DESIREE CABRERA: Okay, it's now recording.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Desiree. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone for this Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance Call on Thursday, the 28th of March, 2019. We've got rollcall that we need to have. I'll hand the floor over to Desiree Cabrera to take the rollcall.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay, in the room we have Berry Cobb, Judith Hellerstein, Marilyn Cade, Natalia Mochu, Ron da Silva, Youngeum Lee, Yrjo Lanispuro. For Staff we have, Nigel Hickson, Veni Markovski, Vera Major and myself, Desiree Cabrera. For the Chair's, we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Desiree. I do note that there is a number here that starts with a +201, I wonder who that person might be? Maybe it's somebody who's already been given? I see a hello from that number. Hadia Elminiawi, welcome Hadia.

Welcome everyone to this call today. It's going to be a purely or mostly informational call and discussion call about our administrative work. We're not going to be talking much about Internet Governance as in the topic itself but we're going to be looking at the forthcoming that we have in organizing the Workshop at the WSIS Forum, organizing a

EN

Workshop at the IGF and hopefully we'll still have a bit of time to discuss what we do with the Charter for this Working Group and the Charter being the Charter of Cross Community Working Group, that might be changed or will probably likely be changed to a Cross Community Engagement Group.

The discussion about the other Charter, which was the Charter of ICANN Engagement with the outside world and with other organizations, will be the subject topic of future call, either next week or the week after. In a couple of weeks' time, once we've got that first chunk of work on the side. As you know, there was a lot of discussion in the face to face meeting of this Working Group regarding this ICANN Engagement and so that will require a single topic call that we'll be having soon. Today's call is going to be looking primarily at the WSIS Forum, which is happening very, very soon and the ITF. I understand the deadline is very close too.

Are there any additions or amendments to the agenda at this point and time? No, okay then let's proceed forward. The first thing is the WSIS Forum. Just as I speak Marilyn Cade has put her hand up, Marilyn, you have the floor.

MARILYN CADE: Under AOB, can we also briefly discuss ICANN 60 and whether there's -- given that it's such a short meeting and it's focused on policy, whether there will be any opportunity for engagement there? I just want to put it on the agenda under AOB.

EN

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Marilyn. Let's put this under AOB. I'm not seeing any other hands, so that's the only amendment we are making to the agenda.

The WSIS Forum, that's coming up very soon in deed. The date of the Workshop, the date that was allocated in the preliminary schedule because a final schedule has not been published yet. The preliminary forum agenda has given us a slot of Thursday, the 11th of April, from 1630 to 1815, slightly different from the usual. I think in past times we had a slot earlier in the week, on the Monday or the Tuesday but that's fine, it's a good room, Room 1 for those people who know the ITU location.

So far what we have is just a very rough agenda, which effectively would be an introduction, presentation of the different stakeholder perspectives and the topic of this Workshop is 'ICANN, The GDPR and WHOIS'. The status of where we are at the moment, is that I've written a while ago to Kurt Prince who is the past Chair of Work Stream 1, EPDP and his response -- well, first he forwarded this over to the group and he also responded that he was could be interested in participating himself.

I'm not sure whether we do have confirmation and I'll hand the floor over to Nigel in a second to give us confirmations or non-confirmations from different participated. We've had him, we've also spoken to or we've seen some feedback, some questions from some members of the group, why this is being done. Ayden Férdeline wasn't too positive about this, but we did get some feedback from [inaudible] that he wanted to be involved, since of course he's based in Geneva and also

EN

there might be someone from -- let me just check my emails. I might just give the floor to Nigel who might have a full tally of the people that we might have lined up for this.

NIGEL HICKSON: Good afternoon. The Workshop is scheduled as you rightly say, Olivier, and although the agenda is down to the troughs, I don't think it will change, I don't see no change, the workshops at this stage, so 16:30 on the Thursday. We have [inaudible] from GAC and also a participant of the EPDP, he would take part and give an update at the EPDP Work, the phase one of its work, which is of course is now subject to consultation, he's volunteered. We have from the Organization; Elena from our Engagement Team has been involved in the Brussels end on this and is happy to contribute.

