

20131211_CCWGINTERNETGOVERNANCE_ID839478

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. And I hope that someone is able to turn their speakers off because we've got feedback. Thank you very much. My name is Olivier Crepin-Leblond and I'm the, I guess the coordinator of this (inaudible) working group on internet governance with Rafik Dammak being the other coordinator. The first thing we'll start with in our agenda is a quick roll call and I will be asking Renate to provide a list of the people that she has on her list of the people on the call. I might add in a few more whom I've just heard saying hello and then we'll ask if we've missed anyone who is currently on the call.

That's primarily for the ability of the transcribers later on to know who is speaking if we are sometimes a bit fast before we speak. So Renate, you have the floor.

Renate De Wulf: Okay. Thank you, very much. We have Yuel Liege (ph), we have Rafik. We have Cheryl Langdon-Orr. We have Tony Holmes. In the room of (inaudible), we have Alain Bidron, Alex Dans, Stephanie Duchesneau, Sarah Falvey, Ayesha Hassan, Louis Lee, Michele Nikele (ph) Neylon, Patricio Poblete, Holly Raiche, Carlton Samuels, and Phillip Diromat (ph). Did I miss anybody?

Robert Guerra: This is Robert Guerra. I'm also on the call.

Renate De Wulf: Oh, thank you, Robert. I forgot, I forgot you.

Patricio Poblete: Yes, this is Patricio Poblete.

Ken Stubbs: This is Ken Stubbs. I'm on the call as well.

Renate De Wulf: Thank you, Ken.

Camille Stewart: This is Camille Stewart.

Renate De Wulf: Thank you, Camille.

Oliver Sueme: This is Oliver Sueme. I'm not sure you mentioned me.

Martin Levy: This is Martin Levy. I'm on the call.

Renate De Wulf: Martin Levy, thank you.

Patricio Poblete: This is Patricio Poblete.

Renate De Wulf: Yes, thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: And it sounds like there's no one else. So --

Sally Costerton: Sorry, Olivier, it's Sally. Apologies (inaudible).

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Ah, okay, Sally Costerton as well. Right, thank you very much. If there is anyone else who we've forgotten please just put your name in the chat and then we'll, we can move forward. So I guess we can move to the next item in our agenda, which really is the introduction and the purpose of this call. Really, this is the first call that we're having first to exchange some thoughts about what this working group is going to have to do, and also, to work on a starting point for a charter as well. And I gather that since time is of the essence, we will probably have to perform these two discussions in parallel on the lists after this call and into the new year.

Just a quick background as to how this cross-community working group came into existence. It was all a little bit fast, and in fact what happened during the ICANN week was that there was -- some of you will have been there, there was a meeting of all the community in the big, main hall early in the morning and one of the thoughts that came out of this meeting was that there needed to be some cross-community work in preparation for the Brazil meeting that was announced just a few days earlier.

So the different chairs of SOs and ACs discussed it between themselves, but yet at the end of that ICANN week, the ALAC had a meeting with the entity SG and the two communities having been quite widely involved with internet governance, and with the IGS, et cetera, decided to start something quickly, some kind of work with three people on each side, having a wiki put up, and basically start working on the preparation for the Brazil meeting, with the view that of course this effort should be open to absolutely everyone. But a couple of communities need to get the ball kicking basically.

So that was announced just a few hours later by Evan Leibovitch on the -- in the public forum. And on the Friday morning, uh, the ALAC leadership team met with David Olive just to recap on the week's work. And one of the subjects was the discussions that had taken place between the NTSG (ph) and the ALAC. And the question that David Olive asked was whether this was going to be the start of the cross-community working group. Not having the exact, I guess, process by which a cross-community working group starts, the answer was, well, we're very open to this being open to absolutely everyone and to this becoming a cross-community working group, depending on what the actual definition of the CCWG is. I'm well aware that in the GNSO there has been some work to define cross-community working groups. But not wishing to get bogged down with process, the answer was, yes, let's open it up to everyone and let's get this thing on the road as quickly as possible, and deal with all of the procedural stuff on the side in the meantime, and basically get down to doing some real work as soon as possible.

As you're well aware, there is also a One Net initiative that has been started by the ISTAR organization, and RIRs, primarily under the guise of the NRO. You're well aware of this, otherwise I guess you wouldn't be on this call. There has been some confusion as to how everything fits together. There's been an enormous amount of discussion on the One Net mailing list about who will be sitting in Brazil. Frankly, my point of view is that I don't really give a damn about who is going to be sitting there, but what is the message that we as a community, ICANN, the community is going to be bringing forward over to Brazil. And this is something, which we need to all work on. I'm not sure whether we can have a unified message, whether we can have a set of message, whether we can have a set of guidelines that we can build on this. But really, that's the sort of way forward I could see in what we're doing at the moment.

I'll move onto agenda item number three pretty soon. That's first to start discussing the goal. But I'll first open the floor for any questions that anyone might have with regards to the purpose of this present call.

