
ICANN69 | Community Days Sessions – GNSO - ISPCP Open Meeting (1 of 2)
Tuesday, October 13, 2020 – 16:00 to 17:00 CEST

BRENDA BREWER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers open meeting. My name is Brenda and I am the remote participant manager for this session. Please note that this session is recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior.

During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in proper form, as I've noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair of the session. If you would like to ask your question or make your comment verbally, please raise your hand. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. Please state your name for the record and speak clearly, at a reasonable pace. Mute your microphones when you are done speaking. With that, I'm pleased to turn the floor over to Wolf-Ullrich Knoblen. Thank you.

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN: Thank you very much, Brenda. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, whatever time you have around the globe. So we have the open ISPCP meeting, and also, it's an open one. I think as you can see from the agenda, it's mostly related to as a prep call for the other meetings we will have throughout ICANN 69 this time. And so I wanted just at first formally [inaudible] into the round whether there's anything to disclose as statements of interest. [No, I don't see 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.

I especially wanted also to welcome those who are not very familiar with our constituency and our guests here. Welcome to see you on the list and have you here in the room. If you have any questions or contributions, please don't hesitate to raise your hands with the Zoom technology here, and we will also be happy to hear you.

So let's dive into the agenda. Let me just add, at the end, under Any Other Business, I would like to take only two or three minutes to talk about the letter we have received from Maarten Botterman, the ICANN chair of the board in relation to the upcoming GNSO review. Just a first, short, on that letter, I shared that with you in advance and would like just to see any views about that.

With that, I would start to dive into the agenda, and first, as usual, we are going to look at what's going on in the council. We shall have any council meetings next week, and the council itself has several meetings throughout this week and the next week. Some of you may have also attended the meeting today of the council and SSAC and council with the board. I just would like to ask Philippe just to cover what's going on on the council throughout this week and what we should have to take into consideration and whether there is some support, advice needed and so on, as usual.

So Philippe, could you do that, please?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Certainly. Thank you. Yes, I will try and summarize the items that are on the agenda for this meeting of council. I think most of them have

been around for some time. You will see that those are not specific to the council meeting. In fact, those were subject to our discussion with the board this morning and also within the CSG as well. And those are around, first, the issue that arose in the context of the implementation of recommendation 7 of the EPDP and the sort of stumbling block that the IRT has encountered and the need to go back to council on the potential revision of the thick WHOIS policy. And I think this is something that was subject to discussions with the board this morning, and for which, to be honest, both on substance and form is something for which we haven't got a solution so far.

The second discussion item that we have for the council is the next steps for the EPDP and something that we discussed already, and that's the two issues of having unique contacts and the legal versus natural contacts in the context of RDS. So that's something that will be discussed at council.

The document that Osvaldo and I circulated last week will be subject to discussion at council. For those of you who monitor the list, it's called the Operational Design Phase and that is meant to sort of formalize the ... I'm not sure what word I should be using, guidance, informational elements that are provided to the board with regards to the decisions that they need to take in the context before the implementation phase.

And so that's the sort of framework that is intended to formalize this. Within this framework, the considerations for the financial sustainability of any policy recommendations by the GNSO would be

within the remit of that paper. And this is intended to provide ... So the issue at hand here is obviously the potential overlap between this and policy-related items, and whether, for example, the financial sustainability should be addressed as early as possible during the PDP as opposed to having that between the approved final report and the implementation. So that is a gray area that needs to be addressed and to make sure that the PDP remains under the remit of the GNSO, to put it very bluntly.

But that goes beyond the financial aspects. But I understand that this will be—although it's a draft paper—used as a framework to structure the discussions that council and the board will be having on the consideration of phase two and the SSAD, and we will welcome your inputs on this in addition to the discussions that we've had on the list.

And the last, I think that was the last item that's precisely on the financial sustainability of the sad and the future discussions with the board. There's one remaining item, that's consideration for delay of the policy status reports for the expiration policy. I don't think that is a major item, but likewise, we'll be seeking your guidance on this.