We also had an offer from Lori Schulman, she'll be in Geneva, she will be happy to take part as well. Clearly, we ought to perhaps have a panel of three or four people. As you say, we're still working on this. We initially exchanged some views that perhaps the overall approach would be to have an update on what's taken place in the EPDP, to talk a bit about the phase two, what's going to happen on the phase two. Perhaps also to discuss what the technical group has been doing, this is the group set up by ICANN to look at the technical way of accessing information. That's where we are at the moment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this update, Nigel. The question that we still have now, we've got a business stakeholder, we've government stakeholder,

EN

we have staff and implementation team, we might have and we still have to get confirmation from Kurt, we might have the Chair present as well. What we're still looking for is someone from offer a Civil Society perspective. I know that you can do things remotely. When I was chairing things a few years ago, unfortunately I wasn't in Geneva last year, I will be in Geneva on this occasion.

I'm certainly able to Chair the session if required but I remember we did have some problems with remote participation and I don't know whether last year remote participation worked properly. Marilyn, you mentioned who is proposed from business, I think we had spoken about -- sorry, not business but IPC, Lori Schulman. Nigel, how did remote participating work last year, was that okay or not?

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you Olivier. Yes, we did have remote participation and I think it was better than it has been in years. Obviously, there is an advantage in having someone on the spot so to speak. We've had an indication that we could get remote participation -- but there will be remote participation, yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Nigel. So far, we have tried asking Tatiana if she was able to attend, unfortunately she is unable at the time. We're trying to look for other European based stakeholders that might be in Geneva at the time, bearing in mind there is no funding for any of these activities, we do have to look at this. Marilyn mentions that she will check if Ben Wallace from Microsoft will be there. That would be an

EN

interesting thing, if you could please do so, that would be very helpful. As I said, if anybody has a suggestion for a Civil Society person, then that would be helpful too.

The question of course is, how will this be organized and I think I mentioned the rough draft so far, there would be an introduction, maybe the first thing would be a quick rundown of what the EPDP has done. If Kurt is there, it would probably be great for him to have a few slides and explain exactly what the whole team has to do, what the task was, etc. What the problem statement was because audiences at the WSIS are not particularly knowledgeable about these things.

Really, the whole session is very much informational, we not looking at having a debate of opinions because that's probably just likely to confuse people on the ground. What we're looking for is to really showcase the great work that this Committee has done and provide some stakeholder perspectives, perhaps even their personal perspective on how they thought the work went ahead and then provide roadmap or an indication of what phase two is going to be about. Pretty much laying the road for being able to come back next year, maybe with an explanation of what happened in phase two.

I'm just sort of widely guessing where we might wish to go but that was sort of an overall, helicopter view of it all. Does anyone have any points that they'd like to make on this? I note that Ben Wallace is indeed on the call and I'm not sure Ben if I can ask you, in fact I should ask everyone who is on the call today, who actually will be in Geneva for the WSIS Forum. I see Marilyn Cade's hand is up, Marilyn, you have the floor.

EN

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I'm not in, not realizing he was on the call but Ben is tied up at that time. Why don't I talk with Ben about our colleagues from the Business offline, I'll just pop him an email. Ben, I'll private chat you and we can speak about whether there is someone who will be there from the Business community who is expert enough in this topic, that they could actually contribute as a Business. You don't have to have all, I'm not suggesting that that's necessary but he and I can check on this.

I wanted to make a separate comment about my experience when I chaired about the remote participation. The only thing that saved us and it was actually a difficulty on the part of the speaker in the timing of availability, what saved us was the speaker had sent a PowerPoint and a detailed statement, which I was able then to use and going through her slides.

That was very affective in terms of substantive content, it wasn't helpful of course in being able to take questions as it wasn't truly interactive but I think we might want to have a backup if we decide we're going to rely on remote participation. My own experience is, remote participation doesn't work very well for speakers, it can work for asking questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Marilyn, what did you mean by that it would work for speaker but not to ask questions?

