
ICANN73 | Virtual Community Forum – GNSO: ISPCP Membership Meeting
Wednesday, March 9, 2022 – 09:00 to 10:00 AST

BRENDA BREWER: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening. Welcome to the Internet Service Providers and Connectivity Providers Membership session at ICANN73 on Wednesday, 9 March, 2022, at 13:00 UTC.

My name is Brenda, and I am the remote participation manager for this session. To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multistakeholder model, we ask that you sign in to Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name.

Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior. If you would like to ask a question or make a comment verbally, please raise your hand from the Reactions icon on the menu bar. When called upon, kindly unmute your microphone and take the floor. State your first and last name clearly and at a reasonable pace and mute your microphone when you are done speaking.

And now I am pleased to introduce chair of ISPCP, Wolf-Ulrich Knoblen. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you very much, Brenda. Hello. Good morning, good afternoon, good whatever to everybody here available to the meeting. On we have,

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.

as you can see on the screen, a fully tight agenda today and we only have one hour available. So I'll really to control the time here.

I would like just formally to start with statements of interest if there are any. Anything to be disclosed. I don't see a hand here, thank you.

And I would like also briefly to welcome newcomers who are around here. I see some new names here but maybe just available for this meeting for some reason, and I would like to give them a chance in five words to introduce themselves. So let's start where I can see with Ross Creelman. Ross, can you?

ROSS CREELMAN: Yes. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Ross Creelman, and I'm from ETNO, the European Telecommunications Network Operators' Association in Brussels. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Then I see Jan Jansen.

JAN JANSEN: Good afternoon. I wasn't expecting to say anything. Jan Jansen here. I'm linked to the Trademark Clearinghouse. Just out of interest joining the group here. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thank you very much. And welcome all the ICANN staff now. I see Nora Mari. Nora?

NORA MARI: All right, hello, everybody. I'm Nora Mari. I'm based in Brussels with the government engagement team. Good morning or good afternoon, everybody.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thank you very much. So thank you very much for all being here. So let's dive into the agenda. I've relatively late inserted the first agenda item with regard to ICANN's emergency financial support for continued access to the Internet. There's a link behind and you can see the announcement from ICANN to that.

The reason was there was a request as you know to ICANN from the Ukrainian side because of the war in Ukraine that ICANN should take measures with regards to the DNS and against Russia especially. And you may have seen as well Göran's answer to that request. And in addition the Board has taken action to take a decision to allocate \$1 million U.S. dollars to that emergency fund to give support for keeping the Internet reliable in Ukraine, and that is behind it of this announcement.

There was also some question related some earlier days in a meeting with Göran, I understand, and to Göran what kind of specific measures the Board and ICANN Org have in mind with regard to that. And as you could understand, the decision is a relatively fresh one from last Sunday, I think. So there was no specific answer to be given because they are still in discussion around how that yet be done.

So that is my status as to that. I want to hear from our membership also. There was a request out to put that on the agenda, so I'm just opening the floor if there is any remark from anybody from our membership here or from the participants with regards to that item and what's ongoing here. If there is something, please raise your hand.

I don't see a hand, so I take that as that in course of the last days you understood what's going on here and how ICANN was reacting with regards to its own role and that there is nothing to add from our side at the time being. Thank you very much for that.

Then let's move ahead to the council activities. Later today there will be a council meeting, and usually we are talking about what's going on in council, if there's anything we should chime in here. So if we could get a small update either from Philippe or from Thomas regarding council activities, please, you have the floor. Philippe, are you here.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes, I am.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, please go ahead.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Good afternoon to you, Wolf-Ulrich. Can you hear me?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Let me just start, and Thomas may chime in as he sees fit. I'll focus on the most important part, I think. We have two motions under consent. One for the reappointment of Becky Burr to the Board. I don't think we have an issue with that. Quite the contrary. We quite support her. And there's another one on the extension of the CCOICI the pilot to cover Work Stream 2 related—yes, indeed, Thomas. Thanks for this. We fully support Becky's reappointment.

To the second item, the extension of the pilot to cover Work Stream 2 related recommendations, to me at least, this is a minor adjustment. And if we were to disagree, I think it would be fair to post an alternative. Personally, I have none. I think the CCOICI works quite well from my perspective [not only as the chair]. So I think it's a good idea.

