

20131220_CCWGINTERNETGOVERNANCE_ID842086

Renate Dewulf: On the phone and in the room we have Alain Bidron, Alexandra Dans, Avri Doria, Cintra Sooknanan, Cheryl Landon-Orr, Hago Dafalla, Keith Davidson, Leon Sanchez, Marilyn Cade, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Olof Nordling, and me.

Naresh Ajwani: Sorry. You have missed out my name, Naresh Ajwani.

Operator: Oh. Nasesh, my apologies.

Naresh Ajwani: Thank you.

Renate Dewulf: And you are in the list, and you are on the call.

Naresh Ajwani: That's right.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Well, thank you very much, Renate, for this roll call. And welcome, everyone. This is the second Internet Cross-Community Working—sorry—Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance, the stage today; the 20th, December, 2013.

I have all sorts of problems at the moment. You'll find the agenda itself, which is a bit of a problem, and it doesn't help also, to be using the—a number of the LUCID meeting page, and for some reason, the agenda on the LUCID meeting page, and for some reason, the agenda on the LUCID meeting is empty. And we still we still (inaudible) what I've got on my screen. I must be on the wrong LUCID meeting. Who knows?

But anyway, it seems to be the right day. What we are going to go and do today, and I'm only doing it from it from memory at the moment, is to have feedback on what's been going on in London, last week. On Friday last week there was a high-level meeting. So there will be some feedback on this by Nora Abusitta, who has joined us on the call. And then afterwards we will look back at the charter and see if we can move it a little bit forward to get that charter—well, the next couple of steps forward with regards to the charter, and address—discuss afterwards if we have a bit of more time—discuss where we are going to go with this working group. Effectively discuss the goals, and as a summary of the discussion that we had last week.

So without any further delay, I hand the floor over to Nora Abusitta, who is going to be able to provide us some details, about the high-level meeting held in London last week. Nora, you have the floor.

Nora Abusitta: Thank you. Thank you, Olivier. This is Nora. I believe that you are all aware of the composition of the finance (ph). So I'm not going to get into that. I can update you a little bit about how London went. It was a very successful meeting. We managed to gather

about 15 of the group panelists. We also invited a few experts to speak to the panelists on various issues. Surely, you know a lot of them, Bertrand de La Chapelle, Bill Drake as well, Sally Wentworth, amongst a few others.

The panelists themselves had come from very varied background, and so we started off the meeting with a backgrounder session that was basically—Vint Cerf spoke for a while about (inaudible) Internet Governance and so on. In the afternoon we divided up the panelists into four streams that basically would look at (inaudible/audio skip)--

Renate Dewulf: Nora, we lost you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We have lost you, Nora.

Nora Abusitta: Hello? Can you hear me?

Renate Dewulf: We can hear, yes. Good.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, we can—we can hear her again, yes. Welcome back. We lost you about 10 seconds ago.

Nora Abusitta: Okay. So I was basically talking about the four tracks that the panelists were divided into, where there was a discussion about, should there be—sorry. First of all I have to tell you that there was general agreement that the name of the panel will change. So the panel now is called, High-Level Panel on Global Internet Corporation Governance Mechanism. So the four tracks that the panelists were divided into were looking at the ecosystem legitimacy, how to ensure the system will be inclusive—multi interest and (inaudible) of state. How do you ensure global participation in this ecosystem from developing regions, specifically, and how this system would coexist with other governance systems.

Every track was moderated by an expert, and then the panelists basically brainstormed the requirements that would fulfill these subjects. So, at the end of the London meeting, the panelists came up with a long list of requirements that they believe should be present in Internet Governance Ecosystem. And right now we are in the process of gathering our drafting team, which will mostly consist of the experts that were present in London. We've also just added the Hugh Brown (ph) from DiploFoundation, and this group will be supported by senior ICANN staff.

We will have our first face-to-face drafting meeting in the program on the 20th January, hopefully by then we would have had the skeleton for the final report, and we'll start basically drafting the meaty parts of the skeleton, and defining them accordingly.

So, that's the update. We are hoping to have an update on the ICANN website, in the next week or so. As you know, there was a press release that was shared with the community. There was also an e-mail that circulated from one of the observers from DiploFoundation about his observation. So, that's it for me.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Nora, for this summary of what happened in London, and about the different sessions. I think we can have—since we've only been on this agenda item for about five minutes or so, we can have some questions. Over to you, from participants.

