
ICANN80 | PF – GNSO: ISPCP Membership Work Session
Tuesday, June 11, 2024 – 10:45 to 12:15 KGL

BRENDA BREWER: Hello and welcome to the ISPCP membership work session at ICANN 80. My name is Brenda Brewer and I am the participation manager for this session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On site-participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and speak at a reasonable pace.

I will now hand the floor over to ISPCP chair Philippe Fouquart. Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Brenda. Good morning, everyone, and welcome to the ISPCP open session for this ICANN 80 meeting. The agenda is on the screen as usual. We'll start with the any updates you might have on SOI, anyone. Looking at the room as well.

Okay. Seeing no hand, let's go to the council update. Osvaldo, would you mind doing that?

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.

OSVALDO NOVOA:

Okay, I'll go through the agenda for today, for tomorrow's meeting of the council. Excuse me. First of all, on the consent agenda is the aspirational segment. Basically, since in several locations we have the fairly long discussions on the final report from the PDP working groups, and since all the members of the council, all the members of the of the GNSO, can participate in the groups, the council has the operation that on the discussion on the final report, there should be very little differences between the members. So the aspirational statement, as it says, is ... Let me see how it. Where is it here? Basically what it recommends is like it says an aspiration is (what we would like) is that in recognition of the multistakeholder model, when our working groups delivers a final report with consensus recommendations, the GNSO Council will always try to vote the policy recommendation absent any truly exceptional circumstances. So in general, we should support the consensus recommendations. It's an aspirational statement. I hope it works.

But then also for both, is the motion to defer the request policy status report on expiration policies. In 2020, there was a request for a policy status report on the expired domain deletion policy and expired registration recovery policy. It was decided then to defer the consideration for two years.

In 2022, it was again considered, and after consulting both the registries, registrars, and ICANN Org, it was decided, since there were no major issues, to postpone it again, for another two years.

Then this year, at first it was considered to postpone it again. And then it says that since the policy [statutory] report is one of the requirements

in the considerations of the policies, it was decided instead of postponing it to ask ICANN Org of service of the request for a policy [type of] report for them to see if it's necessary or not but give ICANN Org a year to do it. So it's not immediate status, but it's to see if ICANN Org in a year can do it or not. ICANN Org has a lot of work. I don't know if they will be able to do it. It's not the first priority, but it is considered, since it's part of the process of the PDP, that it should be done sometime, not as soon as possible.

Those are the two points for voting. We are going to vote on those two, then we are going to discuss the accuracy check that we discussed today. It's very complex problem due to the data protection policies right now. So it's difficult to get information on that. So we are going to discuss, and ICANN Org is going to present their position on that during the council.

Then the Standing Predictability Implementation Review Team is (SPIRT) on the new gTLD are going to present the report also.

And the IGO protections for the second level also is in an update and estimated timelines for that to be developed. They are working on that. I don't know.

I don't know ...The other are updates on Internet Governance Foreign Support Association For me it's new, so I don't know what that is.

And then there's update work from the council strategic planning season that we had last year. And what is the update on that?

I think that's the main issue on the council. There is no big issue for this meeting.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. Thanks, Osvaldo. Any questions or comments on those two items that are up for a vote at council?

I have one question for you on the aspirational statement. Is there consideration given to the distinction between the process and the substance given that, well, as you would know, in principle, council is expected to weigh in only on procedure? And as you would know as well, it's slightly, it's more subtle than this because there's a way that gray area of a working group not working within the remit of the scope, which is generally the way for people to weigh on the substance rather than the process. I'm rambling a bit, but you see what I'm referring to. So is there that nuance in the statement or is this just a general statement?

OSVALDO NOVOA:

No, it's a general statement. There was a lot of discussion on it because of that, because, well, each councilor should vote according to their constituency or in some cases their personal position. So it was difficult to reach this agreement. But I think it's just an intention, just a guideline, for the councilors and not so much as a discussion on the process in itself.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Thanks, Osvaldo. And speaking personally, I think that's a useful statement. And even if it's something that is pretty much every year recalled, as a principle, it's good to have that in writing. Yeah.

Any comments or questions for Osvaldo on this or on the other votes?

Okay, I'm looking at the Zoom room acknowledging our remote participants. Thanks for attending. Okay, thank you.

Anything else, Osvaldo, that you'd like to bring?

OSVALDO NOVOA: No.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay, thank you. Moving on then. Point number three. It's our update on our capacity-building webinar series. Originally we called it a series. We did the first one of that series, which went really well, I found, both in terms of attendance ... I think we had at least 300 registrations and more than ... Was it half of it in terms of number of attendees? Pretty much a bit more than 100 or 120 attendees? So maybe, Susan or Lars, would you give us an update on this? Who would like to start? Susan?

SUSAN MOHR: Sure. I'd like to just start by recognizing that we have and thanking Adiel Akplogan for joining us from ICANN. He's online with us today. This was a series that we began planning, I think, about six months ago or so, and successfully kicked off our first one, to your point, Philippe, earlier this year. We did have really good attendance with about 333 registrants

and, I think, right around 100 participants. I think we wanted to use this time to just get feedback from members on what went well, things that could have gone better.

From my perspective, I thought the content was very rich. I thought that Nico did a wonderful job with the presentation. We actually went over. We had a lot of questions at the end. And so we probably could have gone on 2 hours instead of the allotted hour and a half, but we wanted to open up the floor for any feedback from anyone that may have joined and then maybe look for some thoughts from Adiel in terms of next steps.

As we've mentioned, I think our expectation was that this would turn into a series. So we'd love to start looking at calendars and getting the next set of webinars on the calendar and organized and scheduled and then also, maybe as a third item, discuss the possibility of holding the hands-on workshop in Istanbul in December. It may not be exactly in the alignment that we had within the series that we had scheduled, but to the extent we can get people together and actually get a room and do a hands-on workshop, we think that would be timely for the AGM.

So maybe first I'll open it up for feedback from anyone that may have been able to join.

