

## **CROSS COMMUNITY WORKING GROUP ON IG: FACE TO FACE MEETING; THURSDAY; 14<sup>TH</sup> MARCH; 2019**

*The attendance list will be posted on the CCWG IG Wiki; where there will be a link to the agenda and recording.*

### **Summary**

This was a well-attended, lively and constructive meeting. There were good interactions between the Board members attending and Community members on several IG related areas, including the proposed Charter on legislation and on ICANN's ~~the~~ ITU-D application. On the proposed Charter and on ICANN's ITU-D application, some members of the community shared observations and concerns about the Organisation and Board decisions absent of full dialogue with the Community. There were also some concerns expressed on the desirability of ICANN being a sector member of the ITU, while others noted the value of ICANN joining, instead of joining other organisation's delegations. The members of the Board noted they heard the concerns regarding the proposed Charter, noting that, as indicated on the posting, feedback was welcome, and would bring feedback back to the Organisation and Community.

Finally, it was agreed to hold a CCWG IG Call to further discuss the ITU-D sector member application.

### **Detail**

#### 1. Introduction and Welcome

The Chair, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, introduced the agenda (see attached). It was approved without comment.

He welcomed all participants and particularly Board members Leon Sanchez, Avri Doria, Matthew Shears, Tripti Sinha, Ron da Silva, Danko Jevtović and Lito Ibarra.

#### 2. Feedback form CCWG IG Public Session (Monday; 11<sup>th</sup> March)

Olivier reviewed the issues that had been discussed, noting the interactive dialogue on the issue of extraterritorial legislation (such as the GDPR) and the discussion on the proposed Charter concerning

legislative tracking (released through a blog by the CEO)<sup>1</sup>. He also noted the update by GE and others on upcoming events; including the IGF 19.

Marilyn Cade asked for a public comment period on the proposed Charter. She said this was too important to be announced in a blog or tweet.

Theresa Swinehart noted that there were opportunities to comment on the CEO's Blog

Sebastien Bachelet said there should be a normal process and tools for making comments; his comments were also echoed by Klaus Stoll.

Leo Sanchez thanked participants for input on proposed Charter and agreed to take wishes for a formal consultation back to Organisation and Board.

### 3. Board WG and Objectives for CCEG on IG

Leon introduced this agenda item by noting the specific objective in the proposed Strategic Plan concerning geopolitical challenges and how to address them. He noted Board was aware of broadening of global IG issues with more bodies and conferences. We need, he said, to be aware of this and to take necessary steps. We will, as a consequence be doing a “mapping” exercise allowing the Board to better engage.

At first, he said, we will be mapping actors and fora as a baseline for our engagement and working; this is a first approach and we are aware of need for input and feedback from Community. This, noted, will allow us “early warning” of issues and concerns, allowing us to take timely action based on this.

We will look to see what sort of “tool” we might use to allow conversation to flow on a real-time basis. We will share with you the steps on this.

This is, he concluded, part of our agenda in strengthening links and conversation with the CCWG IG.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.icann.org/en/system/files/files/proposed-org-engagement-govt-standards-charter-25feb19-en.pdf>

In discussion

Matthew said we had heard calls in Kobe this week for Board to engage more on IG issues

Olivier asked about the nature of “tool”?

Leon – Noted this was still in planning stage; but idea is that tool will assist us to understand better the IG environment

Klaus – would this be an “Observatory” as such; welcome this approach also with some information on issues that affect us linked to analysis on them?

Leon – highest level objective is to use this for dialogue and interaction

#### 4. Discussion on Working Together

Olivier noted a further discussion on this was needed in light of having these two “decisions” (on ITU and Charter) without substantive dialogue.

Leon –said this will be part of this dialogue

Matthew – agreed enhancing dialogue is part of our discussion at Board and is linked to evolution of CCEG IG. Need to think more broadly and creatively about what is the best medium to make that work.

Olivier noted that CCEG cannot speak as a unified voice as not Chartered but that we can be a sounding board on IG issues. Would hope that Board WG may come back with ideas on furthering this relationship.

#### 5. Progress on CCEG IG – Chartering

Olivier briefly (*for time reasons*) noted current status; with ALAC willing to be a Chartered body and with GAC and GNSO considering their position. CCNSO will not be chartered but will work with CCEG IG and is putting together a group to work on IG issues

He noted discussion with GAC on being a chartered member of the CCEG IG.

## 6. Any other Business

### ITU-D Sector Membership

*The dialogue on this actually took place before Item 3 after Olivier had noted that Preetam Mooloor, from the ITU had attended first part of meeting but had had to leave,*

Nigel noted that Preetam had asked that it be known that ITU welcomed their excellent working relationship with ICANN and the application for membership of ITU-D they had made, which would be considered by the ITU Council in June.

Tony Holmes - Business Constituency not that happy with this news and with not being consulted – there are other ways of interacting - surprise re ITU-D as ICANN is a technical body; ITU-T would be a better fit; sector members do not have voice at table; often cannot speak.

Marilyn – said Board process on this had not been respectful; not sufficient dialogue; ICANN should have considered an “exchange of letters” with ITU instead of sector membership.

Sebastien - ITU were a liaison to Board every three years ensuring dialogue; was surprised that Board changed their mind on sector membership as had been opposed.

Ron da Silva – we have discussed this a number of times; should have there have been a different process?

Klaus – thought membership put ICANN into a potential position of subservience

Collin Kure – concerned at resources in takes to take part in Study Groups.

Marilyn – acknowledged there had been a dialogue in CCWG on membership, but expected Board to take community concerns into account and to consult the community further;

Leon – said the Board *had* discussed the input from CCWG before taking a decision

Avri Doria – said there was an animated discussion at the Board – was not done in the blind

Tony – noted complications for ICANN if involvement in ITU-T re discussions on IANA/ gTLDs

Lori Schulman asked if there was a document setting out advantages / disadvantages? Should there have been an MOU instead?

Klaus – should we have a process now of potentially reversing decision?

Chris Buckridge – Noted that several RIRs are members of ITU-T and ITU-D - there are issues where “ICANN” comes up so more effective for them to be at table in their own right (as opposed to members of other delegations).

Tony – ICANN is a “Peer” organisation to ITU and thus should not be a member of it.

Marilyn – Asked for specific Conference Call on information sharing re consequences of being an ITU member

Nigel – noted briefly a few facts; including that ITU-D do have Study Groups looking at ICANN issues, including training on IG issues, that being a sector member does allow speaking at PP Conferences in Working / Drafting groups but not voting. Noted the decision by Council is not solely on ICANN list of bodies applying for membership on Fee Exemption basis.

Olivier concluded discussion.

**Action** – Have a separate CCWG IG Call on this.

GE; March; 2019