The concern over the potential [inaudible], the complexity of this was a valid one, but I think it works reasonably well. We have good turnouts to the meetings. And the two tasks that are under the remit of the CCOICI that [we're working on] is almost complete, and we work as efficiently as possible. That would seem to make sense, so I think we should support this.

The other items that...so that's all we have as far as motions are concerned. There are no other votes at council this afternoon.

The discussion items that we have relative to the output of the SSAD small team that we will discuss as well as the next steps for this from a procedural standpoint, the options are still open as to whether council

or the GNSO would need to develop a supplementary recommendation following the findings of the ODA. So that's what the small team is working on at the moment in order to come up with a proposal to council.

I know we have representative there, and I think Thomas is on the team. It's a work in progress. I think it has been said it's slightly early. So essentially this will be a readout of the progress of the small team, as we said yesterday. I think it was yesterday, was it? With the Board.

What I'd like to focus on...so that's the other item. We'll have an update from [TDS] and also an update from the small team on reviews.

What I'd like to focus on is our discussion item on SubPro. There are two sub items, if you like. There's how council will approach moving forward the feedback from the ODP team [throughout] on how we can either endorse [chair] suggestions or review them. So that's a procedural point as well as consideration for launching an initiative. I'm using a vague word because the proposal is somewhat vague at this point. But relative to our applicant support, for example. So that's a discussion we'll have. That's the [first] item.

The second one is relative to the letter that the Board sent to the GNSO and the GAC on Friday which I redistributed to council. Maybe I should have in turn sent it to the ISPCP. I don't know whether everyone here is familiar with this.

The ask from the Board is to take and review the conclusions of SubPro relative to closed generics between the GNSO and the GAC and come

up with, I should say, a more tangible result. If you would recall, there was no consensus on how closed generics should be dealt with. And there was not even a consensus on whether status quo would apply, i.e., what was agreed and put in place so the 2012 round could be carried forward. So there was no agreement whatsoever and no guidance provided to the Board on this. So there's now a request from the Board to GNSO and the GAC to further consider that issue.

Just to share my initial reaction when that was subject to informal exchanges before the letter, my initial reaction was very much the same as I think those who were directly involved in the working group. We do not want to relitigate the discussions. We want to make sure that there is a likelihood of convergence.

And for this, given that the same causes would lead to the same consequences, if you see what I mean, there should be an extra element in the equation, as I generally say. And whether that's relative to the public interest framework that we heard about on Monday by [inaudible], for example, or any other elements, that would be necessary for this to have a chance, let's say.

And so the letter does not elaborate. There's a reference to a framework paper that will be developed by staff on this, and those elements should be present there. That's all I can say at this point. So like the review of the ODA [inaudible] as we said with the Board yesterday, but I think that there will be some discussion on this.

So I'll stop here and ask if there's any input from the group, especially on this element, or if people would disagree with the initial part of my intervention. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Philippe. I don't see a hand directly to your question here. The question is, how much time do we have to respond to that? What is your timeline in the council for an answer to the Board to that?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: It's a good question. I should probably have to go back to the letter. We will have the discussion, the initial part, this afternoon. But obviously, we haven't got the framework paper, so it's only the beginning of this. So I'm only looking for initial reactions. I think we should probably come up with within a month or two a way forward.

All of this depending on the framing paper that Org will provide. So it's a number other notes on the path here, but I hope that's helpful. On this [inaudible] but there's no urgency. I would encourage people to have a look at the letter if they haven't already but no urgency for this afternoon. But would welcome any views on this. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, good. Thank you. So what I can say to the audience here is you can participate at least here while the council is going to discuss in the afternoon later, I mean some hours from now. So those who are

interested in that topic especially to make up your mind and we could come back here in ISPCP level in order to try to give Philippe and Thomas some comments from our side here. I think that's what I would say here because there is no direct action at the time being. Yes, thank you so much.

That was with regards to the SubPro. Philippe, I do have a little bit to look at the time and I do have....