So I think this gives you an overview of what will be discussed at council, and happy to take comments, inputs that our members would see fit. Thank you.

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN: Thank you for this, Philippe. I think that gave us a good overview of what is ahead on council's list and priorities for the future, which, you

may have to lead them on all these topics in the next year at least, hopefully.

So these are topics that will be discussed throughout ICANN 69 on different levels, as usual, so you will see on the different agendas on CSG level as well as it will be discussed throughout the community with the board, with other entities inside the ICANN community.

So it's good, and I understand you would like to have, as usual, input from the constituency that will discuss that. The question here from me is [it's not clear] and I do hope that after ICANN 69 with the board discussion, we'll have more clarity on the schedule and the timing of all these items. So for example, what you raised for the Operational Design Phase, what does it mean, how much input ICANN would like to have and at what time. I understand it should be available before you really start with the SSAD financial implications investigations and all these things. So as usual, it's of high priority.

So I wonder how we do that. I think we put all together these items on item list, and in-between our meeting, our monthly call, we should have a discussion on our list about that. Are there any specific items, comments, questions to what Philippe was raising here, presenting? It's not the case, not yet.

So, question from Phillippe is, "Does the CSG intend to issue comment on the draft document?" Well, it is on the discussion list on the CSG, as well, and we have to do then. At least we should do it on constituency level by ourselves. Whether we should coordinate a specific view on that, well, it depends on how many discussions we shall have on CSG

level. But at least we will have an exchange on the CSG level on the CSG ExCom in preparing for our next calls. I think that would be a way to do so. I will say our comments could be very different from IPC and BC. So nevertheless, we will have an exchange on that level.

Okay, let's go to the next item, preparation of the meeting of the CSG and the board. And in preparing for that, there was as well also something changed throughout the recent discussions on that. But anyway, do we have available for displaying the recent agenda for the CSG meeting with the ICANN board? Brenda, is that possible to display, please? I could start with that.

We have two major items to cover which we put forward to the board. One was requested by the board, as you did this morning on council level, that is a discussion on enhancing the effectiveness of the ICANN multi-stakeholder model in light of the closed public comment and the recommendations to be implemented, and in addition to that, it would be good if we have specific examples for the board from stakeholder groups and constituencies what is working, what we see is problematic, also in each to go more into details. And then maybe we'll also raise in this context all the structural issues we have still here in our house with regards to the multi-stakeholder model.

The question here is—yes, thank you very much. That is [both] items to cover. And this time, the format is a little bit different. In former times, when we had face-to-face meetings, then we were sitting around with some specific board members, and some of us were sitting at the main

table, and then we were discussing all these items and we allocated leads who should go forward with those questions.

This time is different, because everybody could chime in. If you have a question or a contribution, you should chime in and raise your hand to do so on the list. Nevertheless, I would be sure that nothing is lost also from our side. And as I know, we have also colleagues having been more involved in the discussion about the ICANN multi-stakeholder model. I would like just to ask them also whether they could be there and available to that meeting for example. Well, specifically Tony Holmes. And if it comes to a discussion on structural issues, well, I'm sure you can chime in as well. But if there's somebody who would like to go into that in more detail, I'm open to accept self-nominations as well, as usual.

With regards to the second part, EPDP 2 and the implementation, it will cover the items you have raised as well. For example, the cost-effective approach to implement SSAD for example, or the other issues in relation to the question of how to implement and whether to implement the SSAD and with all of the financial burdens and costs which have to be taken.

So Philippe, I'd like to ask you, since you have also conveyed the comment and the statement on council level, that you also contributed in this way this morning at the meeting with the board, and that could be done, should be done when it comes to that item as well from our side. And I think the contributions from today in light of ongoing discussions could be taken as well, if you agree. Philippe,

“Sure, yes.” And Tony as well is going to support the other part from the MSM-related discussion.

