MARRAKECH – GNSO - ISPCP Open Meeting
Wednesday, June 26, 2019 – 17:00 to 18:30 WET
ICANN65 | Marrakech, Morocco

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you very much. This is the ISPCP Constituency open meeting in Marrakech. Welcome, all, to this meeting and welcome also from abroad, those who are remotely participating. I don't intend, due to time limitation, to go around the table. But I would like to ask those who are remotely available whether they can hear us, and just say their names, that we can welcome them. Please go ahead.

ALBERT DANIELS: Albert Daniels, ICANN staff.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Next one? At the time being, seems to be the only one. I'm expecting that Tony Holmes is going to participate, to chime in that meeting. Unfortunately, he couldn't participate due to a medical treatment he had – successful – but he was not able to participate in person this time. Nevertheless, he will chime in to the meeting later on and then he can participate here. Ozan, please?

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.

OZAN SAHIN: Thanks, Wolf-Ulrich. If I may chime in on the remote line, we have Jahangir Hossain other than Albert Daniels. These are the two participants that we have at the moment.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Thank you very much and welcome to the meeting. So, let's briefly go through the agenda and the topics. Then we can dive into specific topics.

So, we'll have an exchange with Thomas about the EPDP. Some of you could follow already through the week here. Then, Joe Capatano from Chris Mondini's department shall join us talking about potential [inaudible] at ICANN 66.

We have a topic to discuss DNS over HTTP (DoH) which was already a high-interest topic at this ICANN meeting. As usual, we will [inaudible] from our side. Last, not least, universal acceptance will be covered as well. We have some not just minor points but some points to cover which are listed here. And AOBs, internal work.

Is everybody satisfied with this agenda or any comments with that? It's not the case. Thank you very much. Is there anything to disclose with regards to statements of interest? Any amendments? It's not the case. Thank you very much.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM **65**
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

So, before we dive in, let me just briefly come back to one point, one item, which I could participate in the week. That was on Monday morning. There was an outreach organized by ICANN and especially by Joe Catapano, an outreach for the business engagement from the area here. We were visiting a so-called startup hub here in Marrakech which was very interesting to see – people who have creative ideas, not originally from the IT sector but any kind of manufacturing or some things but which is then going to be conversed into electronic commerce and these things, and they come closer to the business we are doing and they presented them and it was really fruitful and very interesting.

So, I like these kinds of events. If you go to such kind of areas and regions and have them afterwards a direct contact to those people in order to make them aware of what we are doing and that we can have maybe more participation from this continent in the future. It was also attending the so-called African Strategy Summit. I think so. There was something here in the afternoon. There is also the time that ICANN is close to coming to them and closer to cooperate with them and all of that. There will be more participation offered in the future.

So, that's from my side, just to summarize. That is also we should have in mind when we talk about outreach and what we can do in the future. We will come back to that point later on.

So, nevertheless, thank you very much. Let's dive in directly into the nice EPDP item. Thomas is the right guy to guide us through what the status is, what could be. We should talk about the communication between us and also on the CSG level, communication, what could be important, and how we could do better in the future. Thank you. Thomas, please.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much. Fiona is also here, so we're going through these difficult times together. I'm going to give a little overview of where we are if that's okay with you, Fiona, then you can add to that. I should also note that [Suman] sent a note a couple of days back that his business needs his strong attention and involvement at the moment, so he's not able to follow EPDP things. I think that it maybe would good for our ISPCP leadership to reach out to [Suman], whether this is a temporary predicament that he's in, that he can still keep the position or whether he suggests that he wants to be replaced for his position. I didn't ask him about that, I just thanked him for this information, but I think it would be good for us to get clarity on that.

Having said that, I think we're finally making baby-step-like progress in the EPDP team. We've had a couple of calls so far. I was getting increasingly frustrated with the work of the team,

because it looked like we were not able to agree on a methodology for answering the chartering questions.

As you know, we are working on policy for a universal access model, or as we call it, universal access/disclosure model. In order for that to happen, we need to basically find ways to determine whether parties can be accredited, that can then issue queries towards a system of whatever shape or form, and then they get feedback – either a denial of their request or they would get non-public registration data returned.

There was the suggestion that our group would start with purposes for which disclosure is requested and look at the different purposes and take that as a starting point. Then, many in the EPDP team said, "You can't do it that way. We have to do it differently. We have to start with the requestors." Then, staff rewrote that paper and used the requestors as a starting point.

Then, again, the whole team – excluding Fiona and myself – said we couldn't possibly use that as a starting point, and at that point my blood started boiling, to put it mildly.

I said we have been silent on this point because we don't care where we start. We will follow the group's preferences in terms of approach, but now that we don't seem to be able to find agreement on that, let me suggest a way forward, and that is to forget about all the legal stuff. Let's just answer some simple

questions. Who is asking for the data? Why are they asking for the data? What data are they interested? And, what data can possibly be returned, on what legal basis?

Then, I suggested a use case, a very simple one, where a trademark owner wants to know who is behind a domain name that is infringing upon his or her trademark rights. It was quite interesting to see that after I submitted that proposal only half of the team wanted to chop my head off, instead of the entire team. Even after that, we had a very constructive dialogue during the first EPDP all-day meeting. It looks like we not only found a way that can serve as a role model for answering the questions that we need to answer, but this can also be used as a blueprint for other use cases.

One thing is for sure, and that is that we will not be able to conduct our work entirely without getting help from the European Commission or the European Data Protection Board because we are really entering uncharted territory with this.

But it looks like we're having a breakthrough. The group has found agreement on many aspects of this use case, and I'm hopeful that we're able to make progress on that.

Our group has been requested to provide early input. You might remember that at the beginning Phase One, we were also asked to provide early input. There were questionnaires that we sent to

the list. In terms of resources, we have not been able to make a suggestion for early input, but that's something you should expect to see on the mailing list. We will be a little bit behind the deadline, but we should try to get that through the door within the next … Unfortunately, you will only get relatively little time to take a look at the document, but I think we should put some of our wishes or some of our suggestions on the record so that they can be taken into account when we proceed with our work.

Just to let you know, so far only two groups, if I'm not mistaken, have submitted their early input. Some representatives have said that they don't really see the need for offering early input, as we're going to go through all these questions as we move on. So, we will provide feedback anyway. The reason why early input is sought is because that is in the PDP manual. It's a technical, administrative thing that ICANN has to do in order to invite particularly those stakeholders that are not represented in the EPDP or PDP team to be able to offer their views. So that's going to come your way.

