

---

ICANN79 | CF – GNSO: ISPCP Membership Work Session  
Tuesday, March 5, 2024 – 1:15 to 2:30 SJU

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Hello, and welcome to the ISPCP Membership Work session at ICANN79. Would ISPCP members still standing please take their seat at the table? Thank you very much. My name is Nathalie Peregrine. I am the participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior.

If you'd like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given the permission to unmute in Zoom. Onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record, speak at a reasonable pace. And I will now hand the floor to ISPCP chair, Philippe Fouquart.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Merci, Nathalie. Thank you, Nathalie. Welcome, everyone, to the ISPCP session. Just a quick look at the agenda, we'll skip point one. As the participants of the ICANN79 meeting, you're supposed to have your SOI updated already.

Just a quick check on what we have on the screen. For point three, since we have the benefit of having our ICANN staff colleagues here, I believe it's going to be a bit more than an update and a call for participants. ISPCP participants will have hopefully a quite thorough

---

*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.*

---

explanation of what we intended to do. Just on this point, just to make sure people can read the agenda properly, Susan, would you mind just explaining what we're going to do for point three?

SUSAN MOHR:

Yes. Do you want to just start with point three? When we get to point three, we will be talking about the webinar series. So we have been talking with the OCTO team now for some time to do a joint technical webinar series on the DNS and how the Internet works. And so we've got the team here, we've made some progress. I think what we want to do is give you all an update on where we're at, and then kind of talk through when we think we might get that started in some of the dependencies to have a successful program.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Susan. That's very useful. I just want to make sure that people understand what I meant with the call for volunteers. With this, let's go to Council's plans for this week, and those things that are up for a vote. Thomas, would you like to introduce that?

THOMAS RICKERT:

I was not fast enough bringing up the Agenda Council Meeting. Okay. Can we move to the Consent Agenda because that's going to be the first item? So that's just the motion to adopt the Communication Small Team Report. I'm not sure whether you've seen the report. But basically, the Council has installed a small team of volunteers to look at ways in which ICANN can improve its communication to the outside world. And there are things in it like using social media, maybe trying

to come up with formats that are more easily digestible for those who do not know what we're doing, but also highlighting some of the success stories that we have. So I recommend that we do not object against this. I mean, the Consent Agenda is built already. If nobody speaks up, it will go through. But my recommendation is that we are in favor of this report. I've been part of the small team. If you're interested in details of what we did, we can do that. But basically, we worked through the various media, various target groups, and looked how we can improve our communications.

Maybe you can drop down a little bit. Other than that, we only have Council discussions with the chairs. The abuse topic that's going on, you're going to be part of the public GNSO Council meeting. So I'm not sure whether there's too much to report here.

An update on the interaction with the Board. Maybe in that regard, if I may, there's one issue that I think is important that we haven't yet discussed in this group, and that is the question whether NIS2 requires a policy response from ICANN. Yesterday—or was it the day before yesterday? I mean, one day looks like the other. We had a joint meeting between the GNSO Council and the ICANN Board. The Board asked Council what the Council's view is on the necessity of doing policy work to respond to NIS2, and Council could not give a uniform response because there are different views held in the GNSO community. We haven't discussed this so far. And I think that the ISPs need to position themselves a little bit, particularly because our friends from the IPC and BC are pretty much in favor of ICANN engaging in policy work on this topic. For those who are interested in that, there's an article written by Mason Cole, who's with the BC, on

CircleID where he basically broke down which requirements are in NIS2 and to what extent they are not in ICANN's policies, particularly the new Registration Data Policy, and they sort of derived from that a call to action for ICANN in order not to miss an opportunity to be on top of things as ICANN did with respect to privacy. On WHOIS privacy, the European Data Protection Authorities have been sending letters to ICANN as early as 2005. ICANN more or less ignored to respond to that up until the introduction of the GDPR, which brought with it substantial fines, and that was a good enough trigger for the ICANN Board to come up with the Temp Spec, as you will recall.

Now, I understand the desire of some to revisit what has been done on how to deal with registration data and potentially get more contractual remedies for trademark owners and rights holders and those who are interested in obtaining access to non-public registration data. But there is a huge risk with that, and that is that we do know that some governments are extremely unhappy with the fact that the European regulators have introduced this Article 28 of the NIS Directive, which requires contracted parties to do certain things. Because, for example, the U.S. government explicitly stayed away from regulating this because they thought this is a territory for ICANN to be active in. And if we think this through, if let's say the BC got its way, if ICANN did use NIS2 as a trigger to do policy work and implement the requirements coming out of NIS2, it would basically degrade ICANN to a technical implementer of regulators' requests. And it would either encourage other regulators to do the same, putting ICANN into an impossible situation because you can't respond to every regulatory development at the global level. And if it chose to do so, it

would be perceived like they're doing the Europeans the favor, but what about other countries in the world? So it would likely be an unfair treatment vis-à-vis various national or regional lawmakers.