Are there specific items in relation to the both topics [we should cover here?] Philippe, please go ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. I just want to point out an observation which was made during the discussion with the board this morning. It came from Kurt Pritz, which was, I think, a good point and something which will be difficult to tackle in the context of the considerations relative to the financial sustainability of the system.

And Kurt was making an observation that when you do a cost-benefit analysis, you have to do both. You have to do the cost part and the benefit. The cost from ICANN Org probably wouldn't be very difficult to address. The benefit is much more difficult to assess in the sense that the benefit is pretty much for the clients of that system.

And assessing the added value, if you like, is maybe tricky. So I just wanted to convey that observation, that even in terms of methodology, that exercise may not be trivial. I think Göran this morning made it clear that it wouldn't happen overnight. That is something that is not easy to do.

But even in substance, if you like, the problem is not an easy one because the benefit part may not be easily addressed. I just wanted to share this because I think that is an issue that is intrinsic to the problem, if you like. Thank you.

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, Philippe. And this goes along with the comment of [inaudible] on the chat as well. It's not easy for [any] to get to the other side. Yes, you're right. Well, the question is what kind of incentives could help here. It's really something which could be discussed endless.

But on the other hand—and that is, well, that's why we have different interests represented on this group as well, to find out or to discuss benefits as well. Well, it's a projection to the future as well, what is going to happen.

This morning, I heard very clear Michele saying, “Okay, well, forget it or put it on hold because all the ones who should use it rejected the report and wouldn't like to use it anymore in the future.” So you'll see what's going to happen, but also, BC and IPC did not agree to the report. Whether they are willing to look at this and to find out a better way in order to make better use of this.

So this all has to be done in that group to discover, to sort out, and yeah, in this context, I also understand the operational design phase that Göran is looking for to be implemented into, locked into the existing process. Not the PDP itself but the overall process between the PDP plus the implementation plus the board position to be taken and the implementation. So these things are necessary to cover.

Okay. Thanks for this. I think that there will be a lively discussion on that with the board. So no, we don't have any problem. We have candidates who are going to raise their hands in this regard. So with

that, let's move to the next item. This is the last preparation of the ISPCP outreach event which will take place tomorrow at 12:00 CET here for one and a half hours.

We have two items, two groups to be covered. I have seen also on the list the e-mails going forward and backward with regards to the preparation of that, so I'm especially thankful to all the volunteers participating in that in the first part. Esteban. Hello Esteban. Good to see you after a time again. Thank you. And Lars especially, and then Andrea also moderating that part. And then the second part, which is covered and moderated by Christian and contributed as well.

Let's go through that briefly. How should we go forward, Andrea or Chris? Chris Mondini as well. Could you just briefly—

CHRIS MONDINI:

I'm here, but in fact, as you identified, Andrea has really been managing the process. I'm really just a helpful welcoming voice with the housekeeping and logistics. But you have excellent moderations in Andrea and Christian. And Wolf-Ullrich, I want to echo your thanks to the many people participating. I think it's come together very nicely.

So I'm here for any questions or advice. Otherwise, I'll let Andrea go through any questions or last-minute needs for this group.

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN:

Thanks, Chris. Andrea, would you please—

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Wolf-Ullrich—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Go ahead. I'm sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Please.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, I do understand my three connectors, but I'm having a problem with understanding how to implement on my device, because I'm working from my device so I really don't want anything to get—it's like I'm kind of going to this thing and basically just getting out of like finding myself and things like that. So I just like [ran into coding] and it was just like, [oh, coding.] But it's just like I just ran into [coding] or whatever. I've been really enjoying—I'm sorry, I had to come outside and get some fresh air, it's really nice this morning.

But yeah, I just got on my phone or whatever doing this, and I've been really enjoying it, but it is quite difficult. So I'm going to leave my e-mail in the [text] so anybody can help out. Just wanted to put that out there.