I will close by saying I do think we have found a nice way to work more closely with our CSG colleagues. We have set up a back channel for the CSG representatives to be able to informally exchange views on the fly. And I guess this was too short notice to invite Fiona to the table, but I've been approached by BC and IPC folks after I submitted the use case. I sat together with them, and

we discussed the paper for an hour or so to get more aligned on it, and why there was some initial feedback suggesting that what I had suggested was too narrow to their liking. I think gradually were understanding why I suggested certain things, and I think we're able to bridge that gap.

It looks like we're as aligned as we can be, given the different starting points and positions that are being held in the CSG, but at least we have a very open communications channel that is frequently being used.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, Thomas, for that. I'll take a queue, so if people who would like to comment. It's Tony, I think. I can see the admin chat. Tony is first and we have [inaudible]. Are others to comment? Philippe, then, yeah. Tony, go first, please. And welcome here.

TONY HOLMES: Thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich. Can I just check everybody can hear me?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes.

TONY HOLMES: Okay. Thank you. Firstly, I'm sorry I can't be with you all this time, but I have followed as much of the ICANN meeting as I can. Thanks to Thomas for the update.

One of the things I wanted to mention, after I listened to the CSG open meeting that took place earlier today, was the remark from Janis about going forward and the fact that one of the things she wants to try is to form smaller groups to try and move things along. And I think that's fine.

But I think, from our perspective, as ISPs, we need to work closer with our other representatives from within the CSG. We can't expect Thomas and any other people to cover everything. We just can't be everywhere at once. So, I just wanted to make the point and request that we speak with the rest of the CSG [exec] and try and make sure that we spread ourselves across whatever groups are going to be formed by Janis and we ask those people to keep us up to date at the CSG level. Otherwise, I think our ability to contribute as we would want to, as a constituency, is probably going to come along later in the process and that might not give us quite the flexibility that we want.

I would ask you, Wolf-Ulrich, if we could maybe think about how we can coordinate [inaudible] people work closely with Thomas from the CSG to make sure we get a broad feedback of [inaudible]

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks for that, Tony. I might ask as well Thomas how the organizational work is to be seen. I remember in the phase one you had also sub-teams for some specific items. It was kind of sub-teams as usual in working groups. Is that the same direction as Janis is thinking about?

THOMAS RICKERT: Basically, what Janis is suggesting that for working on the individual use cases, we would have sub-teams that would do some drafting. Those would not be groups that take decisions. Decisions will be taken in the plenary PDP meetings. But those would be preparatory work.

Tony, I think you're making a very good point and if that's okay with our dear leadership, I would use our CSG [inaudible] to make sure that we have representation of the CSG in any of these sub-teams that might be forming.

TONY HOLMES: Thank you, Thomas.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, thank you. Christian, please.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Thank you. First of all, I wanted to say that I've been monitoring this EPDP closely. You guys have done a fantastic job. I do agree that there's been better CSG cohesion than I've seen before on this important issue. Overall, I'm pretty pleased with the progress that's been made within the group, particularly very recently.

One of the hardest parts seems to be dealing with ICANN Org itself and that was on display this morning during our call when it started out the way that I've seen other interactions start out with Goran maybe purposefully being … It's like trying to nail Jell-O to the wall. You can't get it to be held to anything specific. But after a little bit of getting a little bit too hotheaded with you and contradicting himself a couple of times, really did a good job of explaining how that was going to get resolved.

We started talking about this strawberry project and it sounds as though John Crain, who I like and I think operates in good faith, is going to help resolve some of these issues and I wanted to know whether you guys had a good strategy to engage and deal with this strawberry project.

THOMAS RICKERT: I understand this call is being recorded?

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

THOMAS RICKERT: Okay. Working with ICANN is a big pain. I want to make sure this is properly recorded. I think that one of the core issues that I think will become more and more often impediment for the group's work is that ICANN so far has refused to accept its role as a joint controller. We had suggested during the drafting of the EPDP phase one report some language in which an analysis is carried out as to why ICANN and the contracted parties are joint controllers.

ICANN has lobbied hard in order to get the language altered in our draft final report so that the word joint controller is not found there as a recommendation. That was reason enough for the European Commission in its comment on our phase one report to explicitly state that a joint controller situation is present. Yet, ICANN has not confirmed that they share this legal assessment by the European Commission who ultimately was the drafter and the entity that came up with the GDPR in the first place. So, who should know better if not them?

My question this morning, after consultation with CSG colleagues, to [Goran's] words whether ICANN is willing to

confirm this role and ICANN was evasive and denied to make a statement on that other than it would be strategically unwise to make a determination at this point. I think that it's strategically negligent, if not wrong, not to make a firm statement on that particular point.

My sense is that the European Commission is getting increasingly frustrated with the way ICANN is not being accountable and not willing to accept its role. Because that's basically one of the building blocks that we need to put in place in order to advance the UAA or UDM. So, I think that's going to be difficult.

So, working with ICANN is not always easy. I have to say that the work with the ICANN org liaisons is pleasant but not always satisfactory because they can only convey to us the information that they get themselves and ICANN's own compliance efforts are far from being sufficient. I will illustrate this with one example.

We've asked ICANN liaisons to provide us with GDPR-related documentation and legal opinions that they may have asked with external counsel. We got some information on that but when it came, for example, to the record of processing activities whether ICANN has one, we were pointed to a website that contains information and the title of the document is "Record of Processing Activities" or something comparable but it does not fulfill the criteria of what's in the GDPR. And you don't have to be

a lawyer to find one bullet point which says you have to say who is the controller. And ICANN just refuses to say that.

So, ICANN's own compliance is lacking some basic requirements of what GDPR requires you to do and I think that's unfortunate that ICANN, after all this time, have not upped its game in order to get its own dealings in compliance with the GDPR. So, I guess that's maybe a blunt honest answer to your question.

With respect to the strawberry project and how we think we can fit in, I think the straight answer is we don't know yet. All we know at the moment is that—

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Can you briefly explain what is [inaudible].

THOMAS RICKERT: Also, that is a little bit of second-guessing at this stage. You might remember that the board, Goran, have asked the Technical Study Group to come up with a technical approach to solve the non-public registration data disclosure and the strawberry team, as it's called, shall add some flesh to the bones and offer legal parts to the entire thing that needs to be ready at some point.

I think that it's good of ICANN to be forward-looking and to work in parallel on the feasibility of technical [solutions] that can help

the policy that we're developing to come to fruition or implement that. I'm a little bit skeptic that another group that liaises with European Commission that tries to do legal stuff might potentially do things that collide with what we're doing, either in terms of [inaudible] contradictory results.