So I think we should speak up against embarking on a further policy development journey, at least in the context of NIS2. And I think that all the requirements coming out of NIS2 can be addressed by the contracted parties using the existing tools. So in the new Registration Data Policy, for example, there is an opening clause explicitly stating that contracted parties can collect more data elements. They can collect data elements for other purposes than mentioned in the Registration Data Policy. So they have all the flexibility that they need to honor NIS2. NIS2 doesn't have to be followed by everyone. But those who have to follow NIS2 can do that.

Now, we had a NCPH meeting just before the lunch break. And as you can imagine, Mason Cole, in particular, beg to differ. So we're going to have a meeting at three. I offered a conversation with all those who see the need for policy development to dive into details and discuss this. So we're going to have that meeting at three. But I would suggest that if this point is going to be brought up in the meeting with the Board, and if this has been discussed or brought forward as a demand or as an ask from the BC, IPC, that we clarify that this is not a view universally held in the CSG, but that the ISPs think that no further policy development is required. Does that make sense?

---

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: As a question, it certainly does. It's a question for the group. Any comments on this? I'm noting that we have also several participants online. Any questions? Yes, Christian?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Just a very short intervention to say that I fully support Thomas's suggestions, and I also see the problems of creating a slippery slope wherein ICANN could eventually become a regulatory implementation body for the regulatory requests of other jurisdictions. So full strong support for what Thomas just said from me.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Christian. Susan?

SUSAN MOHR: I didn't have the benefit of the discussion since I did get here late. So I guess I'm kind of scratching my head a little bit. It strikes me that ICANN would have an obligation irrespective of whether they pursue this with the policy initiative that you're talking about now to evaluate any law that gets passed across the globe that can have an impact on the DNS, and make decisions about legal and risk decisions around what sort of obligations it has and respond to whatever the laws that that got passed or the regulation that got passed. So it seems like they're in that position anyway. So I'm not sure what you're asking them not to do. If they believe that they have some obligation under NIS2 to pursue a policy evaluation then it strikes me that it's like they may be in the best position to make that determination. So maybe I need more context.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Susan. Just on this point, and maybe I'll rephrase somewhat differently, again, just from a distance, I think it's one thing to say that the—one question I would have is that if I were a contracted party is whether the gTLD policies as they stand make it impossible for me to meet regulations as developed by all the translations of NIS2 nationally. Again, from a distance, I have nothing against saying this is up to the contracted parties to do that. But one question I would have—and I think that's a question that might be worthwhile considering at ICANN—as to whether there's anything in the policies as they stand that would prevent contracted parties to meet those obligations. I guess it's a subtlety. That's the sort of questions I might have. Christian?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Thomas in his intervention had mentioned that it is his understanding that the current mechanisms allow for meeting those compliance requirements, leveraging existing methodologies. Now, if the question on the table were, "Let's do validation of that and ensure that existing mechanisms are sufficient," that's different than trying to say, "Let's go ahead and enter into a policy development process wherein we can see whether this thing passed by the European Union should now be a requirement for everything." On the latter, I'm absolutely 100% opposed. If we're simply doing a validation of what Thomas's assumptions that the current mechanisms allow for there some mechanism, whether ICANN Org does that work, or whether there is

---

some sort of a methodology by which we can do the verification, I'm for that. I don't think it needs to be a PDP, though.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Again, just obviously, in my personal capacity, I would assume it wouldn't for simple reason is that it's pre. Even if the answer is yes, there's something to do, then it would have to be that evaluation, that assessment would have to be pre PDP somewhat. So that's, I don't know, what sort of mechanism could be used. But I was going to say something else. Yes. On the notion of trying to address parallel and potentially divergent demands from regulations. Plural. Again, speaking personally, I'm certainly sensitive to that. On a completely different debate, if you look at the session that we had on PICs and RVCs, that's also an order that that one is related to content. That's the same sort of reasoning as to whether down the road, you may not put out in an awkward position to answer inconsistent demands. Even on the principle and speaking personally, I'm certainly sensitive to that argument. But maybe if we could frame this way, I'm certainly supportive of this as a question mark for ICANN, as to whether down the road, even if it's down to the contracted parties to actually meet those obligations, as to whether there's any stumbling block or constraint within the current policies that would prevent them to do just that.

THOMAS RICKERT:

Even if NIS2 requirements were at odds with existing ICANN policy, it wouldn't be an issue because ICANN can't force contracted parties to be in breach with applicable laws. So they could still proceed and just

do what's required under the national law and then ICANN Compliance can't do anything against them. We saw that with—we have this carve-out in the contracts. And I guess the most prominent example was the WHOIS disclosure practice that certain registries engaged in.