LARS STEFFEN:

So thank you, Susan, for the update. I think, based on the fact that we originally had already had a rough schedule for the webinars and we don't have dates for the future webinars yet, we still have the

opportunity to design the schedule in a way that a potential hybrid session in Istanbul could perfectly fit in.

As we also just briefly discussed, we could still use our contacts in Europe to invite to a session like this, also in a hybrid format, and also to invite contacts from Turkey to participate in an effort like this.

Another suggestions that we could make is that we schedule one of those webinars as part of the prep week so that we can also schedule one of those webinars if a hybrid format is not possible in Istanbul to do it in the prep week.

What we also already discussed is that as an ISPCP (and this is not part of this webinar series), we could also do outreach to different organizations. So, wearing my EuroISPA hat, I already talked to my colleagues that we would like to schedule an outreach webinar to the members of EuroISPA so that members of EuroISPA also become aware of the ISPCP and why they should be engaged with the ISPCP, why they should follow more closely what's going on at ICANN. And I think this is something that we could also replicate with i2C, with ETNO, with several other organizations, also designing the core message on specific target audiences that we would like to talk to.

So those are two different tracks to say that way, but it would be great to pick up the conversation with ICANN staff on scheduling the next outreach webinars that we already agreed upon, also the topics that we already agreed upon on top of this, and exploring the opportunities and options at hand, if it would be possible to have a hybrid session in Istanbul and, if yes, how we can set this up and, if no, if we could

schedule one of the webinars in the regular series in the prep week, for example. Thank you.

SUSAN MOHR:

That's great. Thank you, Lars. Anyone else? Any other feedback before maybe we turn it over to Adiel and Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Susan. Just along the same lines as Lars, I thought it was really good in terms of the content. The feedback I've had was also appreciative. And just to let you know that the audience was very diverse. There were people from the brand department, engineering teams, network architects of whom were really interested in the presentation.

The challenge may be that with that second session, it's going to be difficult to have a relevant material for the same range of participants. But then, speaking personally (and I mean this in a good way), I was slightly frustrated because I thought there would be so much more to say given Nico's proficiency on the topic. But I mean this in a good way. I think we could do that during the second session. So that's about it.

In terms of the next session, I agree with Lars. And ideally, a hybrid meeting would probably be better if we can accommodate that on site, appreciating the difficulties for doing that. But hopefully we'll work that out. Thank you, Susan.

SUSAN MOHR: Great. Thank you, Philippe. Anyone else before we turn it over to Adiel?

LARS STEFFEN: May I just add about the idea of having a hybrid format in Istanbul? Based on the experience that we have with outreach events for the ISPCP in the past, we know that's often challenging to have a room or to have a confirmed room at the ICANN meeting early enough before the ICANN meeting is starting to have the opportunity to invite people early enough to the meeting. So this is always a little bit challenging. So it would be good to have a clear response if there's a possibility of yes or no. And even a no is fine, but then we would be able to plan based on this decision.

SUSAN MOHR: Houda, go ahead.

HOUDA: Thank you so much for giving me the mic. So I want to ask, what will be the training about that you planned for outreach?

SUSAN MOHR: Your question is, what is the training about?

HOUDA: No, no, no. The subjects. Topics.

SUSAN MOHR: The topics. I do not have that list in front of me, but I will look for it and send it, maybe even during this meeting. ICANN had proposed, I think, nine different topics, all related to the DNS, that were all iterative, starting with DNS 101, which is what we did for our initial discussion, and then building on that and building towards a hands-on workshop that would help ISPs of all sizes understand how to build and manage and start a DNS network. So I will share that list again with the membership.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thanks. If that helps, I think there was topics along the lines of DNS abuse, DNS security, root server management, that sort of thing. And hopefully that serves as a teaser for those who would like to attend. But that was really interesting topics.

As a side note, yes to everything that's been said on the needs, the complexity of finding a room. And an early no is certainly better than a late yes, I would say, as far as the organization on site is concerned. Thank you.

SUSAN MOHR: Okay, and Joe, go ahead. I see your hand is raised.

JOE CATAPANO: Yeah, thanks. I'm not in the Zoom quite yet, but I will be, so I don't know if Adiel has commented yet, but as far as the room and some of the troubles we had with some previous engagements, I'm happy to work with Adiel and you guys, if we kind of have (the earlier, the better)

definition of what your needs are. And Adiel, [I'll] obviously inform some of this too as to technical needs, any food, things of that nature. The earlier we have that information, I can try and really start working with the meetings team in Adiel early to see if I can get you an earlier answer because I know that was an issue last time. So happy to help where I can.

SUSAN MOHR:

Okay, great. Thank you. Let me then turn to Adiel, who is online. And Adiel, I'd be interested in any feedback that you had from the ICANN side in terms of what went well and maybe some improvements that could be made, your thoughts on the schedule, when we might be able to kick off the next webinar and maybe even a webinar series. So we launched one and perhaps we could schedule three so that we get those calendared. And then the third item would be to address the capacity-building for Istanbul, whether you think your side could be ready for a hands-on workshop in Istanbul or if you had a preference for conducting a webinar during prep week. So maybe I'll turn it over to you. Thank you.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Thank you, Suzanne, Philippe, and everyone. So as you have all mentioned, I think the first webinar went overall very, very well. The attendance was also engaged. That was my first observation.

One of the things that could have been interesting is to have a little more time. But for a webinar, as we know, more than one hour and a half usually is not always very effective, so that's why we limit it to that.

But depending on the topic, I think we can look at the series of webinars that we have planned and maybe increase some of the topics to at least 30 minutes, maybe with a break in the middle, to allow us to cover the topic more broadly.

Here's a few suggestions that I made to my team after the session. One is probably on topic related to the DNS. We could also use the ICANN Learn platform to prep people. What it means is that people could go online and take some of the 101 courses on ICANN Learn before joining the actual webinar. That will give a little bit of leveling-up to those who have who are not up to the knowledge because what we have also noticed is that the level of knowledge of people online varied a lot. So we could offer people to actually take a one-on-one course online as preparation to the actual webinars. That is one thing that we can add to the schedule.