Now, in order to ask a question, you need to be using the LUCID meeting room, and lift your hand. There is a way wait, and (inaudible) people asking question or something, and that will constitute a queue, by which people will be able to ask questions on this.

Marilyn Cade: Olivier, sorry, it's a point of order question from Marilyn.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I recognize the voice. Marilyn Cade, you have the floor.

- Marilyn Cade: I must ask you to modify your suggestion that you only get to ask a question if you're in some form of communication that allows you to electronically lift your hand, since not all of us are on that mechanism. And be sure that you also take a few of them, just so that they are different kinds of communication, so.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Marilyn, it's Olivier. I'd be absolutely happy to take questions from people who are not on LUCID either. So you've raised your voice, that's the way to do it. And you're in the queue, and you may therefore speak.
- Marilyn Cade: Okay. And I'm happy to be in the queue after others. I just needed to note that that was the limitation I faced with where I am right now. Very quickly, thanks to all, and my apologies for not being the first call. And so my voice my voice may be very new to some of you. And thanks very much for the report. I have two clarifying questions.
- First of all, I did want to ask this question earlier. Is this call being recorded and transcribed, and if not, then I'll just type the comments as it should be, and it's debated now, but come back to it later on, on other issues. My question is related specifically to Nora's report. Has to do with, when Nora said, that 15 of X-number of panelists, and I'm sorry, I can't remember the full number, were present, plus a few extras, will the details on who was able to participate, be included in what I expected to see as a report? And I think, actually, it's not a gesture that would be a written report, and will those details be included in that report?
- Renate Dewulf: First of all, the call is being recorded and is being transcribed. Alexandra Dans is also taking notes, which will be added to the LUCID room and which will be posted also in the Wiki room.
- Nora Abusitta: Marilyn Cade, this is Nora. Thank you for the question. Yes. We will be sharing the findings of the panelists that were present in London. I believe those names were in the press release. The press release may have had the full group, but yes, we will be sharing who was there in London. I don't know them right—I can't tell you all 15 right now, but we are happy to share that information.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Nora. It's Olivier speaking. I was going to actually ask, Marilyn, did you ask a question with regards to the recording of the discussion, regarding this call, or regarding the high-level meeting in London?
- Marilyn Cade: Thank you, Olivier. The high-level meeting--
- Nora Abusitta: Ah, sorry. I also—this Nora. I also misunderstood, I thought you were talking the call. The meeting happened under certain house rules, and therefore the discussions will not be shared. We do have detailed reports of what was discussed, and so on and so forth, but we will not be sharing the recording.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Nora. Any other questions? I was going to ask one from Nora. With regard to chat and house rules, is this the mode of operation that the high-level meeting and the group will continue? Or, is it one which was set only for the London Conference, and they will then decide on the mode of operation, the next time they meet face-to-face, or the next time they'll have a telephone conference call?
- Nora Abusitta: Thank you, Olivier. So far it has been agreed, that the meetings will be under certain house rules unless there is consensus. The next meeting for the panelists, by the way, is in Sunnylands (ph), California. And so, if there is consensus at the—you know, when they open the up, and of course we would do that. But so far there are no plans.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you. It's Olivier speaking again. Is there anyone else in the queue to ask questions from Nora, on the meeting that took place in London last week. I'm repeating this for those people who have just make it onto the call. Seeing no one put their hand up,

thank you very much, Nora, for being with us. I understand you have to run, but thank you.

Please do keep us updated about the follow up, and where now—if you just actually, before you go, let us know what's the next plan, the immediate plan for that high-level meeting. Are they doing to have intersessional (ph) meetings as well, or calls, for the meeting in Singapore?

Nora Abusitta: So, currently the plan is for the drafting team to start working on the requirements that were identified by the panelists. We would have weekly exchanges and updates via e-mail. The panelists will meet on the 27th and 28th of February in Palm Springs, California, and their final meeting will be in Dubai on May 4th and 5th, I believe. Where, hopefully, by then they would have concluded their report. Between meetings, the exchanges will be solely via e-mail and conference calls.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you. Well, I think we've got--

Renate Dewulf: Ah, you're welcome.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: -- full details. So, thanks very much, joining us, Nora.