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yeah, I was about to say thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. I hope you can hear me. What I was about to say before we close the topic, I'll forward, I'll resend the letter to the ISPCP list this time just to make sure that it's at the top of your mailbox and people would probably make the link with what I've just said and what we discussed, if that's helpful. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah. Yes, okay, thank you. And I guess with regards to Becky's coming back and reappointment there's not any issue from our side. And also with regards to the other motion, the addition which was done to that with regard to the SSAD, there's nothing from our side, Philippe. Is your hand up?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes, it is. Thank you. I'll just...I'm referring to Thomas' question in the chat. And indeed Flip has asked that there is an additional AOB item for

this afternoon's call. I don't have much, to your question, Thomas, I don't have much more context of this other than what's in Flip's email. Flip is requesting that AOB in light of what we're all familiar with, the current international climate, let's put it this way, and the conflict in Ukraine.

And Flip would consider as an individual and as is his right that this may require a review, not review. Review is not the right word, but at least for us, the GNSO to have a look holistically at the policies that we have in place and consider the potential—I hope I'm using his words correctly—potential cybersecurity risks. Maybe that's an overstatement, but there's a sense that maybe it's worthwhile having a look at those and whether there are any relevant actions to be taken from a policy perspective. I hope I'm not mischaracterizing what Flip had said. I think that's the intent.

My reaction was to say I don't know. I don't know the answer. Let's put it on AOB. People will go back to their [inaudible], consider the question and if that's relevant. Then if there's something that council should do, that obviously should come from the [inaudible] as a proposal, not from an individual. But given the context, that's worthwhile having that discussion.

Thomas and others, I hope that's helpful. That's pretty much all of the context I have on this. I think it's a relevant question. Probably I'm certain that we'll not have an answer this afternoon on the substance, but I think that's a—yes, exactly, Thomas. Reading the chat, that's

exactly what he's asking for. So there we are. Hope that's helpful. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And thanks, Thomas.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah, thanks for that. And thank you also for bringing up this question here because that leads I think and fits directly to the next item we have here on the agenda, cybersecurity talks between ICANN Org and the European Commission and the potential impacts on ICANN's role and policies. While this gets an additional flavor coming from the last developments here in Ukraine. And so I'm happy that we have Chris Mondini here and some people from his staff. Chris, we had some interest here to hear from you, and I'm happy to have you here. Please go ahead.

CHRIS MONDINI: Thank you. I am delighted to be with you and really appreciate the opportunity to see many familiar faces and some new names and faces. I am going to be very brief. Tomorrow there is a plenary session on geopolitical and legislative initiatives that will cover some of these issues. The other reason I'll be brief is because the person who is most in charge of engagement with the EU institutions, Elena Plexida, will be on that session and is very good for detailed questions in this area. But I will give the highlight of, I would say, the things that we are looking at and monitoring.

But, Wolf-Ulrich, you referred to the exchange of letters between the Ukrainian deputy prime minister and Göran. And I think that Göran's

response and the subsequent communications around it were pretty self-explanatory. We're lucky also that we have Adiel on this call who can go into any technical questions on that particular issue. And Nora Mari I do want to introduce who works with Evelyn and me here in Brussels is another person who can provide details.

But getting to, I would say, the regular cybersecurity discussions in the EU institutions and in Brussels, there are two areas I just wanted to highlight. One is the network and information security directive NIS2. It was introduced all the way back in December 2020. And as we have been providing updates to the community and trying to bridge communications between community members and institutions all along, we have really focused on the issue of the scope.

It specifically talked about DNS services but really included the entire DNS resolution chain, including ICANN really and root name servers. And at this stage there is the final text, and we believe the members of the European parliament, the parliament, and the council have taken out the root service from the scope and we hope it will remain that way.

With help from many people here and others across the community and other, I would say, likeminded organizations from business associations like ECHO, DIGITAL EUROPE, Internet Society, CENTR, RIPE NCC, Netnod of course who operates a root server, we essentially did what we always do which is answer questions about how the DNS works, raise awareness, and really point out some of the unintended consequences that putting these requirements on root name server

operators would have had. In fact the potential opposite of the effect of actually reducing the availability of root service in Europe.

So we submitted public comments to the process. Those are of course public. And as I said, we spoke with members of parliament, attachés of the council. We did a webinar on root service trying to demystify it with help from Netnod and RIPE NCC. And it's been a good collaborative effort there and an opportunity to raise awareness about some of the underpinning workings of the DNS.