I do not think that there's any requirement that would have this effect. And also, it's just the opposite way around that. In the EPDP, we have buried the Admin-C based on the principle of data minimization. NIS2 says if the administrative contact is different from the registrant name holder, that data needs to be collected additionally. And our Registration Data Policy says, as I just mentioned, if you need to collect additional data, you can do that, paraphrasing here. So it's possible. But others say, "Okay, now let's make sure the Admin-C has its Lazarus moment and put that resurrection in ICANN policy and require everyone to collect that data again." I guess that would be putting the horse before the cart because we don't want to implement literally everything that's coming in through national laws. We haven't yet seen the transposition into national law. There might be EU regulators that asked for pretty harsh verification of registration data. I don't think we want to see that in the ICANN world to be a requirement at the global level. I guess that's the danger that I see. But I think that we're aligned. So if it comes to that point, I would make a brief statement, and then certainly you can connect to that.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Thomas. I'll note Fiona's hand and Tony's posting in the chat as well. I think the takeaway here is that as long as it at this point, it's

---

not presented as an ISPCP position, I think that's fine. Fiona, you're last in the queue, you have the last word.

FIONA ASONGA:

Hello, everyone. Morning, I think where you are at. It's night here. My view on this whole issue is that, at the end of the day, ICANN need to be cognizant of its global responsibility and mandate. Governments are going to do a lot of things to try and see how they're able to control the Internet space within their respective jurisdictions. ICANN cannot begin to have developed policies to try and align with the national governments. However, ICANN has consistently and should continue to play the role it has played where it provides capacity building on the global standards and the best practices and what the global community has agreed on as a way forward. But letting the governments continue to see how then they address different issues in their respective jurisdictions. When I look at my region in Africa, some countries need a bit more oversight than even what ICANN offer us for obvious reasons. And there are others that may not. And so being cognizant of that, then we need to be able to allow the national laws to be developed to meet their national demands. However, ICANN that has a Stakeholder Engagement Team should have their staff continually building awareness and capacity on what is considered as acceptable best practices to keep the One Internet, One World together.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. Thank you, Fiona. Just on this, if I may, moving forward, I think you put it well. I think the question some of us have is whether

this sort of ideal situation that you described is indeed borne out by the policies that we have in place. I'll have to say that it's still a bit of a question mark for me and for others, apparently. So, I think coming back to the question of the meeting with the Board, and I would encourage you to have a discussion just after this session, we'll just be quite cautious as to how we phrase this. Again, for those who will be there, certainly no problem in voicing that concern, but not on behalf of the ISPCP at this point.

Okay. With this, I think we can come back to the agenda. Point three, capacity building. Susan, over to you. For those who would not be familiar with that initiative and what we did between the meetings on that topic.

SUSAN MOHR:

Sounds good. Thank you. So let me first introduce our guests today. From the Technology Office, we have Adiel and Nico. You've met them before. We have Alex from the Marketing Team at ICANN. Thank you for joining us. And of course, Joe, who's our North American engagement contact. So thank you all for coming.

This is just a continuation of the discussion that we've been having around having greater technical engagement with the OCTO Team. And we've been in discussions now for few months about doing a joint webinar on the DNS and how the Internet works, as I mentioned. So we have made some progress. Nico has confirmed a series of nine webinars that would take place likely, I suspect, we would start those in either late April, early May timeframe. He does have a preliminary schedule to propose but we haven't been able to look at it yet. So we'll

likely schedule a follow-up call and kind of walk through what that schedule looks like.

We talked about who the audience was. We confirmed that—we think that this should be a very broad audience. It likely will be. It'll be a global audience. We'll host these on a monthly basis. There'll be one-hour webinars held on a monthly basis with marketing materials. It will be hosted on our page. Christian has volunteered to help us, and Lars, I think, to get the content once it's already posted on our page. And that will be where we will direct all of our contacts. That will have to be updated on a monthly basis as we come up with a new content.

The webinars will be mostly virtual. But we talked about possibly doing a hybrid meeting in June in Kigali. So that is very tentative, but likely would plan to do an in-person meeting or hybrid meeting in Istanbul. So, I think we're feeling good about that. We talked about the need to have the presentation done in multiple languages, and that's where Alex is going to help us to make sure that we can make it available. We would also have a recording of the event. Just because we know if we're only holding one global event on a monthly basis, not everyone's going to be able to attend that may want to attend based on where they're located around the world. So we're going to have those available in multiple languages, the recordings available in multiple languages after the event.

We will have two, I think, calls for action. One is knowing that these are going to be hosted around the world, we're going to look at the various timeframes and probably vary the timeframes. And so we'll be asking our members to volunteer to help host and present the events.

