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.

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.

Tony discussed the registries' proposal for Implementing a Operational Point of Contact.
The proposal removes the administrative, technical and billing points of contact and
replacing it with a single Operational Point of contact. There is no consensus on this in
the discussions in the GNSO. 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 come to a new low. There is a recognition that this continue from other
consitiuencies and governments. Tony reported on informal discussions between the ISP
community and the registry/registrar communities.

The chair of the GNSO has produced an unusual reading of the definition. 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. 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 should also 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 unwarrented.

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. 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 personell 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 and 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 empahsis 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. The Secretariat ought 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.

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-tree 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. Greg Ruth suggested that part of the problem was the expunging of information at the end of each cycle of nominations.

Denise Michel talked 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.

Denise said that the US DoC had issued a requst 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

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 is great detail. There should be a final report before Sao Paulo. The group is 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.

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 recent released at: http://gnso.icann.org/issues/idn-tlds/issues-report-28may06.htm.

Tony Holmes asked if anyone from the constituency had attended the IGF meeting. The IGF decided on two items to work on in the near-term. Internet Governance is on the agenda for the Athens IGF 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 it it, according to Tony.

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