The second is also to have formally two people from the technical engagement team or ICANN to be able to engage more actively in the chat session, because it's not always very effective for the presenter, particularly on those technical topics, to also be monitoring the chats, to be able to answer all the questions. There have been a few questions on the chat that were not answered because of the time and also because of the fact that Nico was busy presenting during the session.

The third thing is to add a survey, a formal survey, on the content so that we can get feedback more in an iterative way and be able to adjust as needed.

So those are some of the structural things that we've discussed to improve this, and we will probably implement them for some of the upcoming events in the industry in the series. For the ICANN Learn users, it's not all the topic that will have a 101 in ICANN Learn, but when they are available, we'll let potential participants know and direct them on how to use them. And if the ISPCP group wants to use it, of course. So it's just a feedback for you.

On planning for a hybrid session in Istanbul, that is feasible for us. It's not something new. We have been able to organize training like that, and we can do that. On securing the room, it is something that we will have to work with the meeting team on as soon as possible and try to also secure the time in the week. Ideally we want to do this kind of thing outside of the actual week of the event, like having it the weekend before Sunday or Friday. We can add it to the How It Works session that we've run at the ICANN meeting because when it's happened during the five days from Monday to Thursday, usually the problem we have seen is the conflict with other sessions, and it makes it a bit harder for people to attend. And when we do it during the face-to-face meeting, it's probably going to be more than one hour and a half because the face-to-face we will have for more like for a half day or so, or even a full day depending on how we manage to do it, because this is going to have a hands-on aspect to it.

So from our side it is something doable. We have done it for other sessions in the past, so all would be depending on the planning with the meeting team. If it is impossible, then we will fall back to the prep week, but ideally we'll try to push hard to have it face-to-face in Istanbul.

I will stop there for now and maybe hear from you on some of those proposals as well and see how we can ...

SUSAN MOHR:

Great. Thank you, Adiel. That's really great feedback, I think, and the suggestions for the webinar.

Before I open it up and kind of address what you've said already, I wonder if you wouldn't mind talking about when you think we might be able to kick off the next virtual webinar and what that would look like. And then we'll maybe go back to all of your comments.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Oh, I think we are ready to kick this off. So if we go back to the planning and giving time to people to register and communicate properly about this (I don't know if Alex is on the call; I think we are in, what, June?), probably we can plan something for just after the summer period, meaning maybe September, because I'm guessing that July and August is going to be a vacation period in most parts of the world and I don't know how effective it's going to be to organize anything during that period. From our side, we will be here if that still work.

In terms of content, we are ready for rolling any of the training on the catalog. So this will depend on the Comms team a little bit, but also on you when you think that it will be more effective for your constituency to get ready for this.

But my first thought is to say, well, maybe we should avoid the holiday period. That's it.

SUSAN MOHR: Thank you for that. That's a good suggestion. Maybe I'll go ahead and just open it up to members and get feedback. I have some thoughts, but I'll open it up and see if we've got thoughts from others here. And Fiona, I'll recognize you first.

FIONA ASONGA: Thank you so much. I think my immediate feedback is, having listened to what you suggested earlier and what Adiel has added in and looking at where we are at right now and the fact that we have not been able to really get constituents from our [constants] from this region into the meeting, I think that there's a lot that needs to be done, but we need to be able to break it down so that we have got several webinars happening for different levels, like Adiel has mentioned, because that is when we'll be able to now get these very many new ISPs that are coming up within the region. I know that even in Kigali there are very many ISPs that I serve at TESPOK, [at KXP]. And I'm asking them, where are you? And so for them, they're asking, why should I be at the ICANN meeting?

So there's a bit of outreach that we need to do, and this seminar, the webinars, assists us to help get that information out there, but they need to be targeted in terms of content so that we are having, way in advance, prior to Istanbul, this, like we called it, series. So part of the series is just letting them know that we are part of this ecosystem, we are part of this community. Having a one-hour webinar to let them know ... because they hear it from me. But it looks like this is a Fiona thing. It is not a Fiona thing. There is a whole constituency around it

that is interested in what happens to the ISPs within this ecosystem, and we pay attention to it, and they should be here at the table with us. Then there is the whole helping them understand the DNS ecosystem and the trainings that now Adiel brings on board.

So you see, there's that. You just let them know we are there. Then there is that: that you now help them understand, get the knowledge and proper understanding of what it means when they are part of the DNS system. And we can go into even issues of cybersecurity and all that DNS security and have those different webinars. But it's difficult to lump all these into one webinar and try and target everyone at the same time.

But if we have an advanced calendar with the topics and the areas and have the team available, Africa is not going to be on a holiday in July and August. So we can still run at least two sessions in the month of July, in the month of August, and then have another one in September prior for everybody else prior to. So we can plan and work around it. And if Adiel and his team are able to give us an hour in July, an hour in August, I am taking on the commitment trend, rally, help to get the information, send it out there, and to rally the ISPs within the region to come in and have the conversation and to understand that really we should be part of it. We used to be part of it. The room is to be fuller, but I think the dynamics of change, with new people coming into the space who don't understand and don't appreciate, we need to keep on saying the same thing. In marketing, you're taught you have to say the same message 70 times before it hits home. We haven't yet done the 70 here. Clearly, we are still probably at about 20. Thank you.

SUSAN MOHR:

Thank you, Fiona. That's a great suggestion. So, just so that I've got it kind of in my mind, I think what you're saying is start with a kickoff to explain the relevance of the ISP community, explain what the schedule is going to look like and why it's important for ISPs to participate and then kick it off. Maybe do that in July. In August, kick off the next session, and then it sounds like you agree with Adiel that if we could get the link out in advance so that everyone could look at it and review it before the webinar, that would help sort of set some foundation, but not wait until September but go ahead and kick it off in July. Okay, that's a good suggestion.

Anyone else?

Lars? I'll turn to you, Lars.