So we'll look forward to getting that out likely in our next meeting. But be thinking about that. We'll get the schedule available as far as we can get it for our next meeting and ask for some volunteers. When you think about what would be asked of you in that volunteer capacity, we do intend to develop a template introduction so that we're all sort of saying the same thing about what the event is and why we're there. And then we would just modify that slightly based on the actual content. Nico has confirmed that all of the content for the nine events is done and complete, and we do have speakers with the expertise to speak to them, so I think we're feeling really good about that as well.

So I think our next steps really are, number one, to get the marketing language done, and Alex is working on that. I think once we've got the dates and times finalized, I suspect we can fill those in, but we're going to get the marketing materials out and we'll let everyone have a chance to look at that. We'll get the final schedule from Nico in terms of we know the content, we will confirm those dates. We've got to develop the template language and then get the marketing material on the website. I think that's where we're at. So we've made some pretty good progress. Nico, Alex, Adiel, did you have anything to add to that?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

No. I think on the content and the plan now, I just have one self-serving comment about the process at the end. Most of the content that we're going to deliver comes from our already existing curriculum that we already use. One thing that will be very useful for us is, throughout the process, to be able to get feedback as well from the ISP

---

on the ground about what they may be interested to hear from us so that we can start building into the process those new content that are not covered in this one, that's something we need to look into.

SUSAN MOHR: So almost like a survey at the end of each, something like that.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: You can actually build that into the Zoom, the webinar, so that they can fill those kinds of information.

SUSAN MOHR: Yeah, I think that's a great suggestion. Nico, did you have—

NICOLAS ANTONIELLO: Just to add one more comment to what [inaudible] and Adiel just said, just remind that one of the modules, it won't be only kind of technical presentation that we will deliver, it will be actually Module 3, as per how it is the scale today, it's ICANN add ISPCP. So it would be great if we prepare some... That's not the technical, it's more about how ICANN ecosystem works and how ISPCP works. It will be great if we can prepare a joint presentation that could be presented half by some of us from ICANN and the other half maybe by someone from the ISPCP Membership.

---

SUSAN MOHR:

I think that's a good suggestion as well. You'll see that when we distribute the webinar series, there is one that specifically a joint webinar for the ISPs and the OCTO team.

I think the other item that we'll be asking folks too, and then I'll turn to Philippe, is on the marketing side we've talked about our networks. Certainly, we have a strong network. As the ISPs, we've got our own members, and certainly we would want to encourage them to join. So there's really three purposes behind this. One is to support our existing members. The other is to recruit new members, use it as a recruitment tool. And then the third is to really demonstrate the importance of ICANN within the Internet governance community and the technical support it provides to ISPs.

So we will be reaching out to the extent you have you're representing an industry coalition. Once we have the marketing material done, we plan to develop targeted e-mails. And then ICANN has their own set of contacts, whether it's with the RIRS or the NOGs, then they will be doing that outreach as well. I know Lars has an extensive network in Europe. And of course, we have others with extensive networks all over the world. So we will be looking for your help in getting the word out so that we can get good attendance at these meetings. Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Susan. Just on a couple of points. On the audience, I would add the one that initially triggered the reasoning is the new comments. So they're not prospects, and they're not existing members, but they're really new newcomers. More generally, I think we have—and to your question—two kinds of audiences, and that's

going to be a bit challenging. We've got the technical people who will be very interested in things like the DNSSEC module, for instance, why they should turn that on, the usual question, the grand question. And on one hand, we also have the policymaking people. Those tend to be two separate audiences. Even internally they hardly ever talk to one another. And it's addressing those two may be challenging. I just want to put that out and we'll see how we can address that. But it may be a bit challenging.

One last comment/question is the other reason why we initially triggered this, it was the experience with people who join the ISPCP but who were initially Fellows or people who joined ICANN through a different channel such as [inaudible], for instance. I was wondering whether there would be a way for us to—once we've identified those people, it's easy to put them in the loop. At least for us, it's challenging to identify them within the bulk of those who get involved in ICANN. As a question, I'm wondering whether they would be—I don't know, the Fellowship, call that selection. But the end result, the set of people that would eventually attend an ICANN meeting, whether that'd be easy or not to identify people, for example, whose affiliation would be an ISP, an operator. We've had several examples in the past of such people, as I said. I'll put it to you. I don't know whether that's feasible even from a purely personal data perspective, I'm not a lawyer. But that would certainly be interesting for us. Again, that's a different audience.

---

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

I think for a Fellow, a newcomer, that shouldn't be difficult to do. We can talk to the Fellowship team and the pre-selection committee to try to identify those who have a technical background or ISP background and target them specifically. But I think for the more broader training, it will be hard to do unless we add to the process something that we really do is a pre-event survey, where we try to know who is attending the training, what is their background, and then we use that to adjust the content. But that is going to add another layer to the planning. Maybe we run it the first time. And then based on what we learn, we try to refine it further. Iteratively, we improve it.

