

ISPCP Meeting Notes – Marrakech, Morocco Meeting
June 26, 2006

Tony reviewed the agenda that had been published on the ISPCP mailing list and asked for any changes. The agenda was fine with all the participants.

WHOIS

Tony Harris talked about the current state of whois and the Task Force. He described it as a harsh, difficult discussion. He talked about the cryptic definition that was accepted by the GNSO and the need for added clarification that has since become obvious.

Tony discussed the registries' proposal for Implementing a Operational Point of Contact. The proposal removes the administrative, technical and billing points of contact and replaces it with a single Operational Point of contact. There is no consensus on this in the discussions in the GNSO and its viewed as a potential basis for further work. There was a heated discussion on this topic through the email list supporting the whois Task Force. Tony Holmes said that the Task Force discussions had reached a level where even constructive debate was proving difficult. Tony reported on informal discussions between the ISP community and the registry/registrar communities which had taken place in Marrakech in an effort to break the deadlock.

During the GNSO – GAC session in Marrakech the chair of the GNSO had produced reading of the definition which whilst representing his own interpretation, was not an agreed GNSO view. Further discussion of the OPOC proposal continued with some questions that need clarification. The ISPs need to understand the suspension rules in the OPOC proposal.

Action: Each member of the ISPCP needs to look at the proposal and the Secretariat should make a call for comments on the proposal at some time in the near future.

Maggie said that we should respond back on any changes that should be made to the OPOC. We also requested that the Cosntituency make some statement on the uncivil behavior of certain members of the Task Force. She also said that we would have to study the accuracy issues raised by Greg Ruth. She called the personal attacks unwarranted.

Action: The Chairman will write to the Chair of the Registrar Constituency off-line expressing concern over this development

IANA

David Conrad talked about the current status of IANA. He reported on improvements in resource request processing – there are no major issues. Resource constraints have meant that there are some goals that have not been met as a result of not having people to complete those tasks. There is a consistent trend across the request processing times that show that IANA is doing a better job of meeting service levels. IANA have hired a IETF liaison by moving Michelle into that role. However, automation of certain tasks is not

taking off as fast as they would have hoped. At one point, IANA had cleared the processing queues, but today, as a result of internal personnel activities, IANA has small queues again. The new web site is at <http://test.icann.org>.

Conrad talked about continuing to smooth out request processing with a strong emphasis on documenting IANA processes, generating statistics and reports, and further automation. IANA is committed to completing the Wellington goals. IAB has asked IANA to sign the .arpa zone. On the horizon is a performance MoU with the IETF and migrating to a new IANA Web Site. There will be a continuing emphasis on further process automation.

Other things that IANA is continuing to think about include DNSSEC signing of the root zone and X.509 CA addressing trust anchor. Also, .INT registration policy is an issue on the horizon. ITU has proposed E.910 as the operational procedures for making changes to .INT. There are some problems with E.910 and how you decide who makes policy for .INT. IANA also has a global IPv6 policy issue – it says that the RIR should get a /12. However, the policy has changed for end-user allocations.

Action: The Secretariat was requested to write a brief proposal about how the allocations to the RIRs ought to be consistent with the developing end-user allocation policies.

The IANA notice for being sole sourced has a public meeting in July 26th.

Action: David Conrad's representation to be posted on the ISPCP web site

NomCom

George Sadowsky is the interim Chair of the Nomination Committee and came to talk about the need to get good statements of interest. There are twenty-three members on the committee and the ISPCP member is Tony Harris. Three members of the board are up for nomination in the current phase. The process is currently in the “hustle candidates” period. George looks to the constituency to for good candidates. A problem that the Nominating Committee is having is “candidate desertion” -- with people who were very good but not selected. Candidates that have been rejected in the past are very unlikely to apply again. The Nominating Committee makes its process as transparent as possible but the work of the committee as opaque as possible to ensure privacy. Tony Holmes asked how we might be able to get good people to come back a second time when they have been rejected the first time and received no feedback from that experience. Greg Ruth suggested that part of the problem was the expunging of information at the end of each cycle of nominations. George accepted both points were valid issues that the NonCom should consider.

GNSO Review

Denise Michel joined the ISPCP to talk about the GNSO review. The London School of Economics is still working on its report. They claim to need a deeper understanding of the procedures of the constituencies and GNSO. Denise is expecting a rough draft to

present in a month – early August. The constituencies will see the draft at the time it is initially published. She also said that you have to see a draft to see that the outside consultant understands the process and constituencies correctly. There is funding in the next fiscal year's budget for implementation of recommendations. Tony Holmes had received the request for further information from the London School of Economics. A final request would appear in the September/October timeframe. The Constituency will need to consider how this should be handled.

Denise said that the US DoC had issued a request for comments on the MoU. ICANN will be holding an online call for comments as well. ICANN thinks what is being asked for is: does the ICANN model work well for the current Internet. The NTIA web site has the link for comments. Tony Holmes suggested that the constituency should respond.

Action: Constituency to consider responding to the NTIA request for comments (Secretariat to follow up)

PDP 06- Registry contracts

Greg Ruth talked about the effects of the .com and .net contracts. What contractual conditions could be put into gTLD contracts that would be 'by policy consensus'. A PDP has been launched on this topic and a first draft of its report is currently being revised. It was suggested that the PDP group call in some experts who understood the relationship between ICANN and the registries in great detail. There should be a final report before Sao Paulo. The initial constituency position argues against presumptive renewal and the fees should be limited on registrants. They also believe that the registries should have limits for what they can do with the data they collect.

IDNs

Mark McFadden talked about IDNs and the progress toward resolution of both technical and policy issues related to them. Mark characterized the issues as 85% policy and 15% technical. He talked about the technical issues and described the technical experiments that are going on to assess any problems that might be associated with putting IDNs in the root. He noted that the technical issues with IDNs in the second-level and below are largely resolved. Mark talked about the ICANN President's committee on IDNs and their project timetable -- <http://www.icann.org/announcements/announcement-14mar06.htm> and he suggested that the group is about 4 to 6 weeks behind schedule. Mark also talked about the policy issues that have been identified with the CNAME and NS options for inserting new TLDs into the root. He pointed to the published statement on policy issues that was recently released at: <http://gnso.icann.org/issues/idn-tlds/issues-report-28may06.htm>.

Mark McFadden, Maggie Mansourkia and Greg Ruth will represent the ISPCP within the GNSO IDN group.

Internet Governance

Tony Holmes asked if anyone from the constituency had attended the last IGF meeting in Geneva last month. The IGF had decided to concentrate on two items in the near-term.

Internet Governance is on the agenda for the Athens IGF meeting but this will be tackled in a sub group, not within the main meeting. A couple of participants are going to try to attend the Athens meeting. The working group that got set up have some good people in it, according to Tony.

Constituency issues

The ISPCP then met in closed session to talk about funding and internal policy issues relating to the operation of the Constituency.

An update on the budget was provided by the secretariat and proposals on future membership fees were discussed.

Action: Secretariat and Exec Committee to agree on revised fee structure and circulate proposal to members.

It was noted that provisions for funding and outreach are now budget line items in ICANN operational plan and budget. The constituency will monitor this situation and look to make proposals on how this is handled at the appropriate time.

The ISPCP web site is under review and will be revised within the next month.

Action: Secretariat to progress and update website