be probably working together with the IETF and other relevant people, the maintainers of the main resolver and server services, so as to fix this because this is not just a dot-quebec case; this is going to happen all the time. And it's a major security issue as well.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks Malcolm. And to this point, it's not a "technical problem." That's really the fact that it was a choice made in 2012 and there was some similarity … I think there was some confusion with the fact that adding an accent could indeed change the meaning and the fact that for proper nouns, then, as you're saying, it's just common sense that it has to be—

MALCOLM HUTTY: There may well be words where it's [not] identical, yeah.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes.

MALCOLM HUTTY: But here we are talking about something where it is, and the decision as to whether or not a particular word was identical to another word would be made at the time of the application for the registry. The way I would envisage that happening is whoever applies to run dot-quebec applies to run all the variants of it that they do and they mark it as being identical and therefore the identical policy will apply to it, resulting in the kind of behavior that I've just described. Surely that is how this should be. And it may well be that there are other words which mean different things according to whether or not they've got a slight different thing and then that would be treated differently. But we must have the capability to identify and enforce strict identity.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks.

Thomas, you have your hand up?

THOMAS RICKERT: Just briefly, the applied-for IDN gTLD string in the Latin script containing diacritics, which is not an allocatable variant label of the base ASCII two string (so ASCII string) I think is the issue. Other scenarios can be dealt with via variance, which we can't. And I'm not sure whether that's something that can easily be resolved.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: To the … I'm sorry. Akinori, nice to have you here.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Thank you very much. Akinori Maemura from JPNIC. I actually am very surprised with that. It's a recent development and it's actually how the label generation rule works for the security and it is quite a loophole for that. And then I am still studying about that and then if I had any good suggestion or technical perspective, then I will share with you, but not now. Sorry about that. I'm really embarrassed with that because I was in charge of the IDNs in the Board when I was serving. So I will do something for you. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Akinori. And then no one would blame anyone. It's just a matter of having, as would happen for languages, the right people in the room.

AKINORI MAEMURA: Actually, as Malcolm said, it is possible for this kind of case to happen, but it is hard. If the language and the script is different and the language generation panel is different, then they need to coordinate to have quite a coherent variant management. But it is very surprising loophole for this.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: It is indeed. Thank you, Akinori.

Coming back to Thomas's question, I'd like to draw line there. I think you have the material for the conversation at Council. Feel free. And certainly what I'm hearing from the room is that there's a concern on the timeline. And if there's room for grandfathering the TLDs for which there would be the same sort of issues, which would make the definition of a solution speedier, then I think that's what Council should go for.

On the issue report, I think we appreciate the intent, but again, the concern is that as Sebasti[e]n put it yesterday, it's only the beginning and we don't want this to last forever.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thank you very much to everyone for endorsing whatever approach can be taken that resolves the issue the fastest whilst taking care of the security issues going along with it. I think we don't just want to endorse whatever, but if the security is maintained, then we would support the fastest way possible. Great.

So just quickly, on the first part of the GNSO Council meeting agenda, there's just AOB left. And the second part of the meeting, as you know, is more an administrative meeting where we elect new Council Chair, and where the Vice-Chairs are seated, new councilors are introduced, and we only have one candidate for GNSO Council Chair, or GNSO Chair, as it's called, in the bylaw, to be precise, and that is Greg DiBiase. He has submitted his candidate statement. He has been open for questions during the Council's working session. I suggest that we vote in favor of Greg, who's done an excellent job as the Vice-Chair so far, and that we don't go for the option of none of the above.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Thomas. We had that on the agenda of our last call and indeed that's something that we endorse fully.

THOMAS RICKERT: Great.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Thomas.

Any other questions for our councilors?

Okay, moving on then. Item number four. Just a reminder on the timeline of the election.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: So that's right, I'll give a quick update on where we are. As a reminder, there are three positions that exist within the ISPCP's ExComm, that being the Chair, the Vice-Chair and the Executive Committee member. Two of those three roles are up for elections at this time. Of those are the chair role and the executive committee member role. With the Chair role, there's an acknowledgement that Philippe is actually serving out the remainder of Wolf-Ulrich's final term right now. Philippe is therefore eligible to take on his own first term should he be nominated (and I hope that he will be nominated) when nominations begin on the 30 October. We are going to start a process of having nominations on the 30 October, and we're going to close nominations on the 10 November.