LARS STEFFEN:

Thank you. I just pulled up the list of webinars that we agreed upon, and we also put them in the sequence that they build on each other. We started with the first one. That's a DNS 101. That's a very basic one. The next one we have on the list is the DNS ecosystem, followed by ICANN and the ISPCP, DNS-related threats, the DNSSEC 101 from WHOIS to RDAP and then routing BGP and Anycast applied to DNS. And I've attended some of those webinars already years ago when we did them in the [ECO] context, and they are well-designed. And also, if we put them in this sequence where they also build on each other, I think it's already the right path to follow, and I think we just need to schedule them and to set things up.

And also thank you for the feedback that we can improve on monitoring and managing the questions from the audience and things like that. So, yes, of course, we will add those aspects also to the future webinars. Thank you very much.

SUSAN MOHR: Thank you, Lars. And I may have missed it, but did you have a view on starting in July versus September?

LARS STEFFEN: Well, July is already, from today, four or five weeks away. July is also starting the holiday season, at least in Europe. So I would rather aim for August, September and the following months, but I'm open to any suggestion too. But also to make it, for the colleagues from ICANN staff, more easy to plan, I think I would rather aim for August to be the next date for a webinar.

SUSAN MOHR: Okay, thanks, Lars. And Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Susan. Just a couple of thoughts as a follow-up to Fiona's intervention. In terms of outreach, I think there's always a challenge in finding the right audience and the right people that would be interested in attending that sort of webinar. For smaller ISPs, generally, it's not at the top of their agendas. Let's face it. For the larger organizations, I think it's reasonably easy in our own organizations to find the right

people or the interested parties. It's more challenging to reach out even within associations or industry groups, because we tend to have contacts that are policy-oriented people, not necessarily technical or with the exception of INTA or brand people. So just to say that there's sometimes a challenge in reaching out to the interested parties.

Only the content itself ... In light of what we did last time, I don't think we need specific content, per se. I think the added value of our session was very much in the question time part. I thought it was really interactive. You could tell from the questions (the questions on, I think, DNS glue records, for example) that it could have gone further, as you said, although I agree that one hour is probably the right time. So it's probably a good idea to reference the ICANN Learn material as something that people may want to have a look at before attending the, the webinar. But just to say that in terms of designing the content, it shouldn't require a lot of work. We're more interested in having a dialogue with the presenters, I guess.

As to the question on the hands-on part, for part of the audience, I think it may be challenging to attend something like a half-day meeting on this or a full day, I think, which is personal opinion. My impression is that at least as far as the webinars are concerned, having the same sort of format, at least for a start, would be a good idea. Thank you.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

This is Adele, if I may.

SUSAN MOHR: Go ahead, Adiel. Thank you.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Just also, thank you for those feedback and also maybe a few comments on the input from Fiona.

I think what I also catch from your intervention is about the pure outreach part of this, which is how do we convince people to join the ISPCP and engage with ICANN? I think that is not specifically part of the program that we have for this series of webinars, which were targeted toward technical content on the DNS and the DNS ecosystem, its security, et cetera, and so on and so forth, which is the original goal. When it comes to outreach, explaining how and why they should be joining the ISPCP and ICANN and so on and so forth, I think that will need a different type of content and work with Susan and Philippe to see if we can support that. I mean, we will be more than happy to support that kind of very specific webinar.

Fiona, if you want to work with your association (this is just a suggestion) from a participation perspective, it may be good to start targeting association of ISPs for that kind of content just reaching out to them specifically and presenting how the work that are relevant to them from ICANN, etcetera. But I think that that should be a different program and probably not the same context of what we are talking about related to the webinar series.

Susan, maybe we can add something around that into the webinar series separately and see how we alternate them. Something to discuss probably. And we can use our regional structure to support that as well.

Instead of having something global, we can, for instance, if in Africa, if you think something can be organized in July or in August, my team in Africa, Simon and Yazid, can support and provide that training during that period because they are on the continent and [different].

So I just want to make that difference so that we are sure we are on top of this from an ICANN perspective.

But going back to the series the way we have planned it, I think July will be too close, particularly if we are saying that we need to have more outreach, more preparation, to make sure that people are aware, people have time to plan and to join. I think July will be a little bit closer.

Again, from our perspective, from the ICANN perspective, from the technical engagement team perspective, content are already there. All the topics that we have in the webinar series are from our catalog, our training catalog that we already deliver at several places. So, the content is already there. The most time consuming thing right now is the planning, working with Comm, making sure that we announce it in advance, giving people the opportunity to register, to plan this and also organize the logistics around that. This is what we need to take care of going into that.

SUSAN MOHR:

Okay, thanks for that. I don't see any other hands. Oh, Joe, go ahead.

JOE CATAPANO:

Yeah, I'm sorry. It's a question ... And I apologize. I had to leave the previous webinar early. I take Adiel's point about the separateness of it,

but is there spacing in the event, be it virtual or otherwise, after Adiel's team does what they do so well for one of you to briefly (it doesn't need to be terribly lengthy) talk a little bit about the ISPCP? My thought here is that you have a captive audience because you have folks who have already registered, and you are in real time delivering (I know we're not technically a membership organization; I get that) a member benefit in real-time to these people. So that would seem to me to be the exact moment when you would want to at least raise it. You may not have, depending on the structure of it, time to go terribly in depth, but you may be able to whet their appetite a little bit.

And the other thing is when you have them there, they register. I don't want to get ahead of myself, but if there's a way where you have their information, you can contact them with other opportunities, that type of thing.

So anyway, that's just kind of my brain dump there.

SUSAN MOHR:

Thank you for that, Joe. And actually, that's a great suggestion. And we did that in the first webinar. So we did spend a few minutes at the very beginning just talking about who we were, why we were partnering with ICANN for the series, and inviting everyone that participated to reach out with any questions about membership or the content, and we'd be glad to further those discussions with them. So I think we would plan to continue that for each of the webinars, because presumably we'll have a different audience each time or somewhat different audience each time.

I do like Fiona's thought, though, because that starts to get to the broader capacity-building that we've been talking about over the last year and over the last several years within the group to really do a deeper dive. And the question is always, how do we do that? We had a really good meeting in Hamburg, and I think that allowed us to do that deeper dive. We'll have to give some thought to Fiona's idea of doing a webinar. Maybe that's another opportunity. I think we've been really focused on getting those rooms in at locations like Istanbul, if we could get one where we could do a deeper dive.