In another part of the forest...so that's a directive where the European Union is going to tell member states to implement laws that secure what they consider critical and crucial aspects of the infrastructure. There is also a cybersecurity strategy. It's been mentioned in other sessions here. This is the commission really just promulgating a strategy that they intend to implement.

One aspect that's of interest I think to the ISPCP in particular would be the proposal for a Europe name resolver. DNS for EU it's called. And that's actually adding more resolvers is fine in terms of resiliency and abundance of places to make DNS queries. But some of the intentions behind it or the potential uses for it are really what make it something to question or to explore more about.

Currently, Europeans get most of their DNS queries answered by resolvers operated by their ISP provider. And I'm going to share the study which you will likely have seen that shows that. So some of the justifications about whether there's enough diversity or competition we are just hoping to explore more. And whether it creates any

centralization of queries that creates a vulnerability or reduces security in an unintended way is another thing to discuss.

The reason I think that we are raising awareness about this one is it just speaks to this idea that there's a growing mindset in many corners of the world about needing to have a contingency plan for the root or try to secure part of the DNS in a territorial way, which from a technological standpoint is not really possible or desirable. And so we're trying to again use this as an opportunity to explain that the distributed voluntary nature of the system is what makes it resilient and that there is a global governance of stakeholders that keep it operating.

So between the Ukraine-Russia crisis, the DNS for EU discussion, and where we are on the NIS2, it's been a very busy but in many ways fruitful time to raise awareness about ICANN's role and all of the stakeholders, including your role in bringing DNS and the Internet to Europeans.

Thanks. I'll stop. I used up more time than I hoped to. But again, if there are questions, the key thing to know is you have a team in Brussels and we are happy to engage with all of you as deeply as you would like on the issues as well.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN:

Thank you very much, Chris. I think that is really helpful and informative to us, especially as I remember we had already, some month ago, we had a presentation here around DNS with regard to the DNS resolver policy. You mentioned there was a specialist. I'm sorry, I don't have the name available. But also there was a question also how the ISPCP

membership may be involved in these kinds of efforts. I know that ECHO is looking into it and there may be some of their membership also related and active in this regard. So we are following that.

I would like to open the floor for questions. I see Christian put something in here. Christian, will you chime in directly, please?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON:

Certainly, I'm happy to say my question. I was simply asking, Chris, with the text as it is now with hopefully the root zone removed, do you still see jurisdictional overreach in the text that are threats to the multistakeholder system?

CHRIS MONDINI:

One of the things that I didn't mention that you allude to is that it does have extraterritorial effect. And so having excluded the root, that's a little bit reduced that. But gTLDs will be in scope and, of course, they're operated everywhere.

And there is also of interest to many parts of the ICANN community—extreme interest—is there is an Article 23 that provides guidance on maintenance and retention of registration data and on one hand seeks, I think, to try to provide some resolution of ambiguity about those issues but on the other hand doesn't take into account all of the work the community has done to also try to do the same thing.

And it's a directive, the fact that this is a directive and then is implemented by individual member states, it creates more

opportunities for fragmentation and jurisdictional conflict. But I don't know what the solution is. So this is the...how do you convince a regional government or a national government to bake in parts of their law, oh, and this will be handled by multistakeholder governance processes that already exist. It's an imperfect marriage.

So I wouldn't call it necessarily a threat to multistakeholderism. I try to see it as an opportunity to remind everybody that there are multistakeholder global processes and they must be global because there must be global consensus for the interoperability. So, yes, there are still some rough patches, I would say, and we're monitoring those closely and would love to work with you to raise awareness on all sides.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Impressively optimistic. Thank you, Chris.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: That's good. And as usual his answers are very long, so it means it's complicated. So there is not just a no or a yes.

CHRIS MONDINI: Yeah, that's the short answer. It's complicated.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, are there any other questions to Chris here at the moment? Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Okay, Wolf-Ulrich, this is Philippe here. Was there another intervention? I see Christian has his hand up. Maybe that's a follow-up, so I'll defer to you, Wolf-Ulrich, whether you want to take Christian's comment first.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: I was only going to say, Chris, you said [inaudible] answers. I wanted to know if you had anything that you could suggest that ISPs could do.