On the other role, which is the one I currently fill (ISPCP Executive Committee member), I am terming out. So I have served two subsequent two-year terms. That is a role that has traditionally involved helping to manage a lot of the day-to-day operations of the organization, managing the website, things like that; managing lists and communications and sort of sub-secretary duties such as this when we don't have the access to secretary duties as provided by ICANN. And I am termed out at the end of this year.

Therefore, if there is anybody who is interested in stepping into that role and those set of responsibilities, please get ready for the Nominating period on October 30, and hopefully we'll get some candidates for that between October 30 and November 10.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Christian.

Any questions on the timeline? I think that's pretty straightforward.

Susan?

SUSAN MORH: Thanks. Just one correction. The nominations close on November 5, and then the acceptance is November 10. So we do have a really short timeline. So I just wanted to introduce that small correction.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: I appreciate that. Thank you, Susan.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay, thank you. Let's move on and go back to the agenda. Mindful of time, we'll go also quickly on item five. It's a result of the rechartering effort.

Christian?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: So that's right. We have some new responsibilities now that, since the beginning of this meeting, our charter has been in force. And one of those responsibilities is to nominate somebody who is responsible within the organization for driving outreach. This is not an ExComm position. This is a volunteer position to, in my estimation, lead a group, because this is certainly an effort, since we are all volunteers, that it's going to require many to accomplish the things that we need to accomplish. So it would be the leader of a group who would convene the efforts within the organization on an ongoing basis to handle outreach.

We have done outreach within this organization for as long as I've been a part of the organization, which is almost ten years, but we always could have done better. And my hope is that we take this rechartering as an opportunity to recommit ourselves to our responsibilities, to continue to grow the pipeline of new members. I think that within the context of doing outreach within the ISPCP, the work of the committee that we put together with somebody being tapped to lead the committee as per the bylaws should start with us taking a look at the onboarding procedures that we currently have in place for new members, which I think are probably pretty woefully inadequate to sufficiently bring people into our community as active members.

So that would be the first recommendation that I have. But we need to figure out how we can figure out how to put somebody into that role and build a committee around them so they have resources to do things.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Christian.

Any comment on this?

Yes, Tony?

TONY HOLMES: I think the issue that Christian raised is really important. I think we've got the ideal person to deal with that: Christian. But I totally agree with where Christian was going because the onboarding hasn't been good and that's part of the problem. So I don't think it's fair to just say, “Over to you, Christian.” I think we should involve a few of us in this activity.

One of the things I would also suggest is that we try to involve in this activity the new members that we've got. The lady that isn't here now but was here would be an ideal candidate. And I think talking to her about how she's experienced becoming a member and what she wants out of it and what she feels she's getting and what's lacking would be a really useful start. So it's to get a small group together to work with Christian, including, as I'd like to suggest, that lady I was talking to her earlier, but also other new members as well to come in as part of that group because it's no good us pretending we're doing a good job. We should hear from the people it's affecting as well and include them in this new way of doing things.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Good point.

TONY HOLMES: Sorry to put you on the spot, Christian, but I do think—

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Oh, it's fine. I'm happy to. And her name is Houda and she'll be back and she'd be a wonderful candidate for that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Tony. Thanks, Christian. So we'll try and put that together. One idea would be to sort of add an extra half an hour or something to the constituency call and make sure we introduce the constituency to new members, but at least do this regularly every time someone joins the group.

Yes, Tony?

TONY HOLMES: Just a small point, a discussion I had with Susan earlier. If we're going to do that, most of our outreach or a lot of it's going to be targeted at other parts of the world. And I think it would probably be helpful if we maybe rotated the times of our meetings so that they're more friendly to some of these people from other parts of the world. Maybe that would be a good start as well, trying to do that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes, that's a good point. And I think that was one of the elements put forward in the Workstream 2 recommendations that we'll come on to in a moment, but it seems to be common sense to have that rotation, so we'll take that on board for the scheduling of the calls as well as some dedicated call for new members.

Anything else on this?

Okay, thank you. Moving on, we have twelve minutes to go and just about essentially three topics, but that should do. Next steps on the policy work.

Susan, would you mind helping us with this?

SUSAN MOHR: Thanks Philippe. We wanted to put this back on the agenda. This was something that we talked about earlier this year where it made sense for us to put together a small team, identify the policy issues that were of a priority to the members, and put together short, really brief policy position statements so that we would … I think we saw a couple of points of value in that. One was that those could be documents we could take back to our companies to show value in the work that we're doing. But maybe more importantly, we could use those as recruitment tools to help other ISPs understand the value that we bring to the organization. And this has been a little slow getting off the ground. We've identified the issues, but I think as volunteers, understandably, it's difficult to make this a priority.