So, I think these are things that we will have to ask tomorrow when the EPDP team convenes again. First of all, I want to listen to what the strawberry folks have to say with an open mind and I think that every help that we can get is much appreciated but we have to make sure that it is in line with what we're chartered with so that we don't confront let's say the European Commission with things that are premature to discuss in the light of the work progress in our group.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks, Thomas. Before I hand it over to Philippe, just to shed a little bit more pain on what you mentioned here, I already have seen this morning in the CSG meeting is I understood a kind of, well, Goran trying [inaudible] between the BC and us because he was coming up [inaudible] telling you what you mentioned right now is against what I heard from Steve DelBianco. These things we should really make clear that [inaudible] status of these kinds of elements is he's talking about and what is our meaning of that.

THOMAS RICKERT: If I may respond briefly, for those who haven't been there at the CWG meeting with Goran this morning, after Goran tried to use a divide-and-conquer strategy to get rid of me asking questions that he [does not like], Steve DelBianco took the microphone immediately and clarified that we're on the same page. So, we're aligned and I think that's good news.

Unfortunately, you guys have picked an EPDP representative who is outspoken and I think that Goran doesn't like that I put my finger in the wound of things that don't work too well in the ICANN environment.

I wear his dislike of what I'm saying as a badge of honor because I think that I'm up to something if it upsets them but I try to be – and I hope this can be confirmed by those who have been present this morning. I think I'm asking my questions in a respectful and kind way, in a constructive way. So, my criticism, if any, is not meant to be destructive but actually to help drive the process forward. And as you will have seen, I put in a lot of resources into this with my colleagues in order to help things come to fruition as quickly as possible.

THOMAS RICKERT: Thanks very much. Philippe, please.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. Just on this strawberry team thing. I just wanted clarification or some understanding from you, Thomas, as to how that's going to work. When that transpired during the GNSO working session on Sunday, I tried to seek clarification from staff as to whether that was indeed [inaudible] and how the work of that team might influence the work of the EPDP. I seemed to understand at that time that was the argument, that the EPDP would pursue all possible options. And again, without having dived into the details of what the EPDP does.

It seems that they would like to I believe pursue, investigate, that issue of having a uniform access model and levy some contractual constraints from the contracted parties.

I was trying to understand how that would impact the work of the EPDP. I'd like to understand how, in practice, but I guess from what you're saying, you don't know yet how in practice their input would be taken into account by the EPDP. It seems that if some of the options that you're pursuing were proved unnecessary, given the feedback they would receive from the DPAs. I don't think there's a point in spending any time or effort on those scenarios.

So, I'm wondering how, moving forward, their inputs will be taken into account by the EPDP. I think it's still open for debate from what you're saying.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks. I don't know whether Thomas can answer that or whether that is sorting out between the chairs of these groups and then how to cooperate and how that will fit. But if you have any opinion on that, please.

THOMAS RICKERT: I think that this feedback is most important, particularly for Fiona tomorrow because I have to leave early. I can, at best, participate remotely. But I think the point needs to be made that we have reservations in supporting any approaches or strategies that might conflict with what the EPDP team is doing.

I think that reaching out to the authorities is important. Getting legal certainty of whether what we're doing is something that finds their support is important. But we have to be realistic. I think we only have one shot. So, if the strawberry team, which I think the EPDP team is going to play some role in, if they go there and present the authorities with suggestions that are not fully thought-through, we might frustrate them and they might lose the opportunity of being invited for a second time.

So, our group was supporting a view whereby we work through one of those use cases, really elaborate that with the proper rationale and then take that as an interim result to the data protection agencies and/or the European Commission for

feedback. So I think we need to be wise in strategizing in how we best cooperate or liaise with those offices.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Just a follow-up, if I may. From that point of view, also possibly frame the sort of questions that strawberry team would ask to the DPAs or the EC. First, not to have overly high expectations from what they might get back, but also as you say, to make sure that we don't use that opportunity moving forward.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much. Is there anything to add, Fiona? Do you think it was covered, Fiona?

FIONA ASONGA: I think everything is covered except that we need to have the early input by the 8th of July. So, we need to see how we put it together [inaudible] rest of the group to get it.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: At the time being, there is no action needed here from this group. Okay. Thanks very much, Thomas and Fiona for that. Let's move to the next. Rudi, please.

EN

RUDI DANIEL: The strawberry project, is that linked to the universal access model?

THOMAS RICKERT: Yes, exactly. So, the Technical Study Group has produced some results and strawberry team shall put flesh to the bones as I think Goran put it literally, to help put the legal concept. Both is aimed at setting up a UAM.

RUDI DANIEL: Okay. It's just that there was a conversation I think it was yesterday with Goran and he seemed to have mentioned the fact that what he really wanted to do was to get the European commissioners to work on something that ICANN could not work on or provide some kind of solution that he was finding it difficult to work on in ICANN. But I didn't get much more than that.

THOMAS RICKERT: I think it's difficult for you to understand this because I think nobody really understands. The thing is that Goran, in the best interest of the contracted parties plus ICANN, is trying to find ways for the European Commission or the data protection authorities to confirm that if we do certain things, of which we don't know what they will be, there would be no liability risk for

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

the contracted parties. I find it difficult to imagine how this can be made work if you look at the language of the GDPR.

Well, I have an idea, but that's somewhat different from Goran's approach. I think Goran is trying to get some confirmation or is looking for guidance on how the contracted parties will not be responsible for any errors there might be with the UAM. But in my view, one of the few options, but the best option for us, is to have the EPDP team come up with the policy with rules on under what circumstances what data can be disclosed to whom. All the parameters for a UAM. And present that to the authorities as a code of conduct according to [Article 40] of the GDPR.

Codes of conduct under the GDPR have the beauty that, once approved by the authority, the entities following the rules of the code of conduct can't be held liable for what's in the code of conduct. And that helps stretching the boundaries of the GDPR slightly, and I guess that's the solution that we should be going for.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you very much, Thomas. If you can [inaudible] part right now. Before we go into the next part, I have to say ICANN kindly provided some water here behind you. It seems to me it's not enough for everybody. Bottled but there are some glasses in addition, so you can share, please. Please help yourselves.

Let's move to the next item which is about outreach. The reason why I put that on the agenda is we talked about a potential outreach event at ICANN 66 in Montreal. So, we have to find a way to decide about whether we should do that or not. And if we do that, then how? How to start [inaudible] related activities. Thank you, Thomas.

THOMAS RICKERT: I have a previous commitment. This is why I asked you to put me at the beginning of the agenda. Sorry.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Sure. So, that is what we are talking about. And after the discussion, we should really be aware of that and think about what we should do.

So, for this purpose, I have invited also Allan here from [inaudible]. He can introduce himself because he is Canadian. He knows the Canadian markets related to the ISPs. He can tell us something about the ISP market, about that was your reason why to look at the markets around in Canada and America, especially. Then, kindly, Christian will guide us through what is in the US market, what is available. That's one thing. Then we can discuss with I have Joe here from the Stakeholder Engagement from ICANN who are our counterparts, our most important

EN

counterparts in let me say finding a way how we can deal with that and how we can organize that.