NICOLAS ANTONIELLO:

I have two comments. One is to your comment which we find very interesting because it's something that we have to carefully craft in each of the presentation is to attend the differences in the background of the people that is going to be attending. So they are not going to be full technical, there are going to be people that that is more on the policy side, on the decision-making side, etc. So we will adapt each of the presentation to that reality, let's say. Of course, there are ones that are going to be slightly more technical.

But I'm also thinking—and this is thinking out loud, so don't kill the messenger—for example, we have another module which is called from WHOIS to RDAP, and that's no longer model. In real, this can be only half an hour, the part that this explains why we developed RDAP, why we are somehow someday turning off WHOIS and instead everybody using the RDAP, the advantages of RDAP, the things that were turned better than they are actually in the WHOIS. But I'm

thinking—and again, it’s just thinking out loud—that it may be maybe a good idea to also do a joint presentation there where someone from the ISPCP Membership talks about the policy challenges and things that are under the interest of ISPCP after the introduction or the explanation, the basic explanation of what is WHOIS and what’s RDAP. Because there are, as per you were talking before this today and in your other meetings, there may be a lot of interesting topics that you would want to present to the Membership to even discuss or get the feedback so we can blend that into the capacity building plan also.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

If I may, just a follow-up. Yes, RDAP versus WHOIS is an interesting topic. The challenge here is that as far as ISPs are concerned and contrary to our BC/IPC friends, two things. We’ve been using WHOIS for a number of different things, the absence of which was a challenge, but since GDPR we sort of figured out different ways of trying to do the same things without WHOIS. I’m not saying that it’s brilliant, but at least, as engineers, we try. So I guess what I’m saying is that the topic of RDAP is it’s going to be difficult to tailor to the right audience. If it’s too technical, we’re going to lose them, I think. It’s just a side note, but happy to think about it and try to tell you that.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

The course is not that technical. It’s very high level, conceptual. It was built during the transition for the registrar from WHOIS to RDAP, to just give awareness and allow technical people to understand, “Hey, the WHOIS that you know is going away. This is the new thing. This is

RDAP.” The RIR, they have been using RDAP for some time. This also helped ISP to get acquainted to RDAP in general. So it’s not technical.

Something else that we can do when publishing this is that those courses that are for general audience, we can identify them. We can actually clearly say, “This course is for everyone. This is technical, this level.” We can also do that by publishing it so that people can self identify themselves. Yeah, this is good for me. I think this is too technical for me. I’m not interested, so on and so forth.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Follow-up, if I may. Again, I’m thinking out loud. But in the technical audience that I was referring to earlier, I know that within a number of our own structures, we have two subsets, pretty much, those who would operate resolvers, for instance, on one hand, and sometimes those who would be in charge of cyber defense. I don’t know. Again, I’m thinking out loud, but it may be a different audience, if you add the hosting people, the authoritative servers. That’s the sort of motley crew of different perspectives. So, again, just thinking out loud, but we will try and cover that.

JOE CATAPANO:

Thanks. This is Joe Catapano, the Stakeholder Engagement Team for North America. I wanted to go back to the newcomer thing portion of the discussion there, and part of it is response, and part of it is answering the question with a question, so I apologize. So, you either meet with the Fellows and someone from the ISPCP meets with them at some point during the meeting? You do not? Okay. So I’ll leave the

NextGen aside for a moment because it's a different program and I have touch points with it, but it's different. The Fellowship is kind of something that has a little more concrete that I'm thinking about, want to articulate, although the Stakeholder Engagement Team is separate from the team that runs the Fellowship, the public responsibility, folks. In my capacity for the North American Stakeholder Engagement, I do see the applications as they come in, and then I'm able to comment on them, and they get fed into the process to the committee that ultimately selects the Fellows. In those applications, there are areas of interest that are flagged. I am interested in privacy issues. I have background in Internet, ISP things, whatever. I think what I question and maybe something that I might be able to take back is after the Fellows are selected, is there any kind of mechanism that notifies someone in the ISPCP leadership, secretary, whatever, that a Fellow is interested in? Maybe that's something we can work on that says, "Okay, Joe has just graduated from American University, and he's interested in the ISPCP or is interested in service." And then something goes to you guys. Somehow, organically, something can happen, whether that's as simple as a coffee or whatever to kind of get things going a little bit. Maybe that would be helpful. I'm happy to take that back to the team and talk to them about it.

SUSAN MOHR:

I think, along those lines, we've had some conversations with Carlos about the possibility of ICANN hosting a Fellowship event with the SOs and ACs, and so maybe that's possibility to do an introduction there.

---

Okay. Are there any questions or objections to what we talked about, or any suggestions for changes?