But I think your recommendations are well placed.

JOE CATAPANO:

Great. Thank you. And then the last thing I was going to say, what you said generated this. It goes back to Adiel's idea of a survey. That's another kind of bite of the apple, right? They respond, and it's like, "Would you like more information about the ISP? Dah, dah, dah." And then you route them to wherever you want them to go, you know?

SUSAN MOHR:

Go ahead, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. On the last point, that's something we didn't do. We should have done it. Probably using the list of registrations to do outreach, we could have done that. That's a good point.

Funneling off on your first observation, I think we only took 5 or 10 minutes, maybe as introduction, but we were discussing just a moment ago whether that actually took away some time from the more in-depth presentation. It's a give and take anyway. But I agree it's an opportunity for us to do outreach, so we shouldn't miss it.

JOE CATAPANO:

Yeah, it's tough because you don't want to keep people too long for something that they didn't necessarily come there for. But at the same time, you want to take advantage of having everybody there. So it's tricky. It's a little bit of guess and check, trying some things out, seeing what works.

SUSAN MOHR:

Okay. Well, I think where we're at, then ... Adiel, thank you for your time today and for the recommendations. We do have some work to do. It sounds like you may need some additional time to identify a second resource to be on the webinars so that you can handle the chats. I think that makes a lot of sense. We did talk about a survey in advance of the DNS 101, but I don't think we pulled that off. So I'll get with Nico and we'll work on the survey.

In terms of timing, why don't we just get an email going again, like we did last time with the group? And we'll talk about whether August or September makes the most sense to continue the series and then probably follow the series schedule as Lars suggested, or at least the iteration leading up to December. And then we'll look to you to tell us whether you're able to secure room for the hands-on workshops. And

in that email string, we'll probably set a date (I think we need to know or not) so that we know whether we're going to be able to move forward with a hands-on workshop or a webinar during prep week so that we can be really effective in our outreach. I think we've run into some challenges before where we've done some invitations and maybe that we weren't able to actually get the room. So I think we should just set a date and then go one way or the other. So that's probably our next step.

Did I miss anything? I also like the idea of using the survey for outreach, and so we'll incorporate that into some of the discussions within the membership.

And then separately, Fiona, it sounds like if you want to reach out directly to Adiel about a region specific program for Africa, there's some opportunity there.

Go ahead, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thanks, Susan. Maybe I'm being picky, but just a question. On that notion of using the list of registrations for outreach, are we good on this as far as the motives? I'm not a lawyer, but with GDPR and all this, we want to make sure that we're in a good shape.

JOE CATAPANOL

I'm not a lawyer either, so I will not say yes or no. But we can ask.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: We would have to make it explicit that people might be contacted further on and for that purpose.

JOE CATAPANO: It depends on [if] the survey is constructed. And maybe there's a mechanism to get people to consent to whatever they need to consent to. Maybe they already do that when they register for this webinar. It really depends. So let's think about it. Thanks.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yeah, I'm being picky.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN: Well, no, no, no. It's important. It's important, and there is a framework for that because this need to be announced upfront during the registration. We need to be clear about what we're going to use. So there is a framework for that that the legal team is very much aware of, and we will talk with them if we want to do something like that, then they will give us exactly how to work this, how to prepare for this. But it's good to know in advance. We cannot do it after ... For the first group, it is over. We haven't put that in. But for the upcoming, we can design the registration and the collection of their data accordingly. And I think we can work with the legal team to achieve that. And I think it will be useful for the ISPCP for sure.

One additional thing that I just want to add is one suggestion: at the very beginning. I think, Philippe, you mentioned [we should] maybe to be a bit more predictive on the date of some of the webinar series.

Maybe we can go two at the time. So go with maybe before the end of the year or before Istanbul. Try to target two webinars before the face-to-face, hands-on one. I will have to discuss with Alex to see the planning in between, but I think it will be good to announce, probably on the ISPCP website and other places online, the date of at least the two upcoming, and then revolving that going forward so that people can plan. And that will help the team internally as well, to do all the logistics, particularly the communication aspect of this, which is important.

SUSAN MOHR:

That sounds great. It makes a lot of sense. So I will get an email string going after this meeting. Maybe we'll do one online meeting just to kind of get a chance to regroup, talk about all of this one more time. And then we'll just get those email strings going and follow through.

So I think with that, I'll turn it back to you, Philippe.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you, Susan. We're now on item four. There's a bit of a duplicate there, but I think what we meant was essentially outreach. I think we've covered this in this discussion, so please correct me if I'm wrong. I see people nodding.

So let's move on to what was provisionally reserved for an update on the request for reconsideration by the IPC on the CCWG rec seven on auction proceeds. So we couldn't have a speaker because there's a conflict with discussion on RDRS, but just to cut it short, hopefully we

can discuss that on our next call. For those of you who attended some of the sessions early this week, the course has been corrected slightly in light of the feedback not only from the IPC, but also from a number of different parts of the community with a view to a more limited updates of the bylaws that wouldn't be as open ended as the concern was raised in the IPC RFR.

So my takeaway, for what it's worth (and take it with a pinch of salt) is that the concerns that have been raised in the RFR to some extent have been addressed. We'll probably have an opportunity to discuss that with our IPC colleagues, but I thought that was good news essentially on this topic.

With this, I think we can, unless there are questions, move on to item six. And that's the update on the ... So we said WSIS+20 discussions, but it's probably broader than this. We have Becky with us for this, for that update, and we'll be happy to discuss what the constituency has done on the matter as well and see how we can engage as efficiently as possible. Becky?

BECKY MCGILLEY:

Thank you. And thank you for having me here. So I know it's only been a few weeks actually since our last briefing, so there's not too much new to significantly report, but I'm happy also to hear from you as well, more interested in the Internet fragmentation paper. And I saw that WSIS comments.

So I'll brief a bit on various developments such as the WSIS-related events you see here and engagement that our GE team has been

involved with and will be coming up and then we can have some questions. But if I don't have an answer, I will definitely take it back to my team of experts and get back to you.