So I think we just wanted to tee up question number one. Is this something that we want to continue doing? So we were looking for some feedback from members here today, and then, if so, then it's looking for some volunteers to rejoin, maybe reconstitute the committee, make sure that we have the right policy priorities identified, maybe realign on what the expectations are so that perhaps it's simpler or easier to do, and really drive towards some documents this year, unless the membership thinks that this is not something that we should do.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Susan.

Any comment on this?

The other factor probably for you to consider is also the bandwidth that you would think is necessary for this. At the very least, I think we probably want to pick a couple of priorities on the list that we previously identified and try and take that forward. It's something that we should raise with the newcomers as well to make sure that what we do here with the limited time we have is actually relevant to them.

But I'd like to open the floor for comments on what those items might be.

Tony?

TONY HOLMES: Well, to start with, I think we should continue, but it's only worth continuing if we've got the right things to work on.

One of the things that bothers me, and I think bothers all the community at the moment, listening to some of the discussions here over the last couple of days, has got to be WSIS. And I know there was some discussion yesterday about ICANN providing feedback, but we as ISPs form quite an important part of the community that could really be impacted with what comes out of WSIS.

So I would like to suggest that that is one of the policy priorities for us. Yes, we need to engage with ICANN with their response back. But I think as a vital part of the infrastructure, the Internet infrastructure, it would be beholden on us to put our own views back as to how we see the landscape, not only now, but going forward as well, because it's a lifeblood for all of us, that infrastructure.

So maybe make that a policy priority and try and get something back. There's a deadline for that as well, but I don't know what the deadline is for comments back into ICANN. But I think it would be a good start.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Tony. On this, I think there are two things. There's the deadline for feedback to ICANN itself, and then the end product of conveying views and positions to whatever body is in charge.

And coming back to Jeff's note in the anniversary session, on a totally different topic, it's also important that we realize that to some extent it's a top-down process there, and that we tackle those at the very bottom in terms of contributions and inputs to those discussions.

My question would be, how do you see this ("this" being what this group would come up with)? I would see this as potentially material and background to be used by all of those down the road, like my affiliation, for example, who would be party to those multilateral discussions for their own inputs, individual inputs, because I think that, coming back to the initial question, this sort of deliverables is definitely something that would be easy to reuse and of huge importance internally. So that's sort of the way I would see this working, rather than something which the constituency would sign off but then remain on a website for no purpose, if you see what I mean. But I'm trying to get my hand on the practicalities of doing this.

TONY HOLMES: I think it's both because it would be useful to have a statement out there from the ISPs' constituency. But also you mentioned, and Susan mentioned as well, showing value back to your companies from the stuff that goes on here. This is vital for all of them. So I think it serves both purposes, if you can do it that way.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Tony.

Susan?

SUSAN MOHR: I think this is what you're saying, but I think you're both right that these are … Particularly with WSIS+20, if we had our own statement that could inform ICANN as they're doing the work that they have discussed in this meeting in developing their own messaging leading up to WSIS+20 … And then as we align with ICANN, we have our statement, we've got the ICANN statement, and we can use those in our conversations with our government partners, either whether it's on the GAC or in other forums, to let them know what's happening and what's important for ISPs.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Susan. Totally agree with this.

Beyond the three of us, would anyone else be interested in joining the small group that would take this forward. Christian? Osvaldo?

Okay. Let’s—Tony?

TONY HOLMES: May I suggest that we try and include some of our new members, and invite them to join as well?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes. And we'll ask them then, like Houda, who joined the very beginning of the meeting.

Okay. Susan?

SUSAN MOHR: I just wanted to point out, as we're thinking about what our priorities are, thinking about the CSG meeting this morning and the CEO goals that were published in September, there are some things that likely align for all of us. The WSIS+20, I think, is a really great example. DNS abuse is something that is important to the CSG generally. Of course it is to us, and it's one of the CEO goals. Notably, holistic review is not one of the CEO goals. So it's worth thinking about our comments. That may be worth raising. The RDRS and the WHOIS database is something that I think as ISPs is important to all of us, ensuring we're aligned and what that position is.

So those are just examples of maybe some areas we could highlight that we know are on the CEO list that are something that the CSG is addressing, and understanding where we as a constituency come out, I think will be important.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Susan. Okay, thank you.