CHRIS MONDINI: In terms of awareness raising both about the governance aspects and the model and the technical underpinnings and workings I've been on a crusade to help people even via their local national GAC representatives to get to policymakers, people in ministries and national capitals that are working on cybersecurity issues or the CERTs in those places. You are all potential amplifiers of all of the work that we do here.

And then I think also it's an opportunity for ISPs internally to look at their businesses and see how their DNS services are treated. Whether they are somehow seen as strategic or whether they're seen as just an operational cost. Whether they're...I think it seems...it's one of those things—and Philippe may have comments in this regard—but it is an opportunity to rethink strategically positions of ISPs on how they provide these services for users.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thank you. Philippe?

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. And thanks, Chris. Hi. Good to see you. Yes, it was more of a comment really and somewhat related to what you just said but more broadly on the EC's project and resolver diversity. And speaking as an ISPCP member, by the way, for my affiliation. Certainly not in any other capacity there.

I think it's important that those figures are known, that people bear that in mind when they look at the EC's RFP. I think that's crucial to remind people that in most—I haven't got the figures with me—but for the countries I'm familiar with just about, what is it, 80% or 90% of the DNS requests actually go through the ISPs' resolvers. And when we talk about diversity, it's there. The diversity is exactly there and from an [affiliation] who's having an interested look at the current RFP.

Then to some extent I'm surprised people are surprised by the substance of the call. I appreciate that it's poorly phrased, that it sounds like the ultimate filtering engine to some extent with all references to blacklists and all the rest of it.

But mindful of the fact of the figures that you just quoted, mindful of the fact that the ISPs are good law abiding people, that they operate in certain countries, there's a rule of law in those countries. We can disagree on whether that's good law or not, but they do not define those blacklist themselves. It's generally agencies, public agencies or decisions by courts, etc. And they've been around for 20 years.

So again, the phrasing is really poor. The purpose is moot. Maybe there's a number of things to fix there. But the sort of gut reaction that we're sometimes hearing is somehow at odds with the way resolvers have been working for ages in those countries, I think. From the figures you quoted and the way a number of us as ISPs understand how all those things work. Hope that's helpful. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes. Thanks very much, Philippe. I'm sorry that we have not too much time really. So I wonder why we at virtual meetings every time have just one hour [they give us]. We should think about how we can improve that in the future. We have so interesting topics here to talk about. And I wonder....

CHRIS MONDINI: Wolf-Ulrich, I'm just going to put the link to the paper in the chat, the Zoom that Philippe is referring to, the resolver study. And then also just to say one of the issues is the perception issue. It's giving other parts of the world the impression that they need to do something similar, and again it's a culture of fragmentation even though on a practical basis it may not have that affect. It's all about the optics. And I'll stop there. Thank you very much.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, good. Thank you very much. We'll stay in contact with regards to that. We will discuss it internally as well. Thank you also, Adiel. We have another VP from ICANN here available. So we have had in the past with

you and with Göran together specific talks two times, two rounds talking about goal number three of personal goal of Göran.

And in course of that [inaudible] discuss how to deal with that and how to come closer to each other in the understanding what could be done here. So we came to the conclusion to invite you as well at first again here. And this is an example what I put here in here to the agenda which was also discussed in our round. It's the question of new identifier technologies in a 5G environment and the impact on ICANN. And I will say then how could ISPs be involved, could help here, or could be of help. So that is the question behind all that.

Adiel, if you could in general [drive] that so it would be very helpful. Thank you, and the floor is yours.

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. And thank you to the ISPCP community for having me here. I will start—I raised my hand briefly when Chris was speaking—and just say that this kind of exchange actually matches very well with your own goal where ICANN position related to technical impact of legislation and emerging technology on ICANN bringing the ISPCP and the ISP in the loop is important so that you can really help relay item position and risks that we are seeing.

And on the DNS for EU thing a resolver, regional resolver, local resolver thing, I think the most important is for ISPs to be part of the communication, be part of the process and make sure that they explain some of the stuff that we are seeing from ICANN to regulator locally,

regionally so that they have the right picture, so that they have the right information before going into a policy or regulation side.