Okay. So I think our next step then would be to do maybe another Doodle poll. And if you could, we'll look forward to seeing the schedule. And the marketing language, we'll work on that template, get together sometime in the next couple of weeks, two, three weeks, and then really get this nailed down with a schedule. Once we've got that, we'll be reaching out to our members with the communication piece and a call for volunteers to help host these events over the next nine months. So thank you. Thank you for coming. Thanks, everyone.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks very much. Thanks, Susan. With this, let's move to item number four. That's the update on the CIP, also known as the Continuous Improvement Program and the Action Plan. Santanu, who's our rep on the program, would you like to... Well, maybe you remind people of what that is, how that relates to what we do internally, and also go through the questions that the program has asked.

SANTANU ACHARYA:

Thank you. I'm thankful to ExCom and Leadership Team for bringing this agenda in a short notice. So what the CIP team is doing, they are asking every group what the groups are doing and what continuous activities have been taken by the group, and whether this is effective or not. So in the first two meetings, there was update about what is the group about and what are the activities we are doing, whether we

---

have any charters or something, whether it has been amended also. Could you please open that Excel sheet? So in the first two meetings, I had updated those things.

FLIP PETILLION:

You may want to do a string search or something, ISPCP. I guess it's there somewhere, hopefully. Let me check.

SANTANU ACHARYA:

Could you click there in that main box in box D? Yeah. Just click there. Yeah.

So in the first two meetings, I had updated the CIP Team what my group is doing and how we are taking the continuous activities, and when the charter has been amended. But as of now, they'd like to understand whether any continuous improvement activities has been taken by the group, and whether this is effective or not. So I thought to bring this to the notice of the entire group and the leadership, because I'll be representing the group and my group should be there as one of the brightest group to show what we are doing. So that's why I brought this agenda. I requested leadership team to bring this agenda. So anything specific, the group wants to update their fees. You may advise me.

Second thing is that ICANN has also made five principles to discuss in every meeting. I'll read out what are the principles have been taken that the SO/AC/NomCom is fulfilling its purpose, first principle. Second principle is the structures of SO/AC/NomCom are effective. This is the second principle. Third principle is that the operation of

SO/AC/NomCom is efficient. Fourth principle is that the SO/AC/NomCom is accountable to the wider ICANN community, its organization, committees, constituencies, and stakeholder groups. And the fifth principle is that the ICANN community collaborates to further the mission of ICANN and effectiveness of the ICANN multistakeholder model. So these are the five principles based on this, our groups, the activities will be seen by the CIP team.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thank you, Santanu. Any initial comment on this? I think what we can do is that if you have a timeline, what I was going to suggest is to have a couple of volunteers, especially on the first action item, which shouldn't be too difficult for us to read this and provide some input such as the sort of things that we do on an ongoing basis, which was your question.

SANTANU ACHARYA: We have a meeting tomorrow. For the tomorrow's meeting, there is some other agendas are there. But for the next meeting, all these items will be discussed. So we have a time of around 30 days after tomorrow.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay. So, who would like to help with this? I'm certainly in. Anyone else? Susan, if you'd like. Okay. So we'll do that. Hopefully, it will be the good people.

---

FIONA ASONGA: Please let me in.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: All right. Thank you, Fiona. Sorry, I should look at the Zoom Room. Just to kick start this, just sends us an e-mail with the pointer that we had on the agenda. We'll take it from there.

SANTANU ACHARYA: I'll do that. Thank you. Thank you so much. And one more request. Can we keep it as a continuing agenda for us in every meeting?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: We could do that.

SANTANU ACHARYA: Okay. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: We'll have a short update. Thank you, Santanu. Okay. Going back to the agenda. Next is the survey on the evaluation of the CCOICI pilot, which is a related topic, more GNSO-focused. Maybe, Thomas, since you're at Council—I don't want to put you on the spot—but you're probably, being a member, closest to that.

THOMAS RICKERT: Sure. I'm happy to. It's even worse. I'm under CCOICI team. Now, is there any way that we can click on that link so that we can walk through the questions together? I'm a little biased since I'm on the

---

team, I'm a fan. But there are one or two points that I think warrant a little bit of discussion.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: What I will do is—I'm sorry to interrupt—I will share. That's my mistake. I sent it to the list so everyone should have it. But for the benefit of the meeting, I'll just share my screen, if I can. I can't seem—

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: Mike, can you make Philippe a co-host, please.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes, please. Thank you.

THOMAS RICKERT: Today's the deadline for submissions in response to the survey. So I'm going to do that today. So if you don't object, I will put my name as the contact person in there.