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much, [inaudible]. Well, you have never participated in ISPCP meetings before, have you?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: No, this is my first time. Like I said, I kind of stumbled upon the ... And I've just been like [coding] through the layers.

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN: I would suggest that you leave your e-mail address either to me or to Chantelle or Vanda and we'll get in contact with you and then we could establish relations if possible.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Perfect. Yeah. I would really appreciate that, because no lie, for the past few months, I've been going crazy. I've been up all nice just [coding.] But I've been enjoying myself, honestly. I have. But yeah, I'll definitely drop my e-mail.

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN: Yeah. Thanks very much.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you.

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN: And let's over to and follow what Andrea could present or go through any question, any open items with regards to the meeting tomorrow. Andrea, please go ahead.

ANDREA BECALLI:

Hello. Thank you. I think we are pretty set with agenda for the session. Maybe we can go through it and see if there's any farther consideration we have to do.

I also have a slide deck that I will then send to you to just use if you have slides that you want to present, and then we will send it to our technical team to make sure that it's backed up. And I see there is a question in the chat from Susan Mohr on how much time each panelist should expect per question.

We have a long session, but we have a lot of speakers, so we would have five to seven minutes per question of the panelists, and that will do. For the rest, we have secured [Adiel] who is also on the call with us to present on the part of [inaudible] DNS, the new topics, new IP and other topics. And then he will also speak in the last part on how to secure the DNS.

On the rest, I think we're all set. I would suggest that we can set up a Skype chat. I can do that with all the participants and moderators in the session, so for any last-minute troubleshooting among us, I can do that. I'll send an e-mail with my Skype details and you just add me on and we'll do that.

And for the rest, we have been promoting the session. Last time that I checked, we have over 90 persons registered. I would expect something more. We keep pushing. We pushed it through social media, Twitter, LinkedIn, and I would push it through our contacts in Brussels in the telco and business world. So I'm confident we'll have a good outreach session on that.

CHRIS MONDINI: May I?

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN: Please do.

CHRIS MONDINI: I wanted to mention also the outreach session to promote interactivity is using the Zoom format which is the regular interactive meeting where participants—I believe this is correct, Andrea—can see each other and chat, and we’ll invite people to put questions also in the format in the chat.

To Susan’s question, really, five minutes doesn’t leave very much time in fact to answer many questions. But if some of them have been typed and read aloud, we might get through more of the questions. I would expect that the moderators will have to be pretty strict in paying attention to the time, and as Andrea said, if we’re on a Skype chat, we can help each other out by pointing out questions, raised hands and letting people know when time is running short. Thanks.

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN: Yes. Thank you very much, Chris, and Andrea, for that. From the format point of view, I understand the participants will have also some contributions to be displayed. That’s my question for example to Lars and to Esteban as well and others. And that is going through. And then after that, there are short statements around this kind of of—not a big

presentation, maybe just one or two slides. So there may be then following up these questions you're raising, just to understand the format in detail. Andrea, could you help in that respect?

ANDREA BECALLI:

Yeah, so we have a slide deck. I'll share it to you and the rest of the speakers. And if you have slides that you want to present as a support, then just add them to the slide deck and send them to me. And we will have them—just to be safe, we'll send them to the technical support at ICANN, but then I can just present them, use them through Zoom, I'll just share my screen and it'll have the presentation on. And it's just a support we can use during the session to introduce the agenda, the speakers, to keep a bit the time on the schedule.

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN:

Okay. Great.

CHRIS MONDINI:

Andrea, do you want to give a deadline if anyone has a slide or two to send you, just so you don't get any at the last minute? And again, sorry to be so concerned about timing, but given the very short interventions, I would think that really, people would be limited to one or two slides if it helps them illustrate their point.

ANDREA BECALLI:

Thank you, Chris. Yes, if you can get it to me by tomorrow close of business, end of day, I'll make sure that we have it backed. And if there

are any last-minute changes since you just sent it to me on Thursday, I'm here and we'll do that.