So, let's first introduce Allan. This is a part which is [inaudible] later on from Christian. But Allan, just briefly, please [inaudible].

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. I'm Allan MacGillivary. I'm with CIRA, the dot-CA manager for Canada. In my previous life, I worked for a while in the telecom industry in Canada. So I know a little bit about the structure of the industry. I was chatting with Wolf and he said that maybe I could contribute to a discussion of whether and how you might have an outreach session. Now I see you have the US. Anyone who looks at the market structure from the perspective of Europe will find it very confusing. Canada's market structure most closely follows that of the US in that we never had a single provider actually providing residential service across the whole country. There was a series of regional monopolies, mostly were never government. So I think we're one of the few countries in the world where we never got our phone service from the government, much like the US as well. That's where the parallels are.

Then, what is happening in Canada which is maybe a little different is actually cable providers, like in Canada like Roger Shaw, Video [inaudible]. They actually have a larger share of the

residential Internet market than the incumbent telco provider. As a consequence, they both have a real lock on the market. They have about, depending on how you measure it, by subscribers, by revenues, whatever, they have … Actually, the independent providers have under 15% of the market nationally.

for that reason, I believe, there is no ISP association as such. So, the large providers do their own thing. The small providers, [inaudible] are quite small, they do have an association but it deals mainly with making submissions to the telecom regulator. That's their main focus in life is to get those cost of inter-connection and resale of incumbent networks down. So, it's a hard industry to go, "Hey, who should I talk to?"

So, maybe I'll stop there. I asked our guys back home if any of the telcos are registrars and, actually, our largest telco is. We didn't do a big search but I actually was surprised at that. I can understand them doing it but they're not very active in the market. I'm sure they do it just as a convenience for their large enterprise customers

So, I'm going to stop there and maybe respond to questions.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much, Allan. I think it's helpful. But just to shed a light on that, what we are going to expect there and can expect there

from the market, maybe you can complete the picture from your side, Christian, because I think Montreal, the ICANN meeting should attract as well the US side. Then we can discuss that.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: I think that's true and I'm interested, Allan, in you hearing … After I give a few facts and figures. I think that our markets are very similar. You have the CRTC regulating yours. We have the FTC regulating ours. FCC, sorry. It was the T on his. FCC regulating ours. It's a fairly similar market.

The first thing I got here is basically how I'm defining ISP. I will talk to you at the end about how ISPs see themselves different. How I'm defining ISPs as I'm [inaudible] through these are carrier and Internet backbone services, dial-up Internet access, residential broadband services, business broadband services. There's just four slides if you want to advance to the next one.

Basically, we're talking about $115 billion industry. Within those categories that I gave before, there are over 12,000 businesses that are growing rapidly. So, that's the good news is that there's a lot of revenue and actually a lot of businesses in the ISP market, way more than you think. But … Here's the next slide.

Ultimately, about 78% of the market is taken up by five companies – Comcast, Charter, AT&T, Verizon, and CenturyLink.

So, 81.65 of that $115 billion is taken up by five companies leaving – here's the last slide – about 12,421 companies to operate under the last $38.35 billion.

Now, if you go back to – you don't have to go back to the first slide but let me just give you some general perspective here. Most of the people who provide services in that remaining 12,000 companies that fall into one of those categories, they don't think of themselves as ISPs. In fact, those five major companies that make up 70% of the market don't really tend to think of themselves as ISPs either. They're distributing content companies.

So, there is a big market there. You're looking at $85 billion of revenue and potentially 12,000 businesses that you target to join the ISPCP which is a lot. Until you realize that if you were in a room with all those companies and you asked them to raise their hand and say, "Are you an ISP?" very few of them would raise their hands. That's what we're faced with.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Any questions for understanding for contribution please? First, Fiona, then Jen please.

FIONA ASONGA: Christian, you'll excuse my naivety when I ask you to then tell us what do they call themselves. Where do they think that they fall?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: So, you're looking at, for instance, there are companies that see themselves as wireless telecommunications companies. That's a big one. But they don't use the terminology ISP. Wireless telecommunications. A lot of these people are simply trading broadband services in Internet exchange points. I mean, you guys both operate in exchange points within the United States, so all of your customers are listed in that document but I'm not sure how many of your customers, [inaudible] would consider themselves ISPs by name.

ALLAN MACGILLIVRAY: I would just respond that in Canada it's almost the same. They would identify as media companies. For example, the largest … They're delivering an over-the-top service themselves. They own the largest national newspaper in the country. They own the largest private television network in the country. So, just to Christian's point, they don't see themselves as ISPs. And this is all spin that they want the stock market to believe they are, so they don't represent themselves as something … There isn't a lot of margin in the business. I'm sure you guys know that.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Jen and then Malcolm and then Lars.

JENN TAYLOR-HODGES: I guess a couple of things. First, I think on how you think of yourself, that's definitely a barrier in some ways, but in another way … I mean, [inaudible] I don't think we call ourselves a traditional tele-communications company anymore. We provide content. We do a lot of other things, too. As companies join who are in that space, I think they do have a question about which way they go. We recently [inaudible] had CenturyLink join. Probably one of the few that if they hadn't would be a viable candidate. But I think every company who is in this space might have some sort of question.

I think one of the bigger barriers might just be, as you said, it seems like there are a lot of viable options, but I think, for instance, I'm based in DC and we're part of Incompas which is a competitive telecom association with companies who would think of themselves as telcos I suppose. But none of them have the capacity to cover this sort of issue which I guess is always the question, but I think finding people who would be able to actually look internationally who operate internationally or have the capacity to follow this would probably be an even bigger challenge. I hadn't thought through this before, so this is just off

the top of my head. But that's sort of what … I think that those names that you put up there, the obvious people, are probably already in – not knowing anything about the Canadian market.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks. Malcolm and then Lars.

MALCOLM: Thank you. As Christian said, [inaudible] is an association with a broad membership. We come across this sort of thing. We wouldn't be, frankly, too precious about labeling: what do you self-regard as? The question is more: are you relevant to the question on the table? There are two areas of that. [inaudible] Internet exchange. So, one of the questions is: are you a network that wishes to pass content across our Internet exchange platform? In which case, great. The other one is, in terms of our regulatory advocacy work that we do, it's really would you be – I mean, you're only entitled if you join [links] and do pass the traffics of [inaudible]. But if you are engaging with that work from the perspective of that portion of your business which engages in Internet access and content delivery services, then you're part of it. If you are engaging with that work …

Now, many of these companies, as you said, the big ones, big conglomerates with, frankly, large areas of business that are

quite different from access services or transit services or such things. But also big parts of their businesses that are part of that.