EN

MARILYN CADE:	No, no, quite the contrary. I was saying it doesn't work well for speakers.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Oh, but it works well to ask questions. Affectively, the remote participants work well when they just have to make a short intervention but if they actually have to provide a full presentation or a long thing, that doesn't quite -- does it break the dynamic or?
MARILYN CADE:	I haven't found it to be reliable medium, always predicable. In past experiences you're looking for the speaker, may have to take them out or order, they encounter technical difficulty.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thanks very much for this, Marilyn. I've had similar experience and hence the concern that I have. Nigel, I guess we really have to try and find -- looking at the whole list of the people that are available or that are part of the EPDP, maybe even looking at alternates, let's try and isolate someone from Civil Society because I'd like to get that angel as well. I can see that we appear to be rather well covered on the other points if Marilyn manages to find someone from the Business.
NIGEL HICKSON:	Thanks Oliver, and we can certainly follow up on that. There are possibly people in the wider community that have been following, either from Civil Society they've been following this very closely and

EN

could give a perspective as well. Tatiana is unfortunately not able to --
who is a very active member of the PDP, is unfortunately not able to be
in Geneva but she said if we do need, she'd be prepared to do remote
participation but with the caveat of course that Marilyn has flagged.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLON: Thanks very much. Any other comments or questions regarding the
organizing of the WSIS Forum? I'm not seeing any hands up. I think we
can move on.

MARILYN CADE: Sorry. Do we have a designated speaker from the Technical Group, I
never get their name right? Do we have someone from that group
already identified?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Marilyn. Nigel, yeah, you mentioned the name.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah, TSG, it's the group that's been looking into the technical process
of having access through RDAP into the databases. We've reached out
to the group and asked if there was a speaker from it because I think it
gives an interesting perspective on another aspect of this. We would
certainly hope to have someone from it and I'll update on that one.
Thanks.

EN

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. The TSG, the Technical Study Group. That has a number of big names on it. I'm hoping that some of them will be present at the WSIS Forum. Marilyn, your hand is still up. Okay, thank you. That's one thing that's pretty much on the road. Hopefully within the next couple of days that will be flying.

The next thing with a short deadline is the organization of an IGF Workshop. In past times the Working Group has filed for IGF Workshops. I know that last year unfortunately I think that we were not able to have a workshop because it wasn't -- we didn't manage to get one. Then of course, the selection was very tight because there was such a short meeting. This year, the meeting taking place in Paris will be longer. The question is whether we would be interested in filing for a workshop. Just as a reminder, there is a page which looks at our past workshops.

Let me just put it in the chat and it's got links to all of the past workshop proposals for IGF. Of course, we've had three out of the four that actually took place. The first one in 2016 was Multi Stakeholder Internet Governance IANA Stewardship. The second one was Post IANA Transition ICANN. The third one was Multi Stakeholder Governance of the Domain Name System Lessons Learned for Other Internet Governance Issues. The one that didn't go through last year was Townhall to Take Stock of Achievements to date on Key Internet Governance Issues.

We now are faced with an April 12th deadline for submitting the workshop. I guess it's the right time to discuss any suggestions that we might have on this. Just as a starting point, in the past we have actually

-- the workshops we've submitted for the IGF were quite similar to the workshops that we had for the WSIS Forum. That being said, this year's IGF being several months, in fact nearly six months, seven months after the WSIS Forum, I'm sure whether the topic of Work Stream 1 and WHOIS Issues and Expedited PDP will still be an interesting topic when the IGF takes place in November.

We also have to keep that one in mind. I'll open the floor now. If there are suggestions for topics or if you think the current topic for WSIS is a good one or whether there's any other suggestions or whether you think this time we should not be engaging with the IGF at all. Hadia Elminiawi, let's start with you. Hadia, you have the floor.