So back to the title of my presentation or what I want to talk about is about 5G and potential impacts on ICANN. I will rephrase that a little bit because, first of all and to be straight, there is no new identifier today that's available and tied to 5G that is threatening ICANN, per se, or that needs to be looked at. So we are not talking about something new that is coming up as identifier tied to 5G that is going to impact us in general.

But that being said, 5G is going to be a technology that may have impact in general on the Internet because we are using mobile more and more to access the Internet and 5G is a technology that is going to allow, I will say to move the communication and the interconnection to the edge even more that what we have seen today. So there may be an impact on the way things work.

And in January two years ago OCTO has done a study, in fact a very interesting study that I would really encourage all ISPs here to look at, that explores the different aspects that 5G can impact the Internet in general, looking specifically at ICANN's remit which is the DNS, but broader than that to look at the Internet in general. So I will touch on some of the aspects of that paper and give kind of a way of what we can do.

Starting precisely on ICANN's remit, what we look at in that paper is called 5G makes the DNS irrelevant or can it have impact on the way the DNS works today. And from everything that we have studied and looked

at the technology itself, there is no direct impact of 5G on the DNS per se.

The 5G what it's bringing mostly is twofold. The first is to provide access at the very, very low latency. We're talking about providing a service and application at latency below 5 milliseconds, for instance. And the question was, will the DNS be able to cope with such a low latency? Resolvers, will they be able to provide answers matching those small latency.

The second [inaudible] of 5G is network slicing and everything that comes with it. I will touch on that later. What we realize is that the latency aspect of the DNS is not architectural. It's not the architecture or the infrastructure that is going to handle the issue of latency there, but it is the optimization, the operational side. It's how you bring resolver, for instance, as close as possible to the edge so that the people who are using the resolver can benefit the last mile which 5G will offer to access the resolver and start the process of resolving.

But then behind they are going to use the normal Internet infrastructure for resolving and going through the resolution process. So if there is any problem of latency there, it's going to be solved by the way the DNS data is provided to those edge devices. So it is more about how different ISPs, different operators optimize their caches, for instance, or they optimize where they place their resolver.

So we don't see any fundamental change architecturally for the way the DNS works that 5G is going to involve, but we see a need for operators to make sure that they design their DNS operation in a way that it gets

closer so that it can benefit the low latency that 5G is going to bring on the table.

The second aspect which is where there is [inaudible] and we don't have enough data yet but needs attention from the ISP and the operator community in general is the network slicing part. The notion of providing a dedicated virtual environment for companies for services is not that new in the mobile environment. Since 2G it's something that is possible. An operator can do that, but they haven't done it that much. But 5G is improving the ability for operators to do that to create virtual environment not only for service but also for infrastructure dedicated using slicing their spectrum to provide dedicated service where quality of service will be another value, for instance. Where low latency will be a [inaudible] feature that they will offer and so on.

So the risk that we see there, and this is an implementation risk rather than the technology, is how possible is some operators or some service providers will use that ability to provide several layers or levels of service whereby if you pay more, you can have access to, let's say, a Netflix slice where you have low latency and high bandwidth but you will pay more for accessing that service, for instance.

So that may create a fragmentation in the way, move away the whole notion of net neutrality when it comes to providing service. And that is an issue not only for ICANN per se, but it's for the whole Internet community where you're talking about the global and unique Internet service that people can access.

But this is going to be driven mostly by business case to be driven mostly by the ability of some big operators to convince operators of the value of providing or using their spectrum to provide that kind of service that the costs that with the benefits of using part of their spectrum. So it's a business case that needs to be looked at, but if that really happens, it may have an impact on the global Internet as we know it today.

From other identifier perspective TCP/IP today has enough features, has evolved over the time and we are sure that it will also evolve to match any needs that an environment like that will have. There are some academic work in different corners to come up with non-IP that's fair and so on.

That may probably be used on infrastructure like that, but we believe that in most of the case they are going to be used in device-to-device connection in private environment with no global scope as TCP/IP has today. It will require some complex implementation at the edge, at device level. Which for those of you who are following IPv6 transition know how difficult it is to move from a protocol that is broadly used that is already well-established to something new. So that will create differently a case for the balance between the benefits—technical benefits, financial benefits—versus the costs.