Likewise, actually, with the very smallest companies. Very often, they do many other things as well. They do consultancy as a big part of what they do and actually possibly even the main thing for which the access and associated services are simply part of the overall solution that is being provided. And it's very much a service-based business.

The question is how are they approaching issues on which we've come together? How would they be approaching here if they came here, the issues on which we've come together? If they would approach it, largely from the point of view of [inaudible] well-represented elsewhere in the ICANN space? Like, for example, the IPC. Then that would tend to be divergent and to dilute our voice for this perspective within the community. But if they would tend to approach it, engage with these issues from the perspective that are common to all of us, then I would think they would be a constructive and useful addition to this community.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. Before we go on to that, that is really our goal, to have in mind there what can we [inaudible] from all of this information we have gotten right now. Is your contribution to that, complementing that? [inaudible] first, Christian, and then maybe

[inaudible] can also [inaudible] with something, so from the stakeholder engagement and your knowledge of the American market because Christian is the one who is leading or he's in charge of the American market there. Then we try to focus on what we can draw from it.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: So, I just wanted to say that, Malcolm, I agree with everything that you said. The question, when we are posed with the question of whether we should put time and resources into building an event in Montreal comes down to whether we can succinctly make the case to the right people to draw out the right people to join us.

To that, I'm actually going to go back to Jen and say do you think we could get somebody like Chip Pickering to come and promote what it is we're doing?

JENN TAYLOR-HODGES: Well, on one hand, yes. I mean, Chip is an amazing figure and he is always willing to do these sorts of things and he has operated … I worked with him a little bit before on some international trade-focused issues. But I guess the question there is it may come back to Incompas, his association, [inaudible] that road in terms of scope. So I don't think that he would be doing it as … Someone like him would be doing it as representing that

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

association. I think that's just what we're going to run into is finding people … Which is not to say we shouldn't do it at all but we would have to think interestingly and really provide I think the case for why ISPs who are focused more domestically at the moment who aren't resourced should try to resource more. I'll have to think about it more. He's obviously … You'll hear about the 1990s Telecommunications Act at length, though.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Thanks, Jen. Thank you very much. Joe, is there anything from your side, please?

JOE CATAPANO: Yes. I don't know if I have anymore than what Christian presented here. I thought that was pretty comprehensive. I think I'm more interested in hearing from you guys rather than having me try and dictate something. But it would be good to get a feel for what your goals are for an event. If you're to do one, what you want to accomplish and start from there because that kind of dictates the form and the likeness of the particular engagement.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much, Joe. That's a very fair question. This is one of the major items we should think about. What is [your] target? One of the first major targets is to raise awareness about the ISPs, the

ISP business related to ICANN, and also to attract people, to contribute actively then in the end [inaudible] which is hard work to do. This is what we have in mind.

So, the question here, then, can we find companies there or representatives of companies who have such an interest from an ISP point of view in that business but they may stay and follow ICANN meetings later on, not just [inaudible] to North America but also in other environments. And how can we attract them? This is a major point. Is that something you would like to … Jen? I thought you wanted to chime in. No? I'm sorry. Christian, is there an answer to that? You know both sides.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: There's an extent to which … I think that what we ought to do is talk to a few people that we know in the market, like Jen can talk to Chip. We could call up people from [inaudible] and TELUS and see if we ought to maybe just take them out to dinner instead and ask them to join us. It's such a small group of big guys that we might be able to do more targeted stuff than throwing another big party.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Any other? Please?

ICANN POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

FIONA ASONGA: I would support Christian's approach of having a few small people, key people – small group – and we have a dinner or something like that because then we can have some good conversation. And coming from a region where we would like to [inaudible] – we don't have to invent things all over again. Intrigued by the larger [inaudible] who has a media company, newspaper, all that. That's a curious one. I would also like to understand a bit more about how then they engage with the regulator, different regulators, and that kind of approach. Because there are some similar coming close to that in our region. It's just the regulations that hamper them getting to that level. So, for me to be objective, for being able to engage in that would be to learn. Thanks.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks. This isn't a question. From this point of view, it would be really better to focus on specific [inaudible] in the background or [inaudible] too. So, the question is then how to do that. It seems to be a smaller event, like dinner or else, to do that [inaudible]. The question is here of the financing of these things. Do we have then to dive into the question of how we can organize it, and maybe can we get support from ICANN in these kinds of formats, for example, to do so? I understand in the greater environment where it's going to public outside, then ICANN may be able

[inaudible] where they helped us a lot in the past. I'm asking you, Joe, to what extent an ICANN support could be done?

JOE CATAPANO: So I can't give you a number. For sure, I can't do that. I think after this meeting, to bring Chris in on this to help with that aspect of it, too. I note that we are constrained with budget, so we've got to keep that in mind. It's always good if you can find a sponsor to help out to fray some of that cost and then we might be able to come in and help things along as well.

Going back to what you guys were talking about earlier, I do like the idea of small, targeted outreach. I think that's better than a scatter-shot thing, especially if, what Allen was saying, they don't consider themselves ISPs, so it's really … It might be—

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. [inaudible] talk about sponsors [inaudible], just looking at ICANN [inaudible] because if I look around, every time the same thing. If you have a specific company as a sponsor, they would like to be seen as a sponsor which is to be understood. I'm wondering, it wouldn't be a kind of company-related event or invitation to that [inaudible] more an open one. So, we should discuss that. We should take that.

What I suggest here is that maybe we together, Christian and Jen, together you could just summarize, hand it over to Chris [inaudible] after you have the first idea of who could that be for that. Then we try to manage that.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: Ultimately, I think what Jen and I could do relatively quickly, in like a half-an-hour call, is come up with a list of 20 top targets of associations and companies in the North America region and we just send you the list of the companies and say, "Hey, these are the people we want to target for membership. Let's talk about how we can do that." But it's not going to be 200. It's going to be like 20, if that.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: But you could help us to more focus, to have a guess who could be really closer to us, to say that who could be easier attracted than others from the 30 membership lists. That would be helpful, I think. Just to concentrate on that. Just think about that. Then it's easier to talk with ICANN about that. Anything else to add? Thank you, Allan, for being here. Thank you very much, Joe, also for participating. Very helpful. Thank you. So, let's move to the next item we have left, only half-an-hour I think so almost. But hopefully we have some shorter items. The next one is DNS over HTTP (DoH).

ALBERT DANIELS: Could I ask a quick question before you move on?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: We have a remote question, please.