Nora Abusitta: Thank you, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And we can now move into the next part of our meeting, and that's the update from last week's call. We've been—have no idea how to move forward through it. Ah, well, there we go. We can magically move forward to it.

So the update from last week's call. I did ask during last week's call about the goals of this working group, and effectively against a few—a little run down of what Rafik and I were doing to create everything, and to get ourselves at home, I guess. Ourselves, as in the WHO Group, at home on the Wiki, et cetera, et cetera.

I'm going to ask Renate to provide us with a little bit of background as to what have been done on the Wiki side of things, and as far as, basically, preparing this for our future work. And also a check what the overall list of participants is, and where it is, et cetera. Nora? Sorry, Nora—Renate, would you be able to do that for us, please.?

Renate Dewulf: Yes. I've been working with Elgie Ramage (ph) to set up the Wiki page according to more specific needs that you've asked for this working group. It's still a work-in-progress, we are trying to set up that there will be pages (inaudible) for the meetings where you'll be able to access the meeting notes, the participants list, the agenda. We also hope to be able to plug in the chat notes. All of that, of course, is still available each time in the LUCID room, and you can always go back to any previous meetings to look at everything.

We have also set up the LUCID room between participants and observers, and ICANN—and actually the Wiki page also has the whole list of participants. I think it needs to be updated because one or two people have joined, but that's about it from my side.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much. Would you be able to put in the chat where those Wiki pages are? Of course at the moment (inaudible)--

Renate Dewulf: Of course, I will do that right now. Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Olivier, I would--

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Marilyn, please go ahead. You have the floor.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. I guess I'm very confused about—and I do apologize for missing the first meeting—but I'm very confused about, very, an experience I'm having. And that is, the requirement to have a password to access any documents at ICANN that is read-only. And I want to just raise the suggestion. And I understand this was made at some other discussions before I got here. But I do want to raise the suggestion that a full commitment to transparency and accountability would support that read-only documents be available without passwords.

And I don't know if that has been discussed, we can come back to it, but I think we want to advance, for this group, and all groups, that read-only documents are fully available without passwords, and in an archive. Not post, that's not what I'm asking, right? But to use an example, Olivier, I think the ALAC documents, and certainly the GP—I'm sorry—the gTLD Policy Council documents, or guides, are fully available via read-only, with no passwords.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Marilyn. I'm not sure, we haven't actually discussed this last week but—it's Olivier speaking—but one of the things though, I do believe that there is support for transparency in this working group. One of the problems we've got at the moment, are the teething problems with using LUCID, and trust me, I'm not particularly happy with LUCID because of the password element, and the difficulty with which it is—to find the link to actually get on this darn call, and to get more information on it.

With regards to the Wiki, I was under the impression that it was actually entirely open. Of course it would help--

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: --if I could actually have a link to Wiki, which at the moment I don't have. So I couldn't even tell you if it's open today or not. But I would imagine that it's open to everyone, and for everyone to look at. I have to ask Renate or Egis Ramanshorn (ph) on this, because I'm not aware of the restrictions that might be imposed on this.

Renate Dewulf: As far as I understood, the community Wiki page can be accessed by everyone. It is true you need to log in with a password, but anyone can do it. It's not restricted.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Renate.

Renate Dewulf: I can check further with IT and with Egis, he's more the specialist, I am not, but I can find--

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You can find out.

Renate Dewulf: --what can be done.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Well there's one discussion that I did have for you--

Renate Dewulf: Yeah. You forgot to take--

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm looking at the dashboard, the ICANN dashboard, and at the moment if you click onto the Cross Community tab, there is a Digital Engagement project, the Trademark Clearinghouse, IAG, the WHOIS IRD, where in the world is this working group that we are part of?

Renate Dewulf: I must admit, the first time I had a lot of difficulties in finding it too. I'm trying to access the page now myself. Just a moment, please.

Marilyn Cade: So, Olivier, I'm actually—it's Marilyn, I'm actually going to make a proposal that, rather than dealing with solving this now, if this part says comment with issues, I'd be happy to

talk with others offline. But if the goal is simply transparency and access at least for, you know, external users then we could then come back with advice to the ICANN staff. Would that be a useful approach?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. Thank you. That would certainly be fine. I think the intent is, as you described it, it's just a case of actually making it happen right now. So we'll just have to do a follow up with you, and maybe on the next call, next month, we will be able to come back with good news, and know exactly where we are on this.