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN: Great. Good to hear. I would like to send you one [chart. You could have the answer I've seen,] so as usual. So I will just [focus] a little bit on the ISPCP itself to make some advertisement around that with one slide so we'll get it as well on my side.

Is there any question from the participants, from the contributor side here?

ANDREA BECALLI: Yeah, Wolf-Ullrich, I see there are questions from Susan on the chat. One is, she's asking regarding the format, should each speaker expect to make an intro statement before the moderator will walk through each of the three questions, or should expect the moderator will begin with the questions?

They're going to do a short presentation of themselves before each question. That'll help. I think that would be the way to go.

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN: [inaudible]. And coming back to what Chris was saying, it's just a question of really strictly looking at the time, because usually, we understand everybody—that is from experience, if you have one or two slides, you think, okay, that is not too much. But if you're speaking about that, time is consumed and in the end, you will have problems

with keeping your time. So that is the experience, and so we really have to be strict with their presentations so that you can place your questions as well. That's the only thing. But the format is okay.

Any further question from those participating in that effort? One last question, Chris and Andrea. Yesterday, I realized, and I think it's still on the schedule, the title of the session is just related to COVID-19. So that is, for me, a little bit—if people are going through the schedule and see, “Okay, COVID-19, maybe that's not that interesting,” but if we could add something with regards to the second part, that would be helpful. Just what I realized. Is that possible?

CHRIS MONDINI:

I think Andrea was going to look into that. We may have missed the deadline, but we'll check. I've also put a note—I hope nobody objects to being on the video when they're speaking. You can save it for just the time you're speaking, but it makes it more interactive. If people object, make a note of that. And Andrea will check on the description in the schedule.

ANDREA BECALLI:

Wolf-Ullrich, what will you change on the title? That is true, COVID-19 is there, definitely. But how would you change it?

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN:

I was thinking your English is better than mine. It's just the question how to add something about the other part with regards to the future

IP or future technical developments. So that's what I wanted to see in the title, that everybody who reads the title is not of the opinion just, okay, they are talking 90 minutes about COVID-19. But it's a different thing.

so let me think about that. Maybe you have also some idea. I'm going to send you something after the session.

ANDREA BECALLI: Okay.

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Philippe, please go ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Yes, just to repeat a note I've put in the chat box. I think on the second panel, we need to assume that people have some vague knowledge of what DoH is, given the short amount of time that we have. If we want to have one slide each, I think that's a fair assumption. I just want to make sure that—I don't know. There's no way we can go into the detail of what it is, and as I've put in the chat, this is very much a follow-up from the HITs that we had at ICANN. So that's at least my assumption. Thank you.

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN: Thanks for this, Philippe. I think we'll have that meeting then tomorrow at noon CET. Again, Chris is saying in the chat, I think one slide each is a good limit. Thank you.

So then let's move over for the last minutes to the next item, is the ISPCP charter. As you know and as we shared with you as well, we are in the very last steps to finalize the charter. Almost everything is done besides the details and definitions around the composition and the membership of the ISPCP constituency.

So far, Chantelle has [inaudible] to put in all—she has already updated the charter, so just the one chapter about membership is finally to be discussed. So a suggestion was made, at first by Lars in a written form, was circulated in our small group to discuss that. So I would like to ask you who participate in that discussion also to react on that, to put in your ideas, and that we then have a further call on this group according to the [report] which was just sent out by Chantelle today and which will take place in the call in the week after the ICANN 69 so that we can be in a position not to start again from scratch but we need to sort out what is problematic from our point of view, how can we have a more detailed approach to definitions with regards to membership and in the related items?

That's the way we would like to further work on this chapter of the charter, and I would like, if possible, also to give you a chance or to hear from you all your side in this respect, whether you have any ideas, any different ideas, any limitations you see or any restrictions or specific ideas on that which could be exchanged here as well at the

time being, or just leave it up to the small group at the time being to come back with the suggestion and discuss it in the entire group.