- Robert Guerra: This is Robert. Just I guess a technical point of order. I have yet to get my access credentials for the Lucid (ph) meetings and would like to just put in that request when that's possible. Thank you.
- Unidentified Participant: Yes, same here. There's a lineup of us.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Now, I'm not sure if I'm the person to resolve this. So --
- Renate De Wulf: I have given you approval to join. I don't understand why you have not been able to join.
- Unidentified Participant: To join what? All I have is a phone number.
- Unidentified Participant: Yes, it's a dog's breakfast (ph).
- Renate De Wulf: I will try and get you in. Just a moment.
- Evan Leibovitch: This is Even speaking. I just got in. What happened for me was, is I took a look in my email. There is a something -- I got a meeting reminder 10 minutes ago from Renate. And so it gives me a personal click and when I click that, it takes me in under my own login. That's the only way I got in. I originally tried about 15 minutes ago where you request a password. That didn't happen. So I looked at -- so it says who is present and waiting and who is waiting for, and I think for every individual it gives you your own personal URL to get in under your account. At least that's how it worked for me.
- Renate De Wulf: That is correct.
- Unidentified Participant: Well, maybe (inaudible) like that.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Evan. Thank you. Renate, if you can work this out, please do your magic in the background and let's move on with the call itself.
- Renate De Wulf: I'll do that.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Any other questions or thoughts about the purpose of the call, assuming we're all on it and assuming we're all on the -- on this Lucid thing, which by the way I'm not too pleased with either. But there you go. Try something new. I might like it one day. Okay. No one. So let's move on then to the goal itself and so effectively, as I've just mentioned, I guess we can spend about 20 minutes discussing the goal of what this working group is all about. It's pretty open at the moment. The first initial set of action items that the NTSG and the ALAC had set themselves was to create the wiki space, et cetera, and that's all been done by the way. You can see that somewhere on that goal page, I hope. I'm not even sure where you can find it. Anyway, it might be somewhere on there.
- And on this, you should be able to also see the link to the mailing list. So the mailing list has been created by a global stakeholder engagement. So effectively, we've got the tools to be able to work. We have staff that has been assigned to support us, a number of staff. Renate is one of them. Ergis (ph) is another person who deals with the mailing list. If you want to add any more people, please email Ergis and there is, well, (inaudible) the mailing list is working correctly.
- Now, I wish I could actually do something that I could show, here we go. So I put together a little internet governance PDF. And I wonder whether that actually works or not. Maybe I can share my screen. I'm really sorry, just trying to just use this. Here we go. So there is a PDF that's just come out with a little mind map of where the working group is, because I realize that's rather confusing for many people. If we look at the internet governance space as such, I put a little sort of item that says internet governance. You've got the IGF totally on the right hand side, the IGF and other internet governance work. On the left hand side, there's the Brazil meeting in which, of course, there will be

the input from Slash One Net (ph) that is made up of ICANN and many other organizations. And my view of the current situation, and this is just something I'm putting on the table here for discussion is that there would be the CCW on internet governance and ICANN staff feeding the ICANN input into the One Net and into the, I guess, into the Brazil meeting as well directly.

And in the CCW and internet governance, we've got our participants, all SOs, ACs, and SGs, and I'm sorry, (inaudible) organizations, (inaudible) committees, and stakeholder groups. And then we've got the different threads with a charter and the topics. And I guess we have to now start building up on the topics on this for the time being.

I see the queue is empty at the moment. Okay, fine. So that's the structure effectively. Now, with regard to the topic, I guess this is a sort of pretty open thing. We really need to find out what our goals are going to be. Now, if the goal is going to be somehow the input into the Brazil meeting, I'd like to hear from you what your point of view is with regards to the goals of the input that we need to bring into One Net and into the Brazil meeting. I know it's a very open-ended question, but it really is down to start kicking some ideas around and start basically putting some shape to this whole thing. At the moment, I don't even know what I should be looking at to see if somebody has got their hands up.

Robert Guerra: Olivier, this is Robert (inaudible).

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So I see, Robert. Yes, okay, excellent. Here we go, Robert. Go ahead, Robert.

Robert Guerra: Okay. Yeah, as I think as I put it on the chat I think as we're bringing all the different groups from ICANN together, I think one of it is an information sharing given that there's still some uncertainty exactly as the scope and focus of the meeting. And so I think that - this group can be particularly helpful for that. I think as I put in the chat, I think there are kind of two immediate things that come to mind is to help develop either the issues, points that we wish to bring forward to the meeting, and then the issue of representation. Given that there seems to be some sort of competition as the names to attend the meeting, I think we should try to get some clearance or some guidance on both the input, but also whom from this group could be nominated going forward to be a possible attendee of the event.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Robert. Very, very good points and I hope actually someone is taking notes. Renate, is someone taking minutes of this? And you might be (inaudible).

Renate De Wulf: Sorry, I was talking to myself on mute. Sorry about that.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Go ahead.

Renate De Wulf: No, so we will be working on those through with Alex and also with the recording and the transcription.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Fantastic. Thank you. Thank you very much. So thanks Robert. We'll take notes of that, but good point. I've got next Oliver Sueme.