I was actually going to ask, just prior to moving forward, slowly with this, whether there was anyone on the call, who thought the opposite. Who thought, well, no we need to keep all of this closed.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: Olivier, Cheryl here. And I don't believe that. But I also can't find the blasted place to put up my hand in this stupid room, so I'm breaking in, and I do apologize for that. So far I've found a list of people with the ability that the queue is empty, and an awful lot of other crap, but there we go.

I actually don't understand something that Renate said, and that is that you would need to have a logon to get into the Wiki at all. Any of the conference's users, as I understand it, and I would certainly, not only support Marilyn, but suggest we all should be agreeing to this here and now. But this work group should be on a totally open and public Wiki and with the only reason one would ever need to log on with one's (inaudible) and password, would be if one wished to edit a page.

But in the absence of wanting to edit a page, or make a comment where your comments are annotated to your login, I tend to log in, so that know it's me, not anonymous talking, but it should be exactly as you suggest, Marilyn. It should be 100% open-to-read access, and no requirement for any form of passwords at all.

Now, yes, if you want to edit the page, you will need to log on, and certainly you should be encouraged to log on, if you've got the log on. And so anything you comment on is annotated to you. But beyond that, let's just make it happen.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Cheryl. Olivier speaking. I think we are again, are in agreement. I don't see anyone speaking against this being opened up, so I think that's what we will do, and in fact, I can see nobody going against it, we can say there's a consensus on the call, that we move forward with that. Of course, it would be a lot more helpful if I actually had access to the Wiki pages.

Renate, if you could, please, help me on this I—I'm totally unable to find it--

Renate Dewulf: I put it in the chat room, it's--

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You've put it in the chat room? The chat room is the size of, sort of one name--

Cheryl Landon-Orr: No. No. If you think about that--

Unidentified Participant: Okay. Are you on the community--?

Cheryl Landon-Orr: -- as a tab and if (inaudible) would have to take up your whole page, you'll be able to find it, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Here we go. I think I found it, I'm now trying to log in.

Cheryl Landon-Orr: Right.

Marilyn Cade: Point of order.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes. Back to Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I was just going to raise the point of order here. I don't think that is a very helpful approach, Renate, sorry. But I also think we are also setting our wheels on stuff that we need to do offline, because I'm very anxious about the time here. So, could we take a different approach here, where Renate actually sends the information also to Olivier directly, and then we can get to context?

Renate Dewulf: Yes, of course.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. I was just going to say that if I did not have a link to the Wiki, I couldn't actually guide you through anything afterwards, because I was running blind. The next part of this call is the charter, and we need to have access to the charter to be able to talk and ask you questions about this.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So, I think we--

Renate Dewulf: I sent it in Skype (ph), Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah. I've got it now, thank you, Nora—why am I saying Nora—Renate, thank you. I've got it. Okay. So, the next part of our call is looking at the charter, a follow up to last week's call on this. And effectively what do we have, and this is where I will ask you to go onto the Wiki. What we have is a first, very draft charter, which was put together to by Rafik and by Mikey O'Connor, and I think that we can probably just try and go through the initial parts of it. I wonder whether there are any questions or comments. I did ask last week it was possible, if I went to look at it, and to make some comments or suggestions.

I haven't seen anything on the list so far. There might be something that might have come through over the night. So if anybody wishes to take the floor—ah, here we go, we've got the charter on the screen. And as I let you discover it for the next few minutes, so this has got a problem statement, chronology of the situation, how we got there. We've got the—what alternatives to doing this project have we explored, and then the stakeholders are right there, and then which employees, and of course we basically have a whole list of who will take part. Then have they been involved sufficiently with these points. And then, should they be brought into the project.

And then you can continue further down: to what degree do they share the belief that this is a problem that needs to be solve, et cetera, et cetera. And we've got the full listing here. Now the question I would like to ask everyone attending, is whether they believe that this question-and-answer charter is a good base, sorry—the (inaudible) is a good base for starting charter and putting pen to paper and drafting it. Or, whether there's any information on this, that they disagree with, or whether there's anything that might have been missed in this whole listing.