So I'm not going to go through all the events listed here, but I did want to start by sharing some of the recent key ones that we've observed and participated in and then some of the upcoming ones. So you can see there the WSIS +20 high-level event. This was two weeks ago. We participated. It was at the ITU in Geneva from the 27th to the 31st of May, and it was intended to commemorate two decades of progress achieved on the implementation of the WSIS. So the agenda covered a very wide range of topics: cultural diversity, digital divide, digital inclusion content, AI, ethics, infrastructure. And it brought a large number of high-level officials, also from the governments and other organizations.

So we had a four-person delegation, ICANN Org, led by our Board chair, Tripti Sinha and head of GE, Veni Markovski. So ICANN's key objectives at this high-level event really was to emphasize our messaging on the importance of the technical operations of the Internet as a fundamental pillar of the global digital society, the multistakeholder model, and really ICANN's activities in digital inclusion and also kind of a side for government engagement. We really use these opportunities to, of course, engage with other governments and other stakeholders through bilateral meetings.

So we did participate in some panels. Tripti was a panelist on the Leader TalkX panel. I think that just meant it was a little bit shorter. So that was called "Innovating international cooperation to scale digital

inclusion.” We organized our own session on digital inclusivity, highlighting our activities with IDNs and universal acceptance, the Coalition for Digital Africa, as well as the grant program. And we also participated in a technical community panel that was organized by CIRA.

So the GDC ... And we have another slide on that. So I'll get to that. But I just wanted to mention that we are closely monitoring the ongoing GDC developments, which have really been ongoing since April and will continue until the summit of the future in September.

The HLGM. I'm not sure if everyone here was able to observe the HLGM. So it happened on Sunday here in Kigali. We thought it was a really successful meeting with strong support across the board. We had over 50 government delegations participating in person.. I think the key outcomes for us was it was a great opportunity to showcase the success of the multistakeholder model of Internet governance, to attending government, and to increase awareness on the importance of the GACs role, which is very important for us. We heard discussions around four sessions, which included resounding support for the multistakeholder model, recognition of ICANN's role in fostering their interoperable and secure Internet, and of course, the continued need for inclusion, inclusiveness, the need to improve conversations, really, between the technical community and governments as well.

And then I had mentioned some of the forthcoming. So we have continued GDC as well as the ITU Council. It's actually ongoing right now in Geneva, which is the council working group meetings on the Internet. An open consultation on the WSIS and the SDGs is going to be

taking place not until the third quarter, and I think into the fourth quarter.

We talked about the summit of the future. Okay, so we're also deep into planning for the WTSA 24 in October. It's going to be held October 15 to the 24th in India, New Delhi. And this is where they set the work program for the ITU standardization assembly—so the ITUT for 2025 to 2028. So we have been very actively involved in the prep sessions, the regional prep sessions, for that. So we're actively like paying attention to and engaging on issues such as IDNs and UA, IP addressing identifiers, and just overall other Internet issues related to our remit.

And then we have the Internet Governance Forum. We also started planning for that. So we're planning to have a, I think, 20-person delegation from ICANN. So it is a big deal for us. We've always been a supporter, and we'll continue to participate actively in IGF, and that's in Riyadh in December.

Next slide, please. So a busy next six months coming up. So a little bit more on the GDC. The revision one was released May 15, as it said. We, as part of the WSIS +20 network, held, again, two interactive webinars, for which some of the feedback was that they were even better than the first ones on the zero draft. So that was good. So it's a consolidation of oral and written inputs to the zero draft, which was released in April. That's what the revision one was. And still they, I think, concluded the readings a few days ago, June 6 and 7th. And from ICANN's perspective, the revision 1 did capture three important elements for ICANN (again, very important for us): the recognition of the technical community as a distinct stakeholder group, recognition of the IGF as a key

multistakeholder platform, almost as *the* key stakeholder and multistakeholder platform). And again, this creation of the multilateral digital cooperation form as a potential replacement of the IGF seems to be off the table, at least insofar as it's definitely not mentioned by name, the digital cooperation form.

So the next steps: they're continuing the readings. But in between the readings, revision 2 is expected, which I think is maybe a little bit interesting. And we will see from there what ICANN Org's next steps will be. Once revision 2 is available, we assess to see if there is going to be an impact to our mission.

Next slide, please. And then so on to the WSIS+20 updates. Again, noting the importance of the WSIS+20 process to ICANN and the technical community, we launched the network in March. It's open to everyone, all like-minded stakeholders. The network, the mailing list, has been pretty active. And so far we've done two webinars, both based on the GDC. We're open to feedback and listening to what the mailing list participants are looking for specifically. So a lot are asking for, say, talking points, so we're trying to get more fact sheets. We should start publishing those soon. We're going to start publishing more resources on the website as well, on the webpage.

And additionally we're continuing to do engagement with interested communities here today: ALAC, ICANN Fellows. We're leveraging our good relationships with governments, organizing many, many bilateral meetings, especially with key countries that we're focusing on, briefings for the UN diplomats, who might not (it's more the educational) have the technical information. And yeah, those kind of activities afford us

the opportunity to provide that factual information to government stakeholders.

And I think that's it. The next slide is just: if you're not on the mailing list, we welcome you to join it and.

PHILIPPE FOQUART:

Thank you. Thank you, Becky. Any questions or comments?

I have one. Well, just for a start, a side note and a question for you, although that's not directly related to WSIS+20. But on the WTSA and the work that you do on the proposed changes to resolutions, I know it's early days, but certainly this group, since some of us are involved in those activities, would be interested in being posted on the potential risks posed by some of those changes.

As a side note, and having been involved in the ITU's work for some years now, for my own sanity [and more], I know there's that perception that resolutions is a mandate for study groups to work on specific topics. I know that some member states have that perception that it's not only a mandate but an order of sorts of working on these.

BECKY MCGILLEY:

And they're very active.