Oliver Sueme: Yes, thank you, Oliver here. I'm having a look at the document that you called internet governance PDF. And according to that graph, it seems like One Net is the only way of access if we want to put some content into the Brazil conference, into the Brazil meeting, and everything goes together at the point where you have one net in that document. Is that the -- what all of us understand is the official way to get input into the Brazil conference? Does it always have to go or does it always end in One Net and then One Net transports our contributions and our input into the Brazil conference? Or are there also ways? And second part of the question, is that a mutual understanding on behalf of

ICANN and of One Net and the ISTAR organizations that this is the way to contribute to the Brazil conference?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Oliver. Very good questions indeed. I don't know if anyone has any answers to them let. Let's bank them for the time being and I'll give the floor to Ken Stubbs. And in the meantime, if anybody is able to provide some input with regards to these questions from Oliver, I would appreciate that they get into the queue. Ken Stubbs, you have the floor.

Ken Stubbs: Thank you very much, Olivier. There some serious issues here around what may be implied in this chart. First of all, the ability to contribute does not necessarily imply to dialogue within the discussion. We need to ensure that the perspectives that are developed in this working group are open for and available to a dialogue that would go on within the Brazil meeting. I would hate to have a situation where our output became nothing but a report and then it became the responsibility of some sort of a representative to decide what was important in that report, and not be able to, as the -- we all are aware that there's going to be a lot of fluidity in this Brazil meeting. And we need to ensure that we have the ability to work within that format. And we need to get from whoever is coordinating this meeting, either on ICANN's behalf, or the meeting, whoever is actually sponsoring the meeting, we need a lot of clarity on the format for participation within the meeting itself. So hopefully that's something that can come out of the group early on and that it would be some sort of a formal request for clarification. Thanks for hearing me out.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Ken. Very well noted and whilst you were speaking, I saw that Sally Costerton put her hand up. I first have Rafik Dammak before Sally. So I'll give the floor to Rafik and then Sally Costerton afterwards. Rafik, you have the floor.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Olivier. So just to clarify, I think One Net is an existing initiative, which is supposed to go beyond the Brazil meeting and is not supposed to be the only channel. For to give input to the Brazil meeting, my understanding there is already a deadline the 1st of March and it's open to everybody. So we can work as a community to provide maybe it's up to us to decide what kind of format is -- we cannot provide input. So we don't need to go through One Net. I think that (inaudible) qualification.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Rafik. That's noted as well. And next is Sally Costerton.

Sally Costerton: Thank you, Olivier. I'm happy to do as much as I can to clarify some of these questions with the caveat that (inaudible) finally agreed with PGI, who were the hosts. But in the interest of -- and I anticipate that happening in the next probably 48 hours. To the question about clarity on how this fits together and participation, I was on a call earlier today with the ICANN communications team. Now, One Net, ICANN are participants in One Net, but as Olivier pointed out, we're obviously not One Net. It's not just ICANN. But we want to do what we can to help clarify the communications side. And we are working on a piece of communication which will probably be around about the end of next week on trying to explain to the best of our ability how all these things fit together from a sort of organizing principle point of view, if that's the right way of thinking about it. A little bit like Olivier (inaudible) mind map. Maybe a mind map is the right way of doing it.

And secondarily, how community members can participate to each of the streams separately and where we may take content, we may flip content from platform to platform. Now, the obvious example of that would be that one of the things that One Net and the Brazil conference, and also I think probably ultimately the independent panel will have in common is a discussion about future governance models for the internet. So it doesn't make sense to have all those conversations happening in sort of different silos, essentially the same conversations. But neither do we want to streamline it to the point where there's only one conversation happening.

So we need to find a balance between those two things and that's probably going to be about designing the website in an intelligent way so that it's clear for people where to contribute. But just to stress the point I put in the chat, certainly I can say from the Brazil meeting (inaudible), which the one I'm hosting (inaudible) with, there will be a separate website set up by CGI to take ideas in about the conference in terms of what kind of models the people think are important, what kind of principles, what kind of framework, because those are the two primary strands as you know for the Brazil conference, future guiding principles and future institutional framework. And the idea at the moment is that those will stay open until about the beginning of March and there will then a process of (inaudible) and distillation, if you like, that will -- sorry, interrupting, that will make it easier for people to see what some of those ideas going into conference would be.

So it's still in flux. What we -- the next key stage for the Brazil conference is the nomination of the committee members of the, I think, many of you are on the One Net list then you've seen the four proposed committees that were in the original release. So that process is happening right now and Idela (ph) is coordinating that on the One Net list. I hope that's helpful and I'm happy to take any questions. I can't guarantee I can answer them, but I'm certainly very happy to take them.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Sally, for the very, very helpful feedback on where we are at the moment with One Net and with the overall Brazil conference. Are there any questions for Sally or any comments so far? I see the group chat is quite busy. The problem is that the group chat is probably a centimeter high on my screen, which is pretty hard to read. But that's something I'll have to get used to. I see Rafik Dammak has his hand up. Rafik, you have the floor.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. So I want to add, Sally, if we want also to give input to the (inaudible) panel, at least the high level panel will have started working, I mean maybe from tomorrow. So I think it's more realistic for us to work towards giving input for the Brazil conference. And then we can focus. Otherwise, if we try to give input to several panel, it will be really complicated for us in a short time and I'm not sure that we can handle that. But I'm open to a discussion from the rest of the members here.