The first question is whether the objective of the CCOICI framework was clear. I think it was. So I would say strongly disagree. Since we have a couple of questions to go through, I would suggest my answer and you intervene in case you think it should be differently. So I would put strong agreement in there. Whether the objective of the CCOICI framework was appropriate, also strongly agree. Whether it's fit for purpose, I think so too, again strongly agree. I wouldn't have any additional comments unless you suggest otherwise. Then set two of the questions is the framework scope. I think that the assignments

within the CCOICI framework were clear, strongly agree. Scope of the assignments completed within the CCOICI framework were appropriate, also strongly agree. Nothing for the freeform responses. I suggest framework use of the CCOICI.

There were three topics WS2 recommendations specific to the GNSO Council review of self-assessment and review of the Statement of Interest requirements, and that's going to be a point where I think we need to talk a little bit because that ended up being quite a contentious point, as some of you might remember. So the first question on that is the structure. I think the structure is okay. So I would strongly agree with that. Membership structure is fit for purpose. Also, best score. CCOICI framework document only prescribes decision-making methodologies for the Task Force but not the CCOICI. On that point, I think we failed in the CCOICI on the topic of the SOI because we needed unanimity, if I remember correctly. I guess that's the point that we should probably discuss a little bit.

I've been on the predecessor group of the CCOICI many, many years back for a few years. We always took pride in us deliberating on issues at hand from our perspectives and taking our time but then converge to consensus in a truly consensual manner, i.e. unanimity, so that everyone would fully buy in into the results that we produced.

Now, the question is, do we want to deviate from that? I think that since we're not talking about policy, but about the things that improve our way to work together primarily, I think a case can be made that we should not use stronger consensus principles than we do for policy work. So that maybe we should just up for the CCOICI operating on

other consensus principles or decision-making principles that we usually have in our PDPs.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Thomas. Just on this point, just to let people know I know it's a bit arcane sometimes, but tasks that were put to the CCOICI with things like the working group chair's evaluation, for example, the SOI was a contentious one. On that one, I think given that ultimately the output of the CCOICI will be put to Council, a number of them, I, speaking personally, think that rough consensus would be just enough. If there's something that a constituency would like to oppose to, then there will be a leeway for them to express themselves through Council, through the appropriate body without making that subset which remains—I wouldn't say informal, but there's no need for this to be overly formal, precisely. Just my personal thought.

THOMAS RICKERT:

I think that makes a lot of sense. Anyone else on that point? Chris?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON:

When we take a look at how things work using the multistakeholder approach across various different organizations, the ways in which we look at consensus began at IETF and their RFC document which detail the ways in which they've built their definitions in and around different types of consensus. Historically, I've seen that the way—drawing on things based on rough consensus is the way that gets us to move things forward in an efficient as possible manner, the multistakeholder approach is difficult and things move slowly. And

when you try to have unanimity for things, it can really gum up the works. And when progress is often fleeting anyway, deviating from the things that that have historically worked, not just that ICANN, but throughout the places that have used the multistakeholder approach is problematic. So I don't think we should use anything but rough consensus. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks, Christian. What I would suggest is... I think that's probably the only sort of substantial response that you wanted to have feedback on, or was it?

THOMAS RICKERT: I would suggest that we disagree on the point of decision-making, and then just suggest to the freeform text "Rough consensus should be sufficient as results have been presented to Council anyway," right? Other than that, I think we can be in agreement. I understand that you want to speed up a little bit.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes, if you would. Just time check. We've got 13 minutes.

THOMAS RICKERT: No, that's fine. I mean, I wouldn't be in favor of using the CCOICI as a mechanism in future. I think that it should be working with task forces as it did on this one occasion. So I would respond to the remaining questions favorably.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Thomas. I'm speaking personally, but also as the GNSO chair, who was at the time when the CCOICI was put in place, I think it may not be perfect, but I'm still to see a viable alternative to what the CCOICI does. So I'm sensitive to having an efficient structure for the sort of things that we ask the current CCOICI to do. So I'm also strongly supportive of that initiative, speaking personally. Okay. I'm seeing no hand. Thank you, Thomas.

So I think we can go back, Nathalie, to the agenda, the other things we can hopefully maybe expedite somewhat. I know the next one is probably the topic of the week. And the questionnaire that was sent on PICs and RVCs, I would just within two, three minutes maybe have some feedback on your thinking following the plenary on this topic. We will, as we agreed—and I have to say that I'm somewhat late on this—develop a response to the letter sent by Tripti on the topic.

My takeaway from our call was that the ISPCP's view was that, at the very least, the changes to the Bylaws should be minimal, if any, and that we need to find the language, but struggling with the need to have such an update compared to a similar need for the 2012 round. So I'll circulate a draft text. If people would like to be involved, but I'll just reflect what we said during the call on that topic. It doesn't seem to be very complicated, given the discussion that we had a few weeks ago.