I don't see any hands. So, that item is- I wouldn't say it's as critical item, but it's an important item. It should be broadly discussed and thought about, how we could move forward, because our charter should be ready as soon as possible. It has to take further administrative steps. After we have in our constituency agreed to that, it will be put forward to ICANN. It will be then commented by ICANN, I think, more from the legal point of view, and these aspects, and then it has to be put for public comment period as well. So it all takes time. So we are [clearly on route] to finalize this, but we can.

No other comment on that, so then let's do it that way. Okay, then in the discussion, fixing a Doodle date and then continue the discussion around that.

Last, not least, Any Other Business. What I shared with you just today is what I got from Maarten Botterman, from the chair of the ICANN board. He sent it to all the SOAC leaders, a letter this morning to be aware of the upcoming and scheduled GNSO review in 2021.

So there is a rule, or it's a process, [you know,] laid down in any kind of guiding document so that every five years, the SO/ACs should go through a review. And we had a five-year cycle finished some years ago, and now it's up in 2021 to start formally.

What Maarten is putting forward is saying there are some dependencies because in parallel, there are discussions about ATRT3.

There are recommendations from ATRT3 to be implemented. And there are discussions on structural items, there are recommendations from the ATRT3 saying, okay, put in a moratorium on structural reviews unless several decisions from the board have been taken in advance.

So he wanted to see and hear from us, the community, how we see that, how we see the timing of the GNSO review upcoming in 2021, and we should discuss and give some input on that. I'm sure we will discuss it also on the CSG level with the other constituencies, and we should give an input to that.

So my question here is, do we have some specific items to cover which we could put forward, for example, in the CSG open discussion which is also two days from now? I'm sure we'll come back on that meeting as well, to that point. And how could we cover that? Are there any ideas, any points to take into consideration when we move forward with that discussion?

I see no hands at the time being. So what I could suggest then is just trying that we put some items to take into consideration with regards to that process to the list. I could take the first one, and then we could start it on the list, [inaudible] input. The question is not so complicated, I would say. One question is just, should we have a structural review in 2021? And under which dependencies, under which conditions?

We have discussed several times that we are not satisfied with the structure in our house, so this is something which should be an

element of the entire discussion on that. So in the end, as usual, we will have to put some items together in paper to have a solid basis for discussion on that. [inaudible] some points. I could start on the list and then hopefully, all the others who are maybe familiar with formal reviews as well and with the structure we have, and the pros and cons to that, they'll chime in so that we can have a fruitful dialog on that and give an input also to the discussion with the board itself.

So, that is on the point of GNSO review for the time being. Are there any other points to discuss from your side? Then the very last point, which Philippe didn't mention in his presentation on the council topics to be covered, there'll be a second part of the meeting next week of the council meeting, which is for the council chair election.

As you know, Philippe is the candidate for council chair. I'm really hopeful and I also think it'll happen, so Philippe is going to be selected and elected as council chair next week. That would mean then if that comes to that part, Philippe will take a big load for the next year to work on.

I would like to ask all of you as a back office at least for Philippe with regards to ISPCP-related items, to help him go through that big job. I wish him all the best for next week. That's my last statement on that. I see Philippe's hand raised. Go ahead, please.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART:

Thank you. Just to thank you for your kind words, Wolf-Ullrich. I would certainly welcome your support if that comes to fruition next week.

I'm hopeful that this will be a good result, both for me and the constituency. The procedure has been amended somehow to facilitate the vote next week. That should be a roll call, and I'll take it as a positive sign, but we'll see. There's always some surprise in ICANN, which is always good. But we'll see.

Thanks again. Certainly, support from the constituency would be most welcome for next year if that is successful. Thank you.

WOLF-ULLRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much, Philippe. Last question. Are there any more questions? No, it is not the case, so we are good in time. Thank you very much for that. Thank you for Chantelle and Vanda for your support. And see you at other meetings. Thank you very much. Goodbye. The meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]