Sally Costerton: Yes, Rafik, just, I think that's a valid point. What we're discussing at the moment, and I don't know exactly where the (inaudible), but I think it would be a smart idea to share the output of the panel discussion online as soon as possible after the panel has met so that that can then be open for community discussions. So and it's an intricate process. I think the panel is planning to meet more than once. So there will be -- while it may be too difficult to do it in the next two hours, (inaudible) helpful, I think just because I'm not sure that it's clear what the input should look like, I think there will be plenty of opportunity as we go through the next few months. That's my understanding of the situation. I hope that's helpful.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Rafik and thank you, Sally for this. I have Ken Stubbs in the queue next.

Ken Stubbs: I apologize because I'm forced to have to ask the question because the group chat room is really very poorly designed. So I'll just ask you if you make arrangements to have the link to the One Net mail list subscription posted somewhere on the site here or emailed to those of us who have not had the opportunity to subscribe yet. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Ken. That's a very good point and maybe we can have this as an action item for staff to add this to our own wiki page. In fact, I think it will be important to have the list of the people on this working group, the list of observers, and of course all of the relevant links to our new, I should call it, our new ecosystem that we're putting together or that we're going to live in, in the next few weeks and months in the run-up to the Brazil meeting. So certainly, a link to the different mailing lists would be very

helpful indeed and we'll keep that -- we'll put that as an action item. Is that noted? I gather it's Renate who is taking the action items?

Renate De Wulf: Yes, I'll take the action items.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you. Next, we have Robert Guerra. Robert, you have the floor.

Robert Guerra: HI. I just wanted to maybe summarize two quick comments that I made. I think one is it would be great to get a sense of the scope of what the different inputs and different processes are as we go forward, and I hear there will be more definitions or more detail coming in the next couple of days. So I think that's a good one. I think being herpes on too many of the lists related to the Brazil meetings, I personally am overwhelmed with the amount of information, multiple posts, et cetera. And I think what could be useful if we're creating yet another space for discussion that perhaps we try to create one thing of value, which is aggregating some of the key details, some of the key dates for the community who may not have time to be on the eight or nine different lists that have been set up for the Brazil meeting. So that would help those from different constituencies and others that, frankly, I don't think have the time, but really want to participate in a strategic way.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Robert. I totally agree with you, Olivier speaking, totally agree with you, with the overwhelming amount of volume on the list. And cross posting, as well, is another real concern at the moment. I don't get one copy, but two, three, sometimes four copies of the same email going by different lists and so on. There needs to be a bit of (inaudible) on this. This, obviously, the list that we have is, I would hope, not going to be carbon copied with all of the other lists out there. The scope, really, of our work is going to be a lot more reduced, I guess. And so hopefully we're able to -- we'll be able to just focus on the tasks that we have at hand.

We've got some good discussion and good notes here from what we have so far. An interesting thought, and I was going to ask Sally. I know that the format of the Brazil meeting hasn't really been set up and so on. But Ken Stubbs did mention a dialogue to be needed within the Brazil meeting. I mean do you have any idea of whether there will be actual direct dialogue or is the Brazil meeting all going to take place a little bit like other non-ICANN, non-IETF, non-W3C meetings, if you know, the ones who met in Dubai in December type meetings where everything comes in as documents that are brought forward and then discussed and amended face to face.

Sally Costerton: It's a good question, Olivier. I don't know definitively the answer to that. The second committee, which is really the organizing committee, will have that task of defining the format of the meeting and also making some decisions about how to -- exactly what the format of the recommendations, the documents will be, which is really obviously to the last point. There is a strong desire that I've heard expressed from TGI to keep the meeting very interactive, to have a high level of remote access for people that can't be there in person, which feels more like an IGF, more like an ICANN meeting, if you will, (inaudible) and less like a (inaudible).

And I think it will probably, this is quite personal for you, I imagine it will end up being a little bit more recommendation document driven perhaps than an ICANN meeting because the workup for us is designed to gather a (inaudible) of what people think are the priorities, the best ideas and so forth. What we're looking at on the One Net website, which I'm not fully up to speed with whether we've managed to deliver this or not, but it's some kind of mechanism, a little bit like the idea of a Facebook like on the (inaudible) so you can start to see the areas that people are really engaging in and the things that is getting the most traction. And that will help us sort of focus on the key topics.

But I'm sorry not to be able to give you a better answer. But I think it will be -- the other thing that I would say, which is relevant is there are, of course, a number of meetings

before Brazil and after Brazil, and my expectation will be that the topics will be discussed everywhere, not just in the Brazil meeting, if that makes sense. So for example, at the ICANN meeting in March, for example.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Sally. Olivier speaking. Just touching on this, you mentioned other meetings. Would it not be a better idea first for this cross-community working group to focus on that one meeting that we've got on the Brazil as being a target? I've heard others today already mentioned it.