Mindful of time. And we've got a couple of other agenda items on, very quickly … And I think I missed Point 6. I hope most of you were at this CSG meeting where I and others gave a readout of our meeting with the NCSG during the day zero meeting. So I won't repeat it here. We put together an effort to try and coordinate more efficiently across the house, especially on items that were quite painful to deal with over the summer, including the Seat 14 appointment, which has been an embarrassment for a number of us [(]so we don't want to reproduce this[)] and work also on the onboarding of our new Board member. So we'll put that together.

On Point 8, you touched upon it, Susan, but maybe we'll take that to the list or just a quick reminder for people. I'll leave it to you, Susan.

SUSAN MOHR: Thanks, Philippe. Really briefly on this, you might remember we had the OCTO team talk to us at ICANN 77, I believe. But one of the outtakes was that I think we've agreed that it's important for us to stay aligned with OCTO. We're going to try to bring them back in. We're going to invite them back to talk about some of the projects that they're working on.

One of the things that they had offered to do was to run a webinar for us on the IHTI project, which is looking at trends and DNS operations. They thought that might be a nice introductory way for ISPs to understand some of the work that they do. And that could lead into a series of webinars where we talk about the security of the DNS, how to set up the security of DNS, which would be important for perhaps smaller or newer ISPs. And then we could lead into a series that becomes more and more mature depending on the size and the maturity of the ISP itself.

And so we're going to go ahead and kick off that first webinar on IHTI, and we'll see what kind of feedback and participation we get. And if we find that that's useful, then we can talk about broadening that to more webinars with OCTO.

And in the meantime, we will bring them back and have them talk more about their technical issues.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Susan.

So we're now at the bottom of the hour. We have a couple of items left, so we'll be two or three minutes late. I just want to refresh people's memory on the Work Stream 2 implementation and the recommendations that we discussed during a constituency call sometimes in February, I think that was.

And Nathalie, if we could have the summary of how the recommendations (thank you) had been covered by the constituency so far and by our new charter in principle.

So we won't go through the detail of all this, but I think we didn't go back to the team that developed this from ICANN Org. So I think we need to do this. There's an implicit understanding that most of those have been covered, but for a couple of recommendations, maybe there are things that we'd like to discuss that are not quite covered or partially covered, and we want to [flag] them.

So what I would suggest is, although those are not major differences, again, for the reason that we have a new charter, that I'll go back to the list and flag those recommendations. And based on your feedback, we will draft a quick letter to summarize our sort of coverage of the Work Stream 2 recommendations based on their assessment and ours. But I realize that we should probably have a formal answer on this, as we initially suggested, again, in February or January.

Anyone opposed or concerned about that?

Okay, seeing no hands, I think we can skip the public comments part. You all—I'm sorry, Christian?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: [You're saying, apart from [inaudible]].

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes, but is there something you'd like to say on that, Christian?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: I was just going to say, if you were already addressing, apart from the fact that we've already raised a need to engage in the process that Osvaldo outlined … and that somebody needs to agree to take the first pen in addressing the concern around the scoping of the terms of reference.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks.

Osvaldo, would you like to take that onboard?

OSVALDO NOVOA: Yes, sure. I think we can use it as a base [for] our previous comments, absolutely, because several of them weren't considered. So yeah, I'll do that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay. And as I said for the others, I think we can have a look at that outside of the meeting.

AOB. I just want to note that the next ISPCP call will include the candidate call. Also I'll note that within a bit less than half an hour now, we will have (I think it's at 04:00 local time) our outreach session with two topics for the membership and beyond. This is an open session.

And I'll just take the opportunity here to ask whether there are any other points you'd like to raise.

Okay. Seeing no hands. Well, as far as this constituency call is concerned, I just want to thank you for taking part—yeah? I'm sorry.

THOMAS RICKERT: You said the outreach session is at four. It's at three.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: It's at three. Did I say? Four? Yeah, in half an hour. My apologies. I'm getting confused now and I don't even have the excuse of jet lag.

So thanks for taking part and see you at the outreach.

And just for those of you who have access to the schedule, where is that? Is it in this room? No. 4F.

LARS STEFFEN: Yes, in 4F. So it's down the hall, behind hall one, the large main hall. So you have to pass the main hall, and then there are three smaller rooms, and that's one of the ones on the right hand side.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay, excellent. Thank you, Lars.

And with this, the meeting is adjourned. We can stop the recording. Thanks, Nathalie, for your help, and see you at the outreach. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]