Now whilst you are thinking, in the meantime, I can let you know that Jonathan Robinson, the Chair of the GNSO Council, has e-mailed his SO and AC peers, letting them know that the GNSO Council, and the GNSO, has developed the initial set of recommendations on how to create Cross-Community Working Groups, et cetera. And also has come up with some language along with that, as to the steps to take for the creation of Cross-Community Working Groups.

Now this, I understand, is a GNSO thing, this has not been ratified by any of the other SOs or ACs. So we are in a position, at the moment, where we could still create a Cross-Community Working Group in a pretty much, sort of a ad hoc way that we have done in the past, where the Chairs of the different SOs and ACs will come together and just agree

for the group to start, and then the Chairs will send people, et cetera. But we've already got that group set up now, so I don't know whether we need to have the Chairs of the SOs and ACs ratify this.

I don't know whether we need to have them work on the charter, or get this working group to work on its own charter. These are just questions I'm throwing, at the moment, in the room, and I'm, of course, open for suggestions, and for some help, I guess, into which way you would like to go. Bearing in mind, by the way, that again, both Rafik and myself, Rafik Dammak and myself are just, at the moment are coordinators to get this whole thing—this whole initiative started. And we do hope that then there will be some co-chairs of the working group that we'll send forward from the different component parties of the working group, in order to take it to its destination.

Now, for those of you that weren't on the call last week, yes, we are well aware that the definition is still pretty much very foggy at the moment. But one of the other pieces of work that the members of this working group should, hopefully, have thought about, is where do they think—well, what do they think the deliverables, of the working group itself, are going to be.

Now this charter, the text that you can see on the LUCID room, meeting room at the moment, does have a very slim listing of the scope, size, perspective, and what is in scope and what is not. But of course I think it needs to be expanded. It's got a small subsection on the goals and objectives, and on there it basically shows several points. It's got critical success factors. This is still a very, very early draft.

Marilyn Cade: Olivier? It's Marilyn. Can I raise a question?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Marilyn, please. You have the floor.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And afterwards I'll have Avri Doria, after you. So, Marilyn, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Well, actually, let me defer to Avri, because I've been speaking a lot. I'll defer to anyone else who has asked to speak first.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, Marilyn. Thank you. So, then we have Avri Doria to start, please. Avri, you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Okay. Thank you. Avri speaking. On your question of using the GNSO Council's guidelines, I think that they can be used if they're useful, but I don't see any reason to predicate ourselves, or to try and hearken back to using them. I think that it is reasonable for us to have a charter. I don't know that we need a questionnaire, I think, a charter—and in that charter, I would wonder, is one of the things we would want the—we understand, even though it's not been formalized yet, that there will be a submission requested.

And so, would we want one of our chartered work items to be—consider putting out a contribution to the Brazil meeting, and if so, the doing of it. So, those are two things that I would look for in the—prior to deciding who gets to go, since we don't even know what the participation criteria are going to be yet.

And, you know, maybe we would have to get to that if there's fixed participants from ICANN, and we have to deal with that kind of issues, then sure. But in the meantime, I think that the first thing, once we get past all this, you know, beginning further out, is for the—you know, do we have anything to say, to the content of this meeting, and if so, how do we get it said? Thanks.

- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Avri. It's Olivier speaking. So from what I hear from you, you mentioned about the written contribution to the Brazil meeting from this working group, that could be one of the goals. And then also the question as to which way this group will operate, I guess. And do we need to questionnaire, what are the questions that the group needs to address?
- Avri Doria: No. What I meant is, instead of a charter at the moment, it looks like we have a questionnaire.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Well, I think that--
- Avri Doria: And I'm sort of saying that's not an appropriate charter, in my opinion.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right. I think—and this is again where, unfortunately, I apologize, I'm showing myself, lack of experience in this matter, having not being part of the GNSO Council, nor any of the GNSO stakeholder groups, and it was Rafik that was supposed to take us through this. Unfortunately, Rafik was unable to attend this call. But I understand that the way the suggestion was made, was to actually have this questionnaire and then graduate from the contents of this questionnaire to an actual formatted charter in the way that the charters are usually formatted.
- But as I said, I'm not an expert on this, so that's just my understanding of it. If anybody else on the call knows better, then I'd be very grateful for their explanation. I haven't seen how it goes from this questionnaire to the charter, but hopefully, automatically it would.
- Avri Doria: It's a charter-writing machine. Yay.
- Cheryl Landon-Orr: Well that puts a lot of time back in yours and my world, Avri, what do you make of that, sees himself (inaudible) on the chat.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Back to you Marilyn. And please, Cheryl, behave.
- Cheryl Landon-Orr: Not a hope in hell.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Marilyn, please.
- Marilyn Cade: Thank you. Marilyn Cade. I don't know—it's like—I think my question builds on—my comments build on Avri's comments. First of all, I think it is important that we have an agreement, a consensus across the participants, what the purpose of the group is. And the way it's presented by you now, is that the purpose seems to me to care for ICANN's (inaudible) participation in the upcoming meeting in Brazil.
- The Brazil meeting is a one-off meeting. It has a particular purpose. I'm happy to have that be the purpose of this group, but I think you need to make sure that we have strong consensus for that.
- The second thing, I would just—the last comment on, is there's both contribution, if that's the agreement—there's contribution to inquire—to guidance to ICANN from the community to their role, and comment about the participation of the community itself. So there's a question in my mind here about, feedback to the Board and the management/staff of ICANN from the community about ICANN as an entity participating. And then participation from parties who may represent different positions within the community. Both in planning and also, then, in the actual meeting and any follow-on to the meeting.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Marilyn. I bet staff has been able to catch all this—I think that this question is actually crucial to the good governance of this working group, and certainly to establish the way it will operate, and the kind of format, the output of this working group

will take. So I'm hoping that staff has been able to make notes of your questions and your comments, and then can send this over to the mailing list after this call, so as for us to ponder about this and come back with the suggestions. Because I do find it very hard to think on the spot, right now, at being able to answer those questions.

And I don't see anyone jump forward to do so. We have, next, is Evan Leibovitch in the queue. Evan, you have the floor.

Evan Leibovitch:

Thanks very much, Olivier. I wanted to build on some of what Marilyn was just saying, and put, maybe a couple of other points in it. As I mentioned in the chat room, we've got to be cognizant to the fact that we really don't have a lot of time to work on this. We don't have a lot of time from the chartering, and we really don't have a lot of time to every thrash over what our objectives are. We really need to do this fairly quickly.

If the idea is to have something in hand before Brazil, we are talking at half-a-year, if we are talking about even having an interim thing ready to talk about it as a discussion point in Singapore, we have far less. So, I mean, we've been thrashing about this, and it's taking us quite some weeks even to get to the point of having this conversation right now. We really, I think, need to have what we are doing down to a question that can be expressed in the paragraph. And, Marilyn, you were saying we needed to have some kind of advice, some kind of specific document that we can present to the Board, or to the community, or to whomever it may concern going forward into the Brazil Meeting.

I mean, it was my impression at the beginning that quite simply, we were trying to get together as a community and help ICANN and help the one that—consortium with a robust defense of the Multi-Stakeholder Model. It seems like everything beyond is a frill, and obviously that's very simplistic. You may have to figure out the best way to do that, but having some deadlines, having some things, some deliverables that we need to do, and then working backwards from there, I think is going to emphasize just how little time we have to work with, and just how concentrated we have to make our efforts.

It doesn't help, of course, that we are going to go into what is essentially a two-week deep freeze for a good turn to the world, and then coming up on the Chinese New Year which is going to freeze another chunk of the world. But we have to work around that, but we still have to be cognizant of that.

I'm really going to suggest that whether it's in a Skype chat, or whether it's in e-mails, or whatever, I think we've got to get—the question we are going to answer—nail down by the end of the year. And I think we have to start figuring out, in what form answers are going to take, and who are the targets for that, and then work backwards from that with some hard deadlines, so we have any ideas of what we have to do. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Thank you very much for this, Evan. Taking a few notes at the moment. Next we have Keith Davidson.

Keith Davidson:

Oh. Hi, Olivier. Just really, adding to Evan's comments, I think, in a way, we have to get a lot of stuff done in a very short timeframe, no arguments about that, and so we need to start concentrating on the actual efforts rather than charters, and so on. You know, I have a feeling that this working group is going to be around in the long term, rather than just the short term, so I think having a charter, well articulated, and giving us the authority to act on behalf of the communities and the reporting mechanism back to our communities, is quite a strong imperative as well.