Sally Costerton: Sorry, could you just say that again? I got interference.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Just speaking about different -- you spoke just now about different meetings that were taking place and the input from this working group that might be helpful to go these different meetings. Would it not be better to just focus on the Brazil meeting for the time being so we don't go in all directions? We have a real deadline on this we need to be clear about where we stand by then.

Sally Costerton: Yes, of course, Olivier. I'm sorry. I don't want to be confusing. Absolutely. I think this working group should focus on that. All I was trying to say is that it won't be the only opportunity to have a dialogue about some of these (inaudible) issues.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Sally. The other question that came into the chat, which is actually a follow-up from what Robert Guerra had mentioned, was the idea to be able to curate some of the information that has come through. And you've mentioned in there that you are currently, your department is currently looking into this?

Sally Costerton: Yes. That's my understanding. At least the teams that are looking at the One Net side are looking at how do we actually aggregate I think is the right word, not just what people are talking about at the moment, and what recommendations they would have maybe (inaudible), but what's been written historically. Because as this group well knows, these topics have been discussed on and off for probably a decade.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you. I think a decade is an understatement. For some people lives have been affected by this. Any other questions or comments for this part of the call? I don't see anyone so far. So what I had, what I've taken from this discussion we've had so far is that there's still plenty of confusion as to where we stand and with regards to the actual format of the Brazil meeting, and that we will be finding out in the next few days more details about the format of the Brazil meeting, which would obviously help us in formulating our goal. And I have heard also some concerns that this working group should not be actually producing just only documents that could come out, but should also foster dialogue and dialogue not only through the One Net, but through the various paths that are being used, that can be used into internet governance and into the Brazil meeting.

I'm not quite sure if I've summarized well. I don't know how to take a poll or find out yet or no, but if anybody highly disagrees at the moment, could they just shout out, please, and chime in on this. Okay. So seeing no one chime on this, another thing that I wanted to touch on quickly was just the, well, actually, we can probably touch on that afterwards in the charter section. I do realize we have 20 minutes left. So maybe it is judicial now to move onto the next section in our call, and that is the charter, and I hand the floor over to Rafik Dammak for this who has prepared along, thankfully, with the help of Mikey O'Connor (ph), the first, I wouldn't even call it a draft, I think we're just looking at a skeleton of a possible charter. Rafik, you have the floor.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Olivier. I'm not sure how I can open the link here in Lucid, but --

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: You click on it.

- Sally Costerton: Just click on it.
- Rafik Dammak: Okay.
- Sally Costerton: And, by the way, sorry to interrupt you, Rafik, but everybody can click on it on their own screen. It doesn't have to be done by the driver.
- Rafik Dammak: Okay. So the basic idea is not to have a draft charter, but it's more kind of a problem statement and (inaudible) several equation that we need to answer and trying to define this call, what we want to deliver and so on. So I think as we can see, this document is (inaudible). And we can start from it to provide I think a light charter. As Olivier explained this before, we cannot spend so much time on drafting charter. So we have several questions. We try to reply to some of them. It's not necessarily that we covered all of them. But just if we can start. So in the first, in the problem status, trying to first is to try what -- to understand what kind of problem we want to solve and to cover the chronology that led us to this context. And also to try to cover which stakeholder should be included in this process. For example, should we also try to include groups who are not part of the ICANN and try to see how the SO, AC stakeholder groups can help to reach the respective communities outside ICANN, and channel their input in our process.
- So there are several questions and like, for example, one of the point that maybe we need to discuss is now we have Olivier and me, we are doing this facilitation work. But also, we may need co-chairs (ph) that they will direct the itself, and also, how to say, in the case, we need to work with the rest of the AC SO constituency stakeholder group's chair. So we need to discuss or to define quickly how we should handle this.
- So also like regarding this call is really to discuss about the participation of the Brazil meeting, maybe to identify the representatives, but I think that can be controversial point. And also, develop mechanism how participant can be informed and so how they can participate in the process, and how they can provide input. And also, in the scope is to try to work in a position paper and to put them on the wiki. So we need really to use the wiki space to share our input there and to develop the content. So we may have a lot of discussions on mailing list, but the wiki space is the area where we need to put our input that we may deliver later.
- So also, that's why we (inaudible) again about the panel. We think that maybe the internet, how do you say, high level, how do you say, high-level panel is maybe out of scope. So (inaudible) open for discussion. I don't think that's it maybe I can go through the whole this (inaudible), but I think we try to answer some questions. And maybe we miss it some of them, but I think we can start from there. And I welcome any feedback or questions and how we can move from there to draft the chart in short time and so we can focus on the more substantive discussion.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Rafik. It's Olivier speaking. I've had a note from some people who do not actually have the access to the wiki itself, and unfortunately the charter points to the wiki. So just for your information, I will be making a PDF copy of the charter in a moment and loading it onto the conference system that we have here. Just a little difficult to work with, something new. Any questions or thoughts on Rafik, what Rafik has said so far? I see the queue is empty for the time being. Evan Leibovitch, you have the floor.
- Evan Leibovitch: Thanks very much, Olivier and Rafik. I guess what my main concern about this is I see the work that's been done on the charter. I guess this refers back to the stuff that Mikey was doing, right? It's a lot of questions and it doesn't have an objective. My main concern is that we're going to be spending a lot of time answering questions and dealing with issues and some that certainly duplicative of what other groups are doing. For this effort to have some real teeth, I think it needs to have a specific objective. At the end of this, when we're done, what are we going to have? Is it going to be a deliverable? Is it