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Thank you, Oliver. I think actually the topic of the WSIS is a big one, the EPDP. I think six months from now, [inaudible] will have actually begun and decisions and key inputs in this regard will be [inaudible]. I think such a workshop that will be beneficial, also to the work of the EPDP team itself. That's just a thought, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I do have a quick question on what you've just said here. Would you say we should focus on Work Stream 1 or should there be a Work Stream 1 implementation or should there be a mix of Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2 or should be focus solely of Work Stream 2?

EN

HADIA ELMINIAWI: I think our focus on should be phase 2. Phase 1 has already [inaudible] Phase 2. This workshop I think could be useful in issues related to the standardized act [inaudible]. My idea is to work on the workshop, concentrating on Phase 2 based on the work of Phase 1.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Hadia. Next is Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Thanks Judith for reminding me to mute but I don't have a dog, so unless you have a cat meowing in the background that's not me. For topics, I'm going to ask us to think outside of the box. Thank you for mentioning the page, I would just say as somebody who's spent a lot of time, Veni's on the call, so perhaps we could hear from him as well. I've listened in to all the MAG calls and the discussion about themes.

There are only three topical areas and while Data Governance is one of them, there's another one that I'd like us to give some serious consideration to which may seem a bit -- it would require us to think about speakers from the community, not from the CCWG itself so much. That is the topic of Security and Stability, which is one of the extremely hot topics for all governments and at the UN and of course we all know was also a hot topic at the ITU Plenipot as well.

It's a growing concern, the safety and security of individuals, use and misuse of DNS, stability issues that perhaps the internet is -- how resilient the internet is, the alternative approaches to bringing security to the internet. To me, it's a very timely topic and it's also much more

EN

predictable than Work Stream 2 is going to be. We don't yet have a Chair for Work Stream 2. We would be submitting the proposal but the 12th. Without the ability to -- which is only a couple weeks. Without the ability to put a lot of substance in, into what the group is going to have accomplished by the time of the IGF.

Alternatively, we could also consider a second proposal for a flash session, focused just on the Work Stream 2, which would be only a 20- or 30-minute session but it would be a way to provide a briefing and an update that is about the work on Work Stream 2. My vote is, at least let's strongly consider Security, Stability and Resiliency.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Marilyn. I am seeing Hadia's hand, is that a new hand that you have?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: That's an old hand but I was actually going to raise my hand and say that I do agree with Marilyn on posting on Security, Resiliency and Stability. I would like to note that, standardized access to new gTLD registration data is part of the security and stability of the internet because it is data that is used by law enforcement and cyber security people. I'm saying it should be part of [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Hadia. Just a question to clarify here. Are you basically saying that you could have an aspect of the topic of Security and Stability that would be explaining the EPDP Phase 2 access topic? Are

EN

you basically saying you could fold this into a wider Security and Stability Workshop?

HADIA ELMINIAWI: Yes, I'm saying that the Security and Stability Workshop could have more than one topic on it that addressed security and stability issues. One of the topics address security and stability issues could be the need for the or the use whatever we decide the workshop should look like, the need or the use of the new gTLD registration data. It's just one topic of many.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much for this. Is there anyone on the call who wishes to add this or comment? I'm not seeing any other hands at the moment. What I would suggest, I've now taken notes on this, so we've got two and a half-ish proposals. We've got one, to either have a workshop on the EPDP. When I say workshop by the way, I use the term workshop it could be a round table, whatever format it is on EPDP.

The alternative, the second topic or the second thing is to think outside the box and to have one on security and stability. I gather that because this is an ICANN or this is a workshop that'd be proposed by us it would be focusing primarily on security and stability relating somehow the ICANN Mission. Hadia mentioned that, one aspect of it could be the Work Stream 2 work on the EPDP, the need or use of gTLD registration data. The, of course, other aspects that would work with SSAC people, with RSSAC people, etc. That also has some ways to fly and then with the added thing that we could have a flash topic also, jut providing quick

update, more details and a quick update on what's been happening in Work Stream 2.