PHILIPPE FOQUART:

And they're very active during WTSA. It's a different ball game as far as the work, the actual work, within the study groups is concerned. It's not because it's within the recommendation that all of a sudden people

who wouldn't support the change, for instance, would start working overnight on a topic that's been included in that resolution, if I'm making sense of that. So it's slightly more subtle than this, but just to cut it short, certainly this group would be interested in any potential change proposed to some of the resolutions.

BECKY MCGILLEY:

Okay. Yeah, definitely, let me take it and get back to you because I know already, just within the prep sessions, on the resolutions that are being put forward, there's a lot, and a few already have been concerning. You don't know how far they're going to get. So let me get back to you on that, for sure.

PHILIPPE FOQUART:

Thank you. And certainly in the naming and addressing space, that's something. If there were initiatives relative to giving some mandates other than experience sharing and capacity-building to ITUT studies groups, that would be of concern to many of us.

BECKY MCGILLEY:

Yes. And we are not members or sector members for ITUT, but we do follow pretty closely where we have people who can follow and help us understand.

PHILIPPE FOQUART:

Thank you. And, well, and as I said, some of us are, so that would be—

BECKY MCGILLEY: [Yeah, to exchange that information].

PHILIPPE FOQUART: Yeah, exactly. Thank you. Susan?

SUSAN MOHR: Thanks, Philippe. And Becky, thank you for coming. I really appreciate you taking the time to visit with the ISPs now twice, following up with us just after our last meeting. Always good to hear from you.

I guess I have a question and maybe a suggestion. I see all of the great work. We hear about all the great work that you're doing at the ICANN meetings, during the forums and certainly when you come and talk to us. I wonder, in looking at the government engagement website, whether there's more you could do there to share with the community the great work that you're doing and the key points that you're making in those meetings. Going back to Fiona's point about marketing, I think we all have so much going on that we may forget what we were hearing from you in the meetings, and having that reminder would be helpful.

And then I wonder. Just before the call, you said that there's really kind of three key themes that you're communicating, and I wonder if you'd be willing to share that here.

BECKY MCGILLEY: Yes, of course. So I agree with you. Probably our biggest way of getting the information out really is through the plenary session at the ICANN meeting, which (I don't know if you saw the one yesterday) was in

competition with a lot of other sessions as well as a lot of technical difficulties. So. But we also probably need to do a better job because we do actually provide what we call the GAC report. It's not very palatable, I say, but it does list all of our activities and a very brief caption summary of who we're meeting with and the topic. But I mean, that's one thing. And maybe I can share with you ... I don't know. Are you familiar with the GAC report?

SUSAN MOHR:

No.

BECKY MCGILLEY:

Okay. So I'll definitely share that as well.

And then to the second topic, for the WSIS+20 review, we are focusing on three main objectives, which, again, I mentioned are making sure that the multistakeholder model of Internet governance is maintained/preserved through the outcome document (even improved, with maybe stronger language there), to ensure that the technical community is represented in strong language as a distinct stakeholder group with distinct roles and responsibilities. And again, that's been the case. It was legitimized in the Tunis Agenda, but in the last couple years ... So the UN secretary general's policy brief five is where they kind of combined it with the civil society. So we wanted to make sure they keep it distinct. And then, of course, there's maintaining the IGF as a multistakeholder platform to not be duplicated with the digital cooperation form or really any process that would take a more multilateral position, which was, again, in policy brief five, seemed to

be the direction they were heading. So the IGF, multistakeholder model, and technical community are three big ones.

And of course, the existential threats there are many. You can just imagine the next steps if the multi ... We use the WSIS +20 outcome documents. I mean, [it] really is what has legitimized the multistakeholder model.

SUSAN MOHR:

Great. Thank you for that.

PHILIPPE FOQUART:

Thank you, Susan. It's probably something that you addressed during the presentation, the discussion, last time, but just know that, as you would remember, our group developed a couple of ... I wouldn't call that positions, but papers on the matter. One of the challenges that we faced (two challenges that we faced) is that if you take both WSIS+20 discussions and the GDC zero draft, as you said, those are wide-ranging initiatives, whereas this group is probably much more focused. So what we did is actually pick up on a couple of things, one of them being that notion of the technical community.

Others were things like the notion that groups could only chime in within the remit of their respective mandate, if that makes sense. There was some language there that would seem to limit the scope of the inputs.

Anyway, I guess I'm getting in the weed here, but the point being is that for this group, sometimes it's challenging to provide inputs on the

whole piece of work as opposed to picking up on very limited items in these discussions. Maybe it's something that everyone is struggling with, given the sheer remit of, for example, the GDC discussions, but it's certainly something that we're struggling with. So we're just being pragmatic on this, which is we developed a couple of papers. We use them individually in our own respective discussions in Europe. We've channeled them in our coordination groups, whether nationally or regionally. Some of our comments were taken, others weren't, as usual. But I guess we're being very pragmatic in that respect. And certainly, if there's a way ... I'm sure, I know, that these comments are consistent with the broader message that you're trying to convey.

But I just want to note that I wouldn't say we've taken our own path, but we're being very pragmatic in that respect, to make sure that some of our members can actually use the material to channel those inputs to those powers that be in the regions.

BECKY MCGILLEY:

I think that that's very important and the purpose, right? We are starting very broad, and you have to get more focus. And I would ... Have you shared the papers?

PHILIPPE FOQUART:

We haven't. We shared them internally, and it was before the creation of the WSIS+20 list, so we didn't share them on that list. Happy to, if there's any ... They're a bit outdated now.

BECKY MCGILLEY: Or at least I know my team specifically [interested in engaging].

PHILIPPE FOQUART: So I'm certainly happy to share with your team. But, yeah, we were slightly, I would say, in advance, because those two papers, I think, were developed before the plenary and the creation of that list, the list that you're referring to.

BECKY MCGILLEY: And I think, too, we at ICANN come across the issue, too. We have not been as forthcoming with written statements because we are very focused on making sure we are only addressing issues that directly impact our mission. So we'll talk more to things, but we are trying to wait until we know it will impact ICANN's mission.