going to be a report? Is it going to be representation? Is it going to be something else? When we were originally sitting in the room between ALAC and NCSG that we're trying to figure out how to deal with this, we were trying to answer the previous day's challenge from Fadi (ph) regarding getting the community together to try and come back with showing -- for lack of a better term, term insurance seems he's asking the community to come up with a defense of multi-stakeholderism. And I'm not sure if everyone else in the group seems to take that form, but it seems that -- the unspoken thing here seems to be that we are all trying to figure out how to defend multi-stakeholderism over a concerted and fairly relentless attack on it in the name of multilateralism.

So that's my two cents on this. I would really like to take the charter that is up there that is referred to on the wiki, that is really a series of questions. And I think much sooner rather than later. We have to turn that into what is our intended result, what is the intended deliverable, what are we going to be able to say, either we accomplished what we set out to do or we didn't. I'm really concerned about this just being more than a talkfest and I really don't want that to happen. For it to be something more than a talkfest, there has to be a specific objective and some specific deliverables. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Evan. Next is Michele Neylon.

Michele Neylon: Hi, everyone. Just doing something, which I rarely do, I'm agreeing strongly with Evan. One of the issues that I've had trying to get my head around this entire thing, which also would help me to drum up support and volunteers in the registrar stakeholder group was trying to understand what the actual objective was because there seems to be a lot of stuff going on and people running around the place worried about things, but nobody seems to be able to clearly state this group's objective is X. And from my perspective, I don't have the time or the energy to try and work out what the hell the objective is. I need somebody to tell me categorically this is the objective, these are the parameters. I mean as others have pointed out, there's a lot of discussion going on in other mailing lists and at other groups. And speaking of the One Net thing, as I put in the chat, does anybody know if there's any way to remove from the trolls from that list? Because oh my God, they're sucking up -- sucking the air out of the room. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Michele. I will contact you afterwards to set up a kill list in your emailer that will send those trolls to the never listened to mailbox.

Michele Neylon: With all due respect, Olivier, I know how to do that. But I mean, the thing is that you've got people who are trying to participate in these things and if you -- if somebody isn't there to remove the obstreperous ones, it means that people's participation is going to be reduced. That's the reality. I mean I know how to -- I can just tell my sys admins block all email from address X, but it is an issue.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: You're absolutely correct, Michele, and I guess on the One Net list that would be something to take up with Adele (ph) and with the NROs, finding out what the accepted standards of behavior are, et cetera. On our own cross-community working group, of course, we're bound by the ICANN expected standards of behavior. So hopefully, there would be the ability to remove any troll that might decide to ingrain themselves within the working group.

Rafik, yes, you may wish to provide an answer on Michele's point of view. Rafik, you have the floor.

Rafik Dammak: I don't have answer for trolls. I think that's what I want to be pursuing, but to reply to Evan, yes, sure, we need objectives and I guess we could ask a facilitator to give that. We are trying to kind of -- to do this kickoff, to start the process, but at the end we need the member here to quickly give -- to think about the objectives, what we want to deliver. So I don't see any contradiction (ph) to already you give some input, maybe you can add that to the wiki. And so we can move forward, but that's what I can say.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Rafik. Just coming back to Michele, you mentioned a clear set of objectives. Are you asking for a clear set of -- that we effectively look at what is the clear set of objectives for the Brazil meeting, what is the clear set of objectives for One Net, what is the clear set of objectives for this working group?

Michele Neylon: Michele speaking. Olivier, just from my perspective, even if it is within this particular group, because if I have to go back to the registrars and say, look, there's a working group, but I can't tell you clearly what the actual objective of it is. I mean I managed to shake loose one volunteer, but from the registrar side at the moment, the kind of general feeling is that we're completely overloaded. So unless I can kind of pull it down into something really simple and straightforward, this is the objective, this is what the output is, I mean obviously, stuff that's outside ICANN's scope is something that I wouldn't expect Olivier or anybody else to be able to answer questions about that.

But just more to be able to kind of say, right, categorically this is what it's about. This is precisely what a can and can't do, if that makes sense.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Michele. It does make sense and I guess it's a question that's on many of our minds and that will probably be the first task of this working group, and as you said yourself, the goal. I hear a lot of questions. I'm hoping we can have some suggestions. I've got Holly Raiche and William Drake in the queue at the moment. Holly, you have the floor. Or did you just put your hand down?