So I think we—in a way we need some work—ongoing work on a charter and the background, that we probably need to start focusing on the urgent priorities in Singapore, and Brazil as we go. So, yeah, it's a double-edged sword idea. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Keith . Any other questions or comments on this from anyone? I cannot hear anyone, or see anyone put their hand up. So, what I heard from Evan, was that we do need to create some Wiki space for the goals, and that these have to be, again, publicized and that's something we have asked, regarding the goals we have asked last what everyone on this working group thought about the goals of this working group, the deliverables of this working group.

Unfortunately, there's only been some feedback from Avri and Andy. Huge amounts of e-mails that have floated around mail boxes, it might have been somehow a little bit lost among all the participants here.

I'm going to ask staff whether it would be possible to take some of the—well, take the input that we've seen on the working list so far—on the mailing list, and print this over on the Wiki and for everyone else to comment under the page on the Wiki. And this is really one way that we can work intersessionally between our different conference calls. That was one suggestion.

With regards to the other suggestion, I hear Keith mentioning the fact that we need to also have a robust charter. I was going to ask whether we could, perhaps, have a small subset of this working group, a small subset by being, let's say, half-a-dozen people who are charter-drafting experts, to spend a little bit of time on this, and put their mind together over the holiday period and be able to come back to us with a first draft sometime in January, in early January. So then we don't have the whole group working on the charter, but we do have the whole group working on the goals and on the definitions of where we want to be.

So I'll ask now for—seeing no one putting their hand up to try and (inaudible) to my suggestions, I'll ask whether there's any support or any opposition to having the Wiki space for the goals, publicizing it, and for people to have input, and bring their input to this Wiki page, working with the Wiki.

Keith Davidson, you have the floor.

Keith Davidson: Just thinking about the idea of the charter and the smaller group on it, I was just wondering if we could—if I could volunteer Bart Boswinkel, he's part of their ccNSO Secretariat who does most of the drafting for our own working group, charters and structures, and so on, and is pretty good, and knowledgeable of the ICANN requirements as well. So I've not just got that, and he said that he can dedicate some time to this. So that might be quite useful, you know, to get us started, at least.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Keith. Any comments from anyone on the call regarding the suggestion that Bart Boswinkel from ccNSO could help us—accompany us, for the sort of first version of this charter?

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Marilyn, you have the floor.

Marilyn Cade: I would welcome having such an offer, I think that would assist us, and get us to the stage within we are editing and contributing on substance more quickly. And I also just want to take this opportunity to support Evan's suggestion that we need to work and work, and work on the charter in parallel.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Marilyn. Good to see your support on both of these points. Any more comments?

Cheryl Landon-Orr: Cheryl here, (inaudible).

- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Cheryl Landon-Orr, you have the floor.
- Cheryl Landon-Orr: Thank you very much. I'd talk into chat, but I'm not sure you'll be able to read it. I think the offer that Keith makes is an excellent one. I think Bart is well-positioned to do something intelligent and meaningful together, and to that end, I'm happy, as it were, to give him a hand. But I'd love to encourage someone else to also give him a hand in terms just having a couple people to bounce it off before we bring it back to the group as a whole. So, you know, I'll put my hand up, I think at least one other person who probably spends as much time doing drafting in GNSO, with charters as I do, should also put their hand up.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, Cheryl. Thank you very much. I note your interest in this. And what I was going to suggest then, is that staff will send a Doodle on the Wiki, and the Doodle will basically ask for volunteers to join that small skeleton group of people that can put together a straw-man (ph) charter with the help of Bart. Having seen no opposition to Bart, from the ccNSO to be involved in this. Is there any comment on this suggestion, positive or negative?
- Well, I hear no comments, so I will take this as being approval from the people who are currently on the call. So let's tap it as an action then. So for Renate, I guess then we'll probably have to ask you to do that. Renate, to send a Doodle Poll to mailing list, and asking for volunteers—to constitute a small group that will work on the charter and put it together. And as that group will work on the first draft from Bart, with the ccNSO.
- Renate Dewulf: Yes.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You've got that. Bart Boswinkel, yeah?
- Renate Dewulf: Yes, I did. Yes.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Fantastic. Super. And thank you, for suggesting the help of Bart, Keith, that's much appreciated. I hope, and I'm by the way, saying that action in the –with the understanding that Bart has been advised of this, and we have the consent of Bart to proceed forward with this. It's not that he's going to be lumped with work.
- Unidentified Participant: Keith, (inaudible)—Keith already said that too.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: He has, yeah? Okay. Now just trying to make sure, be sure completely. Keith, you have the floor.
- Keith Davidson: I was just going to yes. No, Bart is quite happy with it, and I think looking at the chat, Cheryl and Avri and Evan have already volunteered to help. So that sounds to me like a group of four, that probably not much need for more volunteers, I wouldn't have thought, you know, a small group keeping it well focused, remembering that it's going to come back to all of us for approval. And the best thing we can have as a target to shoot at, so that's the objective for them to come up with it. I don't think it needs to be so hard fought over until it comes back to the group.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Excellent. Thank you, Keith.
- Keith Davidson: Yes.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So that was one action item. The other action item was to create another Wiki page, which was the Wiki page for the goals of this working group. And to look through the—whatever goals have already been sent to the mailing list, and just do a cut and paste onto that Wiki. And of course to publicize that Wiki so that everyone else can contribute to it as well. So it means then, hopefully, we will have some idea, it's on the table that we can then discuss, during our next call in January.