ALBERT DANIELS: Yes. Well, first of all, this is Albert Daniels from ICANN staff. I work with GSE covering the 32 territories in the Caribbean and I'm happy to have Rudi Daniels from the Caribbean who is at the meeting right now. Unfortunately, I am in the Caribbean now in Saint Lucia and I had to be up from 3:00 AM to follow this meeting.

But I wanted to bring to the attention of the ISPCP an opportunity for outreach where ICANN can support the efforts of the ISPCP. There is an industry association for ISPs called CANTO, the Caribbean Association for National Telecommunications Operators, and they're having their 35th conference and exhibition in July from the 20th of July, and I think we need one or two good contacts within the administration of the ISPCP who I can have some exchanges with to get a good message that I can take from the ISPCP to give to those 350 attendees at the CANTO meeting, because ICANN has a very good relationship with CANTO and they give us speaking slots where we have the opportunity to make presentations on different things.

So, if I get a specific message from the ISPCP, I can actually take that to CANTO and possibly do some outreach on behalf of the ISPCP. So, I just need one or two good contacts that I can have some email exchanges with within the ISPCP. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you very much, Albert, for that contribution. It's very helpful because we are looking for those kinds of events, how we can help, though we're just starting to discuss it. Rudi, please go ahead.

RUDI DANIELS: I'm kind of aware of half aware that CANTO who has joined the ISPCP, the last time I interacted with them—

ALBERT DANIELS: Yes, that is correct. CANTO has joined the ISPCP, but clearly, for example, on this occasion there is no CANTO representative as far as I'm aware at the meeting. So, since I do engagement at CANTO events, what I can do is I can take information from ISPCP to the CANTO grouping through the CANTO organization, and in that way, extend the outreach arms of the ISPCP to other ISPs in the Caribbean.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay, very helpful from your side. Rudi again.

RUDI DANIEL: Albert, although CalaHub, who I represent on the ISPCP is actually not currently a member of CANTO, but if you require any assistance from that as a bridge, I am happy to assist.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you. My question is, to fully understand, because the CANTO meeting is very close – it's three weeks from now. So, you don't need funding for that or you don't need anybody you know coming personally there or to be sent there. Is it helpful to feed you with material which you can use there? What kind of ideas do you have, please?

ALBERT DANIELS: Yeah. So, this is what I'm looking for. I will be attending the meeting from an ICANN perspective because ICANN actually participates on one of their working groups. So, I will be going. So, it would be very useful if you can feed me with materials and messaging which would give the kind of representation of the ISPCP that would make it interesting for some of the ISPs that are attending the CANTO meeting to consider becoming members of the ISPCP.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much. Well-understood. So, we are doing that in our locations as well. Our members are participating in [inaudible] meetings in other circumstances. So, we will find ways with how to feed you with material, [inaudible] presentation. That will help you and it will help us as well. So, thank you very much for that. Phillip, please.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Thank you. If you need a small team for that, I would be happy to help as well. We've got operations in the Caribbean as well.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Thanks for that.

ALBERT DANIELS: Okay. So, who should I drop an email to with my contact details, my email address, albert.daniels@icann.org

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Please, Albert, send it to me and also to the secretariat, to Chantelle.

ALBERT DANIELS: Yes. Okay, I'll do so. I have another meeting here. It's actually 1:08 PM in Saint Lucia. So, a little bit later on I'll have to drop off the call. So, apologies for having to drop off early, but thank you for the communication.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yeah. And thank you very much for participating. Thank you. Now, let's dive into the next item, DNS over HTTP. Just to spread some information about what's going on in that field and maybe we can talk about and discuss [inaudible] input or contribution. [inaudible], please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you. We are already heavily over time. This is why I would like to ask: do you want to go through all the slides or do we want to say nearly everybody in the room attended the session yesterday and knows about the basics of the issue and we just jump to the questions of what is relevant for the ISPCP?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: I see nodding for what you have said, so that might be helpful. If you could just summarize.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think it would save some time. Okay. So, this is just the background. I apologize for the misspelling of the title. This is the origin of DoH in the IETF and the DoH Working Group. You've got the link to the currently proposed standard 8484. Next slide, please.

So, it is about the encrypted transmission of DNS queries, so the connection to the resolver will be about HTTPS and this technology can be used by any HTTPS [inaudible] application which means that if you use this, it will bypass the operating system and its settings and [inaudible] on the other hand upgrade DNS and web service. Next slide, please.

This is what we've seen yesterday in the high-interest talk session. I think this illustrates the change of what's going on. This slide also includes DoT which we don't discuss here. You see that previously every DNS carrier was sent from the application to the operating system through [inaudible] to the recursive resolver and to where it should end and totally unencrypted. And at the DoH description, you see that here's the example taken by the browser but every application that's used in DNS can use this technology, that the resolution of the DNS is not taking place any more on the [OS] level or at the network level but on the application level and that it goes past through the recursive resolver. Next slide, please.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

So, what will change if you use DoH is that the connection is encrypted and it's hidden inside the web traffic, that each application can use a different resolver because you don't have the central resolver on your [inaudible] level anymore, which also turns application-makers in the position that they gain control about the resolver choice. So, as we've seen yesterday, that you can have a selection of resolvers that you can choose from, but the application maker will also have the opportunity to hardwire just one resolver by his choice. Next slide, please.

So, these are just some points of discussion from here. As you can see, I tried to keep it quite neutral. Christian knows why. Because both of our associations, of course, have been approached by our members. But we should pick up this topic and also discuss this and I can give you some insights on this. [Echo], for example, we've got a quite broad membership. Yes, we have a lot of ISPs, but we also have, on the other hand, registries, registrars, security companies among our membership. So, when we kicked off this discussion within our membership, we received a very broad bandwidth of feedback from people who are clearly against the implementation of DoH in the way that it's being discussed right now. On the other hand, companies and members who are quite in favor of this because they say you can't blame the protocol. It's a discussion about how it's being implemented and used.

So, we are now in the ISPCP and there are a few points of discussion that I would like to suggest to go through. When it comes to routing and handling of DNS traffic, the most common issue that's discussed and that was also discussed yesterday is there's a potential of consolidation and concentration of traffic among a limited number of players in the market. There are people who they say this is a serious issue and there are people that say it's not, because when you take a look at the consolidation of DNS traffic, DoH is a piece of the puzzle that contributes to this direction, but it's not the key driver, so that you will see a consolidation of DNS traffic anyway. One recurring example in the discussions that I had in the previous weeks and months, one example was Malaysia. Nearly every ISP in Malaysia is redirecting its traffic directly to Google. So, from this point of view, I was taught that DoH, yes, is a piece of the puzzle that is driving this direction of travel but it's not that technology that is the key driver of this development.