Holly Raiche: I agree with (inaudible) totally. I agree with Evan and Michele. What would be very helpful for everybody is on that list of questions to start off with what is the Brazil meeting, what are the items on the agenda, what are the things we are either concerned about or not concerned about, a bit of background so that when people can go to the charter, there's enough information to make people understand why we think it's an issue and what we think is going to happen or not. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Holly. That's another question out there, what is the Brazil meeting. Next, we have Bill Drake,.

William Drake: Hello. Hi, I missed much of the front end of this meeting. I got held up so I probably have missed some points that I'm about to step on again. But anyway, with regard to the purpose, it seems to me that insofar as the Brazilian meeting has the very clear objective of trying to adopt some kind of a declaration of principles about internet governance, it's perfectly fine for me, if I have to, to just work through the usual civil society channels to try and get some cooperation there, both inside and outside of ICANN. But I think it would be a lot more powerful and a lot more useful to the organizers if we were to actually come up with something that was a broad community kind of position.

And if we're talking about broad principles, I would think that there ought to be some things that we actually could agree on. If we were to try to take on something like what is globalization, and how should it happen, and when should it happen, and particularly with regard to the U.S. government roles, I'm sure we probably wouldn't have a strong level of agreement across the community and that would go nowhere. But if we're talking about just sort of a broad set of principles that are relative to the role of multi-stakeholders and the role of intergovernmental frameworks, and states, and things like that, where I think we could get some agreement then that might be worth doing.

The other point I would make to you, we will have, NCUC will have a policy conference in Singapore but we would like to make it more of a community wide conference if we can, get more people engaged and so on. It will have, I think, probably sessions that will be focused on each of the main elements of the Brazilian agenda, the stuff about mechanisms for dealing with emerging issues, principles, globalization, and so on. And we would certainly say that I don't expect that every SO, AC, or constituency, or

stakeholder group would all agree enough on a lot of things to do joint positions on some of those things. But it would be great if we even had individual positions, like if people wanted to submit short statements or something like that for discussion in that context. Maybe this cross-community dialogue would stimulate some thinking within groups about that, about exactly what their positions are. So those positions might not be coordinated or harmonized and that's fine. The least we could use this opportunity, and I will stop, as a way of surfacing and aggregating our own viewpoints if we've never had the reason to do so. I'll stop there. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Bill. I realize time is ticking and we only have a few minutes left of this call. I wanted to hear maybe from some people who haven't spoken so far on what you just mentioned here and on their view as to what the group's objective would be, bearing in mind of course this can all be also put down on the charter page and discussed on the charter page afterwards. Does anybody have to add anything at the moment? I don't see anyone with an answer at the moment. We probably will need to mull over this, but I guess that's an action item that we can have for everyone on the call and the working group to provide their point of view as to what the goals of this working group should be. That will certainly give us a number of avenues that we can then explore together and then I guess focus on afterwards.

And it might be that we have more than one goal. In fact, I should think that this community would have more than one goal. I see Sarah Falvey has put her hand up. So Sarah, you have the floor.

Sarah Falvey: Thank you so much. I just want to agree with what Bill just said, but also sort of caution the group. The Brazil meet, there's a lot of moving parts that are all moving in parallel, which makes this incredibly difficult for all the reasons that everyone has already mentioned. I think we definitely don't want to wait, and this is not what Bill was suggesting, so I'm not saying that, but we definitely don't want to wait until Singapore to sort of kind of have an idea of what's going on. I think it's going to be really important for this group to coalesce around some ideas of what we want to do and start moving forward, because the meeting in Brazil is coming up really quickly and a lot of the strategy panels and sort of how ICANN is engaging in this process is already moving forward.

And so I think the longer that we take to sort of get our ideas together and start moving forward, I think we're going to miss that window of opportunity to actually be able to engage and influence the process. And because it's moving so quickly, I think we definitely need to have our group move as quickly as sort of what's going on around us. And so I just sort of want to -- I'm happy to do anything. Obviously, I think everyone is very dedicated. I think we need to try to move forward as quickly as possible so that we're sort of in the mix and making sure that our voices are being heard.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Sarah. Much appreciated as well. I would therefore take it as a couple of action items then. The first one, as I've just mentioned, for the -- for all those in the working group to come up with a set of goals and present them to everyone so as to see where we have consensus and where we might have goals that need to be achieved. The second one, I was going to suggest that this group would be receiving a full, I wouldn't say full report but a summary of the discussions that will have taken place at the high level meeting in London tomorrow and the day after. I don't know if that's possible, Sally, or how quickly a summary could be possible so that this group is well informed about what's been going on in this parallel track.

Sally Costerton: Yes, I will put a request in to the team organizing that, Olivier, and I will let you know.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. That would be great. And then I see the, Bill's suggestion in the chat, which is that the cross-community working group would stimulate discussion and writing. There was a discussion, well, the initial discussion between the NGS and the ALAC was for

papers to be drafted by several people into -- and that would then be put on the wiki for a discussion. That certainly is a parallel track that could take place as well. All we need, really, is for the different communities to start drafting papers. But I would say the first step I guess is going to just be us coming out with the goals, really, of what we want this group to achieve. And once we've got some premise of goals and first steps into this, that will certainly give us something to discuss and to work on, and to focus on.