I think that what next steps for us, I can just send this over to our mailing list, obtain feedback on that because we're not going to decide here with the number of people that are on the call today. I should share this with the group by email and get their feedback and see where we go from there. Unless there is anyone who objects to this way forward or if anyone has any other topics that they would suggest for the workshop or roundtable?

Okay, so that's the way forward then. The action item is for Oliver to send the list of potential topics of the workshop proposal at IGF. By the way, as a follow to this, we'll put it on the mailing list, give it a few days to see if there's feedback and then I would really require your help, we'll create a wiki page for the workshop and it would be helpful if you can all chip to prepare the workshop request because I know Nigel has been doing that in past years but having a starting text would be particularly helpful, those people that are following the MAG, consultations very closely, you know the kind of language that actually hits the right mark of the MAG and that gets the high marks, you know how to structure the presentation or workshop proposal so that this raises interests on the MAG. The last thing we want is for this to be glossed over and looked and said, whatever, that's just another one of these workshops, we're not interested. We will require your assistance.

Let's move to the next thing and that's the Charter Update. Yes, Nigel.

EN

NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry to interrupt, I should have put my hand up. Yes, I agree. What we need is in addition to just saying this is a good idea, we need some descriptive paragraphs or sentences as you rightly said, so we have a good input on this. Also, we need suggested speakers, the workshop application for the IGF has to have a number of speakers, we have to have at least three confirmed speakers and they need to be from different regions. We need to do some thinking on this. It's quite stringent requirements for workshop applications. If we wanted a flash session then I think it's slightly different but if we want to put into a workshop proposal then we have to do a fairly thorough piece of work. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Nigel. What I would suggest, if we were to go the direction of the EPDP Phase 2 and only that, then we will have to get back to the EPDP Chair or Ex-Chair and ask them to share this with their colleagues, to find out who from the EPDP would be able available to go to the IGF and would be planning to be present at the IGF. The same way we've done for WSIS before. I gather there will be more people for the WSIS Forum. If we were to go the second way and this is one which is primarily for the Security and Stability, then I would suggest to get in touch with the SSAC and the RSAC and perhaps any of the communities that are involved. I know that the SO's and AC's all have a group that deals with security and stability or a subgroup, ask them to also provide suggested speakers for this.

I guess the first thing is give it five days once it's on the mailing list, give it five days to get feedback on which one of those two directions we

take and if we can take the direction A or direction B, that will determine who we get in touch with. You still have until the 12th and I know that's the very last moment, but five days will take us over to the 2nd, then we can immediately in the week of the 2nd of April send out the request to the SO's and AC's and get some volunteers. I gather that people her in our group can make suggestions of people so we can get in touch with them directly. Does that fly with you Nigel, is that okay?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, that makes a lot of sense, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. Now, the last thing is the Charter Updates. Before we get AOB because we still have any AOB to discuss. Charter Updates, a quick summary of where we are. For those people that weren't in the face to face meeting, where we are at present is a little bit between things. Technically speaking, this is not a Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance any more now because its only charter by the ALAC.

The GNSO has withdrawn as you know some time ago, the ccNSO has not formally withdrawn but has said it would not be part of a Cross Community Engagement Group, even though they would send a liaison or they would have someone that would be working hand in hand with the group. The informal feedback received from the GNSO was that some members of the GNSO were somehow concerned about the term Cross Community because it wasn't strictly Cross Community since not

all the Community members available or were participating, so it was a kind of incomplete Cross Community Engagement.

Frankly, I don't really care about the name of the group. The feedback we've received from everyone is that there is a need for this platform for engagement. The feedback from GAC has been that, again, there is an interest from the GAC members to participate, there is no overall consensus as to whether the GAC should participate as a charting organization for the group. We're in kind of a middle ground at the moment and I do note that there are other groups operating in ICANN that are not strictly charted. One of the Cross-Community Work Party on Human Rights.

I remember there was also an engagement group on Accessibility, that did some work, that actually related well with Staff and put forward recommendations for accessibility but that had a beginning and end. Our group is really just an ongoing group. Really, that's where we are. It's worth noting that Nigel and his team are likely to continue supporting this group and that the Board Working Group on Internet Governance has also said that they would definitely continue interfacing with the group that we have. It's just that we don't actually have something now that we can call this group by and that would be charter.