I'm really interested in having feedback and points on this from everybody in the room.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: I'll take a queue. It's Jen. Anybody else? Philippe? Jen, go ahead.

JENN TAYLOR-HODGES: Yeah. I don't know if everyone saw, but I shared a presentation that some of our technical folks in London had put together which I won't go through because I know it explains it far better than I ever could.

But, as an ISP, it is a major issue of concern for us. We do understand that there is some benefit – anything that improves security and privacy for our customers is good, but major issues for us around parental controls. If customers have to do content filtering on sort of a per-device or per-app basis, court orders or regulatory blocking. In talking to the UK government, the way that the UK government does some of these things, including parental controls. There have been major jurisdictional issues we could see with having to address a collection of third-party providers and so on. And security. There are pluses, but there are concerns I think, unless implementation is thought through really well in terms of how that's handled and what as an ISP we have sight of. So, my colleagues in London have been doing a number of presentations around various fora on this.

One other question I just want to throw out there, sort of on the same topic but a slightly different take, is just how we address this within ICANN. I think that's one thing that we will need to think about. I think raising the profile, because it's a key issue for ISPs and it makes sense for us I think to be in the lead as the ISPCP on raising awareness and where this lands, but is this an issue for

ICANN? I think beyond raising awareness, my initial take would be no, that this isn't the right place. So, how this moves ahead. It was a question posed to the panel yesterday. I think that there were some open questions. So, that's something that we're going to have to keep track of as well I think going forward.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Jen. Then we have Philippe, and after that, Tony remotely.

PHILIPPE FOUQUART: Yes. Very much along the lines of what Jen has said, what I would add to that is that you need to do it [inaudible] to what ICANN can do. People might disagree as to whether that has a policy implementation in terms of whether those big plays could, moving forward, decide that a new TLD [inaudible] approval of ICANN would be a good thing to develop. Arguably, that's certainly something that's at least technically feasible.

What I'd like to add – and my takeaway from yesterday's session – and your question is whether that's decisive or not. I think, to some extent, it is. It's true that there's a global trend and the fact that you could choose a public DNS today. DoH has nothing to do with that.

The difference I think is that the way it's going to be used by the browsers I think … Warren Kumari yesterday mentioned that DNS would be configured in [crow] in such a way that DoH would be mandatory. If the ISP DNS were not to support DoH, then obviously there would be an option to use [quad 8]. So, in that respect, it is decisive. It's contrary to a geek configuring a browser to use a public DNS. If you have, when you install the browser, that option and if your ISP were not to support DoH, then you would by default move to the public DNS.

So, that was to your question. I think there's a difference there, although from a technical standpoint, I agree. It's just part of the puzzle. On the policy side, it is quite important.

The other thing which I found was interesting, I think it was an observation by Fred Baker, on the relationship between that configuration and the fact that [quad 8] is rooted, or the other, [quad 1] is rooted on the IP level.

I think that, and I would assume that, if you were to go back to our national regulatory authority, for instance, saying, "Look, we've got that new technology and we're no longer in a position to meet our obligations with regard to parental control, etc., filtering," because now we have that public resolver – for example, [quad 8] [inaudible]. I know what the answer will be. You just [borrow] the IP address.

EN

So, that's not an impact on DNS level, within an IP level, and that's certainly not a good thing. That's where the two levels would interplay. I found that interesting.

Just an addon to what we said. I think it was mentioned above birds of feather at the next IETF [inaudible] I've scheduled, I forget, Thursday I think for the meeting. There's an initiative [inaudible] on the topic as well in the US. It's framed I think on both aspects, on the fact that it's an opportunity for those people to shift the resolver from the ISP 2 to the public resolver. But also on the fact that moving forward it's likely that the ISPs would have to support DoH on their network. And that's also how they frame the problem, in making sure that the technology is there for the ISPs to implement. I'll just stop here.

That was my takeaway from the session which I think was very relevant. As to whether ICANN has a role in this, I think nobody knows yet and it will depend on how, as you said, it will be implemented. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Thank you for that. Now it's Tony. Tony, please go ahead.

TONY HOLMES: Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich. I'd just like to add a little bit on the points made by both Jen and Philippe, because it's quite clear that there

are many implications from this initiative. Certainly when we get to implementation, there are going to be many policy issues around this. And not all of those policy implications will directly impact ICANN.

So, I think there are really two key elements for us to think about [inaudible] constituency. The first is that we definitely need to try and leave some of the thinking that looks at what is ICANN's core mission how implications from DoH actually have an impact on ICANN's core mission because it should be around those impacts that any decisions within ICANN, any policy changes, any policy development, should be [inaudible]. I think that's something that we certainly need to do. It's early days at the moment. But I think it really is an area where we need to lead as a constituency.

The other point is really related to some of the broader aspects and it's quite clear that there are serious implications for all ISPs across the globe. We're fortunate in ICANN that we now have a membership that's pretty much spread across the globe as well.

So, I think it's helpful for us to develop our thinking and make sure that we help our members keep aware of the developments. We're lucky that we have people like Philippe who are involved in some of the debates going on in other forums such as the IETF where the standards are being developed.

But keeping everybody up to date I think will help them, because at some stage, there's going to be a discussion at the national level right across the globe on this and I think it would be helpful to all of our members if we make sure that we are [inaudible] their awareness of this issue.

So, I think there are two things. One is what's going to happen in ICANN in terms of how this impacts ICANN and that we need to engage in. But I would urge us also to try and keep this on the agenda and help our members keep up to speed with some of the developments that are probably going to occur across the next 12 months or so. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much, Tony. I'm looking to Lars. His input also is very helpful. I think so. And I think for the future for us here. So we should keep that in mind and maybe from time to time we bring it up as the development goes further on this item. The question you raised, the core question is, well, that it's fit to or it is related to ICANN's core mission should also accompany us in our discussions in the future. Christian? No? I'm sorry.

So, we leave it with that. Maybe then we will follow-up over time. I know that [Echo] is working on a paper for the association on that. I'm sure Lars keeps us updated what's going on there and

that's it also from the others is that we can have an exchange platform here within our group on that item. Lars?

LARS: Yes. Also, yesterday I indicated in the session was – and this is what we are currently working on. For each item that you can see on the slide – and there are several items which are maybe left – you find a lot of pros and cons, and we are currently working on putting those pros and cons together from the different stakeholders and the different points of views on each of the items. We tried to put them together as good as we can. As soon as we are ready with that, I will let the ISPCP know and circulate it. Yes.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thanks very much. So, looking to the agenda and to our time being available, we have just four minutes left. I suggest that we keep the next two items which is council update. There was nothing critical from the council while the work is going on. The [inaudible] shall keep us updated in the future as it happens here.