Any other -- and I guess at this point, I hand back perhaps to Rafik, if you have anything else to add with regards to the charter and which way you want to move forward on this.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, I think in the chat you already asked people to send their comments (inaudible) and this will be also good to share that and (inaudible) also in the wiki. So we can work on the charter. The other point, I think it's more kind of administrative stuff. We need to set a regular call, a weekly call, and I guess we need some rotation to share the (inaudible). And so just this kind of stuff that we need to agree on maybe quickly.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Rafik. It's Olivier speaking. What I was going to suggest is that the call we have today is probably the last one of the year. I'm not sure that we'll -- does anyone feel like have a call next week again? Robert Guerra?

Robert Guerra: I think really going to Sarah's comment, this is moving very quickly. And I think making sure that we have good information flow. If there's a meeting coming up the next few days, my personal choice would be before the holidays there should be at least one of these more interactive exchanges to really set the agenda for the new year. Things are going to move incredibly quickly in the new year, and we've not even discussed that, and that's maybe something that we should do in the next call.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Robert. Point taken. I see Evan Leibovitch.

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks, Olivier. I'd like to make a suggestion for something that has worked well for at large and in other realms where I've worked, which is the idea of having a group, either a Skype chat or a Google Hangout, which has the members of this list that are capable of participating in real time. That allows to have meetings that take, you know, informal gatherings that get together when various people are capable of being online without obligating everybody to be in the same place at the same time. It allows for some very interesting exchanges. It allows for timely information to be presented and to allow people to react to it very quickly. It isn't -- this kind of vehicle isn't everyone's cup of tea, but perhaps for those that are good at working with it, the idea of having some kind of a real time place to be such as a Google Hangout or a Skype group chat might be a good idea to facilitate people getting involved without having to have formal meetings in place. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Evan, and that's the time when I wish I had the ability to see if people agreed or disagreed with this by seeing green ticks or red crosses. I'm afraid this software doesn't appear to have it. Anyone vehemently against this? I don't see anyone being vehemently against that. So let's take it that there will be a Skype chat or a Google Hangout, whichever the two is preferable.

Evan Leibovitch: Let's pick one now.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I'm okay with a Skype chat and I'm saying Skype chat because that's probably the first thing that comes up to my mind. And of course, this is something, which is not mandatory for people. If you want to join, you may join. If you don't wish to join the Skype chat, that's fine too. I expect that the discussions taking place in the Skype will not replace the discussions that will take place on the mailing list.

I note that we are five minutes over the limit and this Lucid system is starting to flash nasty things at me. So I better make sure we move on. I hear from Robert, meeting, a call

next week will be desirable. Let's go forward then with having a doodle (ph) for a call next week and hopefully, we will have feedback from the London Conference by then. So that could be one of the agenda items to discuss. And then after that, the calls after I would suggest perhaps the first week or second week of, well, time is quick, isn't it, first week of January. And that would probably have to be rotated as well at some point. I'm afraid I don't know whether you all agree or not, but I don't hear anyone tell me that's terrible and I'm a slave driver.

- Louis Lee: This is Louis. We found that the first week of January is typically very tough to try to hold a meeting because of limited participation just getting back from everything.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, thank you, Louis. That's a good point, especially since the first week of January starts on a Wednesday. Could we start the first full week of January? So we're speaking about the week starting the 6th of January?
- Louis Lee: That sounds good.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Excellent. So we've got the next two calls roughly. We know what week they're in, next week and the first, well, the week starting the 6th of January 2014. I thank you all for this call. Any other business? I don't see anyone (inaudible).
- Unidentified Participant: Thank you very much, Olivier.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: If I could just ask before we close off, Renate, to read back the action items for us, please.
- Renate De Wulf: Okay. The first one is for everyone on the working group on this call to provide what they think should be the goal of this working group and to send it to the email list. The working group should receive a summary discussion of the high-level panel meeting in London hopefully for next week's call. We will try and set up a Skype chat or Google meeting room for informal real-time chat and we will set up the next two calls for next week and the second week of January.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Fantastic. Thank you very much, Renate. And just for any of you who are currently on the call but are not on the mailing list, there was a discussion as to how many people from each SOACSG could be on the -- in the working group. I think the consensus was that four was palatable to most people, or to everyone, was okay. Three was better but four was okay. Some communities have more than four people, but the rest of those people will be observers. I don't see any objection to having everyone on the mailing list anyway, but as far as the listing of working group members is concerned, we probably will have to stick to these numbers.
- So if you are not on the mailing list, or if you have some of your -- the colleagues that are supposed to be that you've brought forward have not received any of the information that they needed to receive for this meeting, please let Renate De Wulf know and Ergis Ramaj (ph) is the other person. And I guess that in the notes from this meeting, there will be the email addresses of both Renate and of Ergis. With this, I note that we are nine minutes over the limit. I apologize for this small delay in the end of our call. I thank you all and this call is now adjourned. Bye-bye.