I forgot the ALAC; the ALAC has said they will go along with anything that comes along and they'd be happy with either a chartered group or a non-chartered group, perhaps with a preference with a charted group of some sort. There is this essential linkage between the different communities, a formal link between the different communities in ICANN

and the group itself, not just members of the different communities that take part in this working group like a past time occupation. Let me open the floor, I've rambled enough.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. If I could summarize the key ingredients to bake a cake, I'm not good on spots analogies, I think that's what we're taking about. Trying to make sure that we have the key ingredients to make this an affective and key participant to make this an affective advisor to ICANN Org and also to ensure that the ICANN Board respects our input and listens to it. I'm pleased we have one Board Member on so I'm going to be very clear about this statement and frankly to more strongly encourage the ICANN Org to take into account in a consultative way the input of this group, not just create a situation where we learn about decisions after the fact.

I don't know mean that to be a criticism, I mean that to be a challenge to us as the group because I think in the past we may have been a little bit behind the eight ball in getting strong suggestions out that could then be respected and understood in the work that ICANN has to do in a very timely manner. I agree with you, I don't care what the name is.

I do however care deeply that the commitments you've referenced, that the working groups as the board, I may have the name wrong, that Leon I think now chairs, I care deeply that whatever we are has a regularized, face to face encounter with an exchange of views with that group, that ICANN Staff who are engaging in International are carrying information with us in a bilateral way, maybe bilateral is the wrong word, a two way

flow of information and that we are doing substantive thinking that can add value.

For me to continue to put a lot of work into this, that's what I'm looking for. Let's be substantive, let's be knowledgeable, let's add value, let's make sure we have access and let's make sure that our views are taken into account, that will then allow, just to be Frank, Veni and I are on the call from the BC, I've been here from the beginning, but Veni and have to reflect back to the BC why this group matters.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's very much for this, Marilyn. We do have a proposed charter that we sent to everyone and I was just looking at our wiki page and it's still not there. I'm going to put an action item for myself as well, to add that charter to the right location on our wiki page so that we've got an easy location to find that proposed charter and then from that, I guess Marilyn, you pointed out joining the small drafting group, perhaps could you then take the bits of that charter to -- I wasn't going to say water it down because we're not actually watering it down, what we're doing is just to concentrate it even more and get the essence of the charter into an even small document that we can then get the different participants of the group to sign up to.

Perhaps even get a signature of the SO's and AC's that they are interested in engaging in this, so they don't need charter it but certainly they would engage in it. Is that a way forward? Is that what you were thinking of?

EN

MARILYN CADE:
I'm so sorry. The small drafting group I was proposing was for the SSR paragraph, for the workshop. I'm not backing out. Looking at the charter, but I think those need to be two separate. One thing I volunteered was to put together anyone who wants to join, we can put together a couple of paragraphs together on the SSR workshop. Then, secondly, I'm happy to work on the charter with other that might want to work on that as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:
Thanks for this Marilyn. That's the problem, when one reads the chat and there is no exact time definition on the chat or coordination between what's happening on the chat and what's happening on the call. I get my things completely messed up. Sorry about this.

Any other thoughts? Anyone else on the call regarding the charter, what way forward would you suggest? I mentioned one possible way forward, is there anything else on that? For the time being, we've been pretty much able to function they way that we've always functioned, with Staff support and with being able to get to the rooms that we need during our face to face and public meetings, we've had good feedback on that.

The feedback from the different SO's and AC's has not been, we'll we want you to stop, it's just been that we're not sure we can charter things as such because of the implications of what chartering meaning. The main implication being, that internet governance is a complex space. Some of the SO's and AC's are not directly involved with them and some of them have members that are directly involved with them

and their views might conflict with the views that we might hold as consensus view in our group. It in deep conflicted with ICANN Org and ICANN Staff.