PHILIPPE FOQUART: Thank you. And I think, if anything, during the plenary that we had last time, it was something that did come across: the fact that sometimes people might be uncomfortable with coming up front with a written statement. We're not. And the reason for that is that we have a very limited remit and we believe that the two, three items that we discuss in these papers are not controversial for this community. Certainly, they weren't for this group, obviously. But anyway, certainly happy to share. Again, bit outdated now, but we were just being pragmatic in terms of the timeline that we had in those regional discussions. So we do what we can. So these items, as I said, were the terminology, the technical

community, the process itself, and obviously the multistakeholder model as something to support. Susan?

SUSAN MOHR: Just to say that I'll put the links to those papers in the chat for everyone to see and then you'll get a copy and we can also follow up.

PHILIPPE FOQUART: Thank you, Susan. I should have said that, but that's public material anyway. It's on our website, but happy to share.

SUSAN MOHR: Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOQUART: Thank you. Anything else? Mindful of time. It's a discussion that will continue anyway.

So with this, just thank you for being here today. I think it's been really useful and we'll keep that going. Thanks.

So I think we can go back for the last five minutes to the agenda very, very quickly. Just to note, please have a look at the GNSO portfolio project management tool to see the ongoing activities (policy-related, but not only) in the GNSO.

Maybe we could open the public comments page, Brenda. I've got two minor AOBs, but ... So policy and implementation is what Osvaldo

discussed earlier as far as the discussions at council are concerned. So that's the only one at the moment.

So we're now on AOB, just as housekeeping. We have two items that the leadership will need to consider. You would have noticed that we haven't discussed the representation on the PPSAI effort. That's something that we'll need to do. There were, I think, four candidates for this. So that's something that we will do. I just circulated an email about the community prioritization effort. We have two representatives there, Susan Payne from the IPC and myself. We're happy to step down if there's interest within the community. So again, I'll make it specific in the email, which I haven't, but if you're interested, please come forward.

I don't know if Houda is still here.. She's left. But we'll talk about digital inclusion and multilingualism. I think that's something that she'd like to discuss within the group. So, very quickly, those are the three, four items that we will discuss on the list.

So we've got two minutes left. I see, Malcolm, you were first, and then Osvaldo. Malcolm?

MALCOLM HUTTY:

Hi. Thank you. [inaudible] the issue of the IRP implementation oversight team report that is forthcoming with the meeting. If so, I won't bother you.

PHILIPPE FOQUART:

I'm sorry, Malcolm, we can barely hear you. The audio is not very good.

MALCOLM HUTTY: Sorry.

PHILIPPE FOQUART: Would you mind posting your comment in the chat or, even better, on the list?

MALCOLM HUTTY: Okay, certainly. My apologies.

PHILIPPE FOQUART: No, that's fine. We understand. Thank you.

MALCOLM HUTTY: I just wanted to raise awareness to the forthcoming IoT reports, which will be for public comments before September. Okay?

PHILIPPE FOQUART: Okay. Thank you.

MALCOLM HUTTY: Thank you.

PHILIPPE FOQUART: Osvaldo?

OSVALDO NOVOA:

I have two issues here. First is the council. Perhaps you had mentioned it on the council when I talked about the council issues. And the council received a note from the Transfer Policy Review Working Group chairman regarding that they are preparing the final report, and they have several recommendations regarding a change-of-registrant data of which they are asking from all the participants, the constituencies stakeholder groups, if they could classify the recommendations where they agree with them, they have observations but can live with them, and they don't accept them and they cannot live with them.

Regarding that, there are a couple of them (I think three, four or five) that the BC and the IPC both presented that they cannot live with, they cannot accept.

The chairman would like to know also the position of the other constituencies that participated, like us. They haven't received it yet. So I don't know if we should present our own position or if you should support the BC and IPC being in the same stakeholder group. I will circulate the paper so that you can decide all the issues. That would be one issue.

And the other is a holistic review of drafting—

PHILIPPE FOQUART:

Just on this one first, the first issue, when do you need this? As early as possible, I guess.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Well, they wanted it for April, but they would like to have it as soon as possible.

PHILIPPE FOQUART: Thank you.

OSVALDO NOVOA: And the second issue is the pilot holistic review drafting terms. They are asking for volunteers for the draft team with terms of reference for the volunteers. I don't know if anybody from our constituency wants to volunteer. If not, I would gladly volunteer for it. I don't know where the deadline line is, but it's open right now.

OSVALDO NOVOA: Okay, thank you. And I think the process on this is that there's applications to be made through a dedicated webpage, and then it will come back to the SO/ACs for review and an agreement on the group, presumably, with some diversity expected there. So maybe we could share this with the list and see whether there are ... It's certainly of interest, to put it mildly, for the group. So I guess we need to have someone there and we need to have some feedback. Now, ideally it would be good if we had more than one participant. Optic-wise, I don't know for the reason you gave whether that will be possible, since I guess it's intended to be a manageable group moving forward. So thanks. If you would post this to the list.

Mindful of time, I will just add a final note on a separate topic, and it's on the consequence of the what's called NomCom rebalancing, where

at least from next year's NomCom, we start from a new slate of members, meaning that if we want to have some sort of continuity, we will need to ... And as was planned by the community working group on this, some of the tenures would have to be one year as opposed to two years. The suggestion is that there would be a draw to determine within the community who would be one year and who would, by default, be two years. I'll share that with the group.

I personally don't have a better solution. With hindsight (and I think that was the comment from the NCSG), we could have considered a better way of handling this, because the result is that those who will be selected by that process could be in a situation where, for example, if it were us, it means that this year we would have had a one-year term. Next year would be a one-year term too, back to back. And then the next one could be, if we [are] elected, two years, which is precisely not what we want, because there's no continuity there. So there's a bit of contradiction there.

But I just want to note that something has to be fixed, and if we need to go through a draw, then so be it. I'll share that with the list. And so that will have an impact on [the meeting's] mandate for the year to come.

It's now five minutes over, I think. So I think there's a suggestion for the next constituency call [inaudible]. It's just in a moment. So with this, I'd like to thank everyone for attending and close the session. Thank you very much, and thanks for the remote attendees. Have a nice rest of your day.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]