So there is nothing that is emerging today that is going to be the solution or something that 5G will need for providing effective service to customers in general. But if anything even happened today, we don't

see this at the global level but really constrained within private usage, within a very dedicated application [inaudible].

So that's what I can say for now. And for the context of this group specifically the idea here is to take all those different points and look at how they are being implemented in your network by mobile operators that are engaging in the 5G deployment. And keeping in mind that those implementations are done in the way to preserve Internet [inaudible] today and does not pose particularly the risk of fragmentation that we all want to avoid at all costs.

I'll stop there and be happy to take any specific questions related to that, particularly within the remit of ICANN which is the DNS and [inaudible]. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah, thanks very much, Adiel, for this insight. And I do hope also this for our members is of interest here. And especially [inaudible] you pointed to the relevant issues here with low latency and the slicing part with regards to the implementation of 5G.

So question here is from our members is that if there is anything, somebody chime in, question, comment on that was what Adiel working on. So he put into the chat also a link to that document he was referring to.

I'm just wondering a little bit because in addition to that, Adiel, do you see other technical studies you have published already in scope with regards to that process under the coverage of Göran's goal number

three here. So where you would see any comment from our side specifically, is there something [inaudible]?

ADIEL AKPLOGAN:

Yeah, regularly we publish a document that may be used in the context of Göran's goal. And talking about new identifier, for instance, we have other studies that touch on this.

We have a study specifically on new IP that is kind of a follow-up of this 5G story digging down on new IP, what it is and what it's coming from and how viable it is in the long run. Does it pose any threat to the Internet in general? Which can also be something that can be discussed with this group.

There is also a study that we published on non-IP network which is, again, a further drill down into the identifier and the 5G area that we can discuss.

Beyond that there is also something that we have been talking about for a while which is the evolution of the DNS itself and how do we work more to incentivize ISP to, one, [inaudible] on validation at the resolver level to make sure that, yes, while we are pushing a TLD and a manager through a domain name owner to turn on a signing or to sign their zone we also have ISP that validates from DNSSEC side. That is a simple, straightforward thing that needs to be continued to be pushed [around] and that can be also useful for this goal.

And we will probably study in the next coming days other technology that may pose a risk to the Internet. The goal from that goal three is

mainly to make sure that the ISPCP and the ISPs in general are paying attention to what ICANN is saying about these emerging technologies and mostly look at how they can influence their implementation.

For me generally, the technology itself is not the problem. It's the implementation that is the problem. And as you know ICANN is neutral in general when it comes to the technology. Any technology has the chance to live on its own, to evolve, and to be adopted if there is a business case around it. The most important thing is how its implementation impacts the stability in general is what we pay more attention to and we would like those positions within ICANN to be properly relayed to a decisionmaker at ISP level.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thank you very much for that, Adiel. We'll stay in contact. We will also discuss further internally in the ISPCP. We have right now one minute left, so people have to leave to other meetings. I saw that. So it's really my personal, let me say, problem that I put so many items here to the agenda. We have to follow-up.

Last I am asking you whether you could do that the next time. I'm sorry about that to shift you to the next meeting which is in three weeks from here I think so.

LARS STEFFEN: That's absolutely fine. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Christian also already told us that he has to leave and he will update us in written form. So the other things I would like to ask people have a look to the public comment list. It's only one thing I think related to [inaudible] NCAP study and Christian took that with him. Other items may be more [mature] which are on the AOB to talk about the next time, but don't forget these things. [Brenda] was circulating the election timelines. Think about that. I will be behind that, that we have elections in time.

And with regards to the next ISPCP call, my suggestion is to have it on Monday, 4 [March]. That will be a little bit more than three weeks from now. I think that is [inaudible]. That is my suggestion. The same time as we have. I think it was 15:00 UTC, isn't it, Brenda?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes, that is correct. We do have a time change coming up. Do you want to keep it at 15:00 UTC?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: If there is no objection to that, I would like to keep it.

BRENDA BREWER: That sounds good to me. So April 4?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, so thank you very much. Thank you specifically our guests here, Adiel and Chris. And, yes, we will see or hear you in other rounds as well today and tomorrow. Thank you and have nice meetings going on. The meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]