Okay. Anything that you'd like to share after the plenary on this? I thought there was no surprise on the various positions that were expressed. As a side note, I think the nature of the discussion is one of

the reasons why I consider that the outcome on closed generics is not necessarily a bad one because the enforcement of some of the principles that were laid out in that context was extremely dependent on the ability of ICANN to enforce content-related elements. Whilst it's a bit frustrating to see a cross-community effort to not to produce the result, which the closed generics was intended to, but on the other hand, more on the substance, given the dependencies, notably on PICs and RVCs, I think maybe that's not that bad a result with hindsight. Just a side note on previous efforts.

With this, I go swiftly to the update on Team 14. We've talked about that this morning. I think those of you who are interested in the topic, we're putting together both the NCPH wiki space and the mailing list. You'll be informed very soon of that project if you were not here this morning. We're moving forward with this, with the various individuals that are involved.

I will share the initial questions that we put together as a strawman for the team on the various questions that we need to address, and the initial motivation which is, I think, from the ISPCP perspective, essentially a question of timeline. I think the main issue with the discussions that we had on the selection of Team 14 is that we miserably failed in providing a name in due time, let alone the fact that we took exception with the evaluation of the incumbents. I think not doing what we were supposed to do in due time was just not the right thing to do. So that's something that we need to cover in the small team.

---

Point eight, we'll maybe spend a couple of minutes on this, the review of the website. Lars, Christian, and I have sat around the table earlier this week to have a look at the website and things that we can improve. So within the next few weeks, there will be a couple of changes on the website. Christian, would you like to say a word about how we will do that?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON:

I'm happy to do so. One of the things that we worked on was trying to establish more people than just me to have access to the systems that allowed us to work on these properties. And I think that we've mostly achieved that. So, now Lars and soon others in leadership will be able to modify our web properties. At that point, it's going to be easy for us to make lists of things that we want to change and not have it all fall to one person to get those changes accomplished.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Christian. And on this point, if anyone is willing to have a look on the website with the notion of the goal of spotting things that have been overlooked maybe, please do, and share with the list or with the leadership and we'll fix that. There are things that are clearly outdated, that are things that are missing still, but it's an ongoing effort. So it's good that we started this. Anything else on this? Yes, [Buda]?

- 
- [BUDA]: Okay. I want to add that it's interesting to add the recent activities of ISP in the website to see that we are active, especially about the positive feedback of WSIS + 20. It's interesting to post it in the website.
- PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks. Yes. Actually, that's a good point. That's one of the reasons that actually triggered the need for a timely update. When I circulated our paper on WSIS + 20, the immediate question was, "Where is it on the web if it's public? It's public but it's not public, is it?" So to your question, it's now on the website. But indeed, the idea is to do that timely for other papers. Good point. Okay. Anything else? Santanu?
- SANTANU ACHARYA: In case what you're talking about the videos of the trainings and all those things for the newcomers, so we could put some videos there. We could update whatever trainings are going on. The videos of those trainings, recordings of those trainings can be put there. I am sure that it will take a lot of space, but at least few videos for the newcomers would help out to understand what ISPCP is doing.
- PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Good point. Thank you, Santanu. Yes. I tend to think that it's much better to have generic information such as this sort of information than extremely detailed elements that stay forever on a website, which four years down the road, make people think that, "Oh, this is not maintained or updated." So, yes. If at some point we have some outreach material or capacity building webinars, etc., we'll put the pointers there. I think that will be useful. Thanks, Santanu.
-

Okay, anything else on this? So maybe we can finish on time. Because the only thing that I would note now is the project management reference. We don't need to go through this in detail, but just to let you know that, as usual, there's a very simple way to figure out what's going on on the policymaking area for gTLDs. It's to have a look at the wonderful GNSO portfolio and project management tool which you have on the screen. Staff put a lot of effort in this. If you recall the discussion that Council had just on Sunday, it's clear that keeping track of the ongoing work is extremely useful when the time comes of housekeeping, for example, of those activities. So I can only encourage you to keep an eye on this. I must admit that when I'm asked to provide an update, I copy-paste the elements that we can find here. Still mentioning the reference all the time, but that's extremely useful.

Okay. That leads us to the conclusion of this session. I think there's the public comments. Maybe we could open the page. Oh, yes. The NCAP Report, which maybe people would want to have a look at at some point, I don't know. We tend not to respond to those reports, but maybe that's worthwhile. Oh, yes. I want to flag the Applicant Support Program Handbook which was developed earlier, the spin-off by Council. Anything that people would like to raise on this? In case we have time for the private use TLD, I don't want to commit to that. But it'd be interesting maybe to respond from a purely technical perspective. With this, it's now the bottom of the hour. Unless people would like to add anything else, I just want to thank you for showing up and thank the remote participants as well. I wish you a pleasant rest of the meeting, everyone. Thank you.

---

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks. Well done.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thanks, everyone. Bye.

NATHALIE PEREGRINE: This concludes the meeting. You may now stop the recording.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**