The next one, [inaudible] is not here in the room. Universal acceptance. He, as a leader of that group, should have given the

opportunity to say some words but I don't think it's critical at the time being as well.

Let's talk some last minutes about the items under AOB. The first one is continuation on charter work. As we had in the past, several times we talked about that. We would like to move that forward. I personally had an exchange with Malcolm and with Tony as well. We have an important part to contribute here for that charter because several other people are waiting for it to be triggered and then to [inaudible]. I understood that it's very easy for you to get together In London, even in [inaudible].

LARS: My copious free time, I believe, [inaudible].

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Even in the [inaudible] where the [inaudible] is going to get down, I heard, when you talk about Brexit and these things. So, that would be helpful if [inaudible] right now. Maybe [inaudible] the chat and we can move that forward. Anything more for that?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Simply that I want to make sure that we get this … We've gotten to the point where we've got the meat of the new or revised charter framed up. But I don't want to move past this very

important first section that outlines who we are and why we're doing this because the rest of the document should flow from that. So, that's sort of why we're stopping here, to make sure that we get this part right. At that point, I think we're going to make quick progress [through the rest].

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes, Tony, please go ahead.

TONY HOLMES: Yes. Thank you. Just a quick question whilst we are in contact. If I could confirm that Malcolm is available early part of next week, then I'll look to make contact with him there. But maybe Malcolm could just give me an idea if that's an option.

MALCOLM: How about Friday next week?

TONY HOLMES: No, it would have to be Monday, Tuesday, or Wednesday.

MALCOLM: [inaudible] do this between ourselves.

TONY HOLMES: We can arrange a time, even if we chat by phone.

MALCOLM: Certainly. Okay.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: It's recorded. Thank you.

TONY HOLMES: Okay, thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: So, next part is officer elections. We had this term of five of the elections here and I would hand over Tony shortly.

TONY HOLMES: Okay, thank you very much, Wolf-Ulrich, for that. I think everyone is aware that we went through the nomination period for a number of positions and they were for the chair, for the vice chair, for the executive committee, NomCom, and GNSO Council.

I would like to congratulate the people who were nominated, and also I think we're very, very lucky that we [inaudible] I believe have to go through anymore of the voting process, because for each of those positions, we had one person nominated and

seconded, and I think out of that, we've got a very good group of people to fill those roles.

So, just to run through the situation as it is now, [inaudible] Wolf-Ulrich nominated for a second term as the chairman of the ISPCP. Also, we'd like to see Jenn Taylor and seconded for the vice chair position. The same for Christian Dawson on the Executive Committee. For Marie as our representative on the NomCom. I'm sure she'll [inaudible] taking over from [Alain]. And to carry on with some experience on GNSO Council [inaudible] that position as well.

So, with those candidates, I would certainly urge that, as a constituency, we move forward without having to go through the process of voting as there's only person for each position, and that by acclimation that, as a constituency, we support all of those going forward in picking up their seats. They will take their seats either during or at the end of ICANN 66. I think we've got a great deal of strength within the constituency. And congratulations to every one of those people. I think all of them will do an excellent job. Thank you, Wolf-Ulrich.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you very much for that, Tony. I understand the [inaudible] is over, so the people are elected. Thank you. Thank for standing

for these positions. So, you will take your work up from that, from the end of the AGM in this year as well. So, it's great.

We move over to the … Is there something to be said about the CROP program? Not yet.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'll just make one comment about CROP and that is that we are at the end of this mission process for the next round of CROP approvals. We left three events on the table last year that we could have taken. So, if you have outreach opportunities that you want to take where you can go and speak about the ISPCP at some conference that's in your region, let me know, because we didn't use everything that we could have used last time.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Thank you very much. We will go on with that. Travel support, we can decide about more of that after the meeting. We have to put names forward for the ICANN 66 meeting until the 4th of July.

At the very last end, for the next membership meeting, we send a Doodle out to the membership, having next meeting within after four weeks again.

The very last point is that I have to disclose that [Alain] is today with us, but I think officially it's his last meeting, the last public meeting we have with him here since his membership as NomCom appointee will also come to an end with the next AGM. But I am sad to say you may not be participating next time with us. Personally, I would like to thank you, [Alain], for all the years. You have been already here when I came into ICANN work. You helped me as well. And I am already since 2007 here. You helped me as well as also the other members who were there to understand what's going on here and how to dive into the work here. You took a lot of work. You were sometimes, several times, NomCom member. You participated, contributing, in the numbering sector, in the IANA sector as well, and you were – every time you could be reached in terms of when we had some questions related specifically also to technical aspects of the DNS work here.

So, for me personally, thank you very much for that. We don't, as you know, as we do not have a fund here, so we do not have a gift as well to you. But the only gift we can do for you is we just gathered together and we have a nice picture. I do hope you have your camera. We can use your camera, so we have to find the best camera in the room right now to do that. Let's do it that way. Is there any further comment to that?

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: I just wanted to quickly say Tony asked that we make a proclamation. Should we do that before we close the meeting?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Yes, please.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: He asked that we make a proclamation not to hold the elections. Don't you need to basically call for that to happen?

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: So, proclamation you mean for the results of the actions?

TONY HOLMES: Christian is totally correct on that. I think this is something we should do during this meeting. So, thank you very much, Christian, for picking this up.

CHRISTIAN DAWSON: I think you just need to say, "Is Tony's motion carried?" And then we say aye and nae and then we're done with it.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Please. I am sorry about that. I didn't ask you about it because I was thinking in a straight way. But, okay, let's formally follow the

rules of that and come back to the motion of Tony with regards to the election, whether it's accepted or not. So, please, all of you who are confirming that motion say "aye" please. If there is somebody refraining from the vote … Nothing? Nobody. Any noes? Nothing. So, it's accepted. Thank you very much for that, Tony.

What I would like to do is officially hand it over, send a message to the secretariat or to Chantelle confirming that. Then she will help us to fit it into the right line here in ICANN.

TONY HOLMES: Just if I may. The fact that you are one of the very successful people elected, then probably as vice chair I should pass that message to Chantelle which I'll be very happy to do.

May I also add at this stage as well my thanks to [inaudible]. I think his involvement as [inaudible] constituency has been [inaudible] across many years. So, best wishes to you. Thank you.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Thank you, Tony. Just thinking about how we put you to the picture remotely. The photo which we are just taking, just think about.

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 65
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019

TONY HOLMES: I'm sure [Alain] can fix that.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, all, for participating. The meeting is adjourned and we take a picture. Thank you.

TONY HOLMES: Thank you, everyone. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]

ICANN
POLICY FORUM **65**
MARRAKECH
24–27 June 2019