Hadia mentions that she agrees with the proposal going forward, my proposal for going forward. I'm not seeing any other hands so let's move on to AOB. Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think I should call upon you before always moving on to the next thing.

NIGEL HICKSON: I do apologize. I just wanted to say that on the charter we had reached out to the Governance Advisory Committee, you and I did a presentation to them in Kobe. The GAC are considering whether to be a charted member, that is ongoing, whether it comes back with anything, time will tell. Just to that is ongoing. The second point to make is the commitment of the organization to this vehicle, doesn't matter the exact nature of the vehicle but what matters I think is what Marilyn and others have said, that we continue a dialog and that we have good relationships between this vehicle and the Organization and the Board Working Group. Thank you.

EN

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank very much Nigel. The next thing then in our agenda is the Any Other Business. The matter of business that was suggest for AOB was speaking about ICANN 65, the next meeting that will take place in Marrakech, the question was whether there will be both a face to face meeting and a public session, bearing in mind that this is a short meeting since it is called the Policy Forum.

Now, looking back a previous years, in Panama, the last Policy Forum we had a face to face but we did not have a Public Meeting. A year earlier in Johannesburg, we had a face to face meeting but we did not have a Public Meeting. I believe the year earlier, which would Helsinki, we had a face to face meeting as well but we did not have a Public Meeting. Looking a prior sessions, the last time we had a Public Session in a June meeting was in Buenos Aires ICANN 53, which is quite a number of years ago, that's in 2015. It looks likely we could ask for a face to face session but not a session for this meeting. Does that answer your question? I think that it was Marilyn that brought this topic forward.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I think trying to have a face to face is good and I think Peter is supporting that as well. I just think realistically, given the limitations of time, also not to create competing ideas but, I think we have to practical here that the Cross-Community Work Grouping Auction Proceeds has to have to substantive amount of time. The EPDP is probably going to be seeking substantive time. Doing more than a face to face doesn't seem pragmatic and if we just institutionalize that and then plan to head for Montreal, that would seem very, very practical and reasonable.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank for this, Marilyn. Any other comments? Nigel, are we clear on this then? I'm not seeing any other hands up, so I think we are fine with proceeding with asking for just the face to face meeting.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, of course we can pursue that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: What we might have and this is -- just mentioning in the past, I think in some occasions on the B Meeting, we've just been afforded a one-hour face to face meeting. It would be rather short or it might be rather short. I would like to argue that we need a 90-minute meeting because one hour with change over from one session to another ends up being 50 or 45 minutes and then you just get into the topic and it's gone. Let's try and go for a 90 minute. I'm well aware that it's going to be a busy, very busy face to face meeting and a very busy Policy Forum.

I know that EPDP and other groups are asking themselves whether they would have sessions. In fact, the SO, AC, SCG, RALO chairs are currently discussing as to whether there should be many public cross community discussions and perhaps reducing that to two slots from the three or four that there were in prior meetings. Let's play it by ear at this point in time. Let's start with just focusing on the face to face meeting and that's probably quite likely that we can obtain it, seeing the history of the policy for it in the past.

EN

Any other Other Business? I note there is some chat going on in the chat regarding the draft and regarding the submission of drafts for the IGF Workshop and I'd like to thank Ben for being about to help out here with some potential document templates, it will help with the drafting.

I'm not seeing any other hands. Nigel Hickson, are there any other things that we need to discuss on this call?

NIGEL HICKSON: No, Olivier, thank you. Thank you very much, I think that it's been very productive. There's a lot going on as say. I know Marilyn has flagged this before, we're taking part with a number of other organizations, WYPO, we're doing a panel on capacity building, public ecommerce week and we're doing a panel for that next week. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. Any other updates? I'm not seeing any hands. I'm absolutely mortified because I'm always late on closing calls but today, with no further hands, I'm glad to be able to end this call at exactly half past four UTC. It's 16:30 UTC which is great. Thank you everyone for being on the call. This is call is now ended. Let's follow up on the mailing list. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]