Any other questions or comments regarding this charter?

Marilyn Cade: Actually—this is Marilyn—and I don't—my only question is likely to be timing. Since our next call needs to get us to goals, activities, you know, whatever, I'm not trying to change the language we are using, but just that we are fully understanding the source of the work of this group. Because I do think it's likely to end up with a longer-term focus. Brazil was in April, but there will be follow on to Brazil, that community from ICANN stakeholders who want to input into—so timing of the draft side of it, do we feel like we'll have a draft in order to then elaborate on goals and activities? And maybe we want to even think, if not formally, we might want to think about short-term goals and activities leading up to Singapore and Brazil, and then assessing what happens after that. In its two-stage or multi-stage approach.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Marilyn. I think we can let Keith answer this. I would have thought that the—they will be able to come back very quickly with the first draft in early January, and that we can then devote the next call, specifically, an amount of time to gain consensus on the charter. So that it wouldn't go any further than by mid-month in January to have a charter set up.

But of course, as you mentioned, one of the problems is, if you're going to have a charter, you're going to have a goal. So the two issues are somehow linked. We also need to define the goals and the objectives very quickly indeed, and I was hoping that we could also define this by mid-January. Hence the creation of the Wiki spaces. And by having two issues go on in parallel, it probably will be—we probably won't be losing too much time, hopefully.

Avri Doria, you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Hi. Sorry. I didn't expect to get the floor so quickly, it took me a while to turn off mute. I definitely think that we need to have a basic shape of a charter really quickly now, because I really think that we need to move quite quickly in the substance. And if we spend any amount of traditional time talking about a charter, the Brazil meeting and the IGF have already gone by before we've gotten to any substance.

So, I would really like to see us, people, to sort of put charters behind us, even if they are semi-open, because I mean, the thing across stakeholder, yeah, we should send charters back to our respective councils, and committees, and such, but we certainly shouldn't wait for a response loop on charters before we start actually doing stuff. So, I'm hoping that at our next meeting we cannot only sort of say, yeah, there's a charter we need more work on it, but let's get going and then spend a good part of the meeting talking about, you know, the substance of Brazil's statements and what have you. Otherwise, you know, I don't know what we are doing. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Avri. I think that we do have an understanding on this. I was going to suggest about 30% of the call to be spent on the charter, 50% or less on this call on the charters, because hopefully we would have something on the table, but the majority of the call to be spent on goals, and work backwards from the goals, effectively. That's only one suggestion. Of course other suggestions will be welcome on the Wiki after this. I do apologize for not being able to read the discussion online, the little chat very well. It's very narrow--

Adam Peake: Excuse me.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: -- and very difficult to get into it. Yes, who is this?

Adam Peake: It's Adam Peake, and I'm an observer but also just wondering if I'm allowed to speak, so that would be the first question. But it's about the observation that reading through the

minutes of the last meeting, we seem to be repeating, and I wasn't on the last meeting call, we seem to be repeating very much what was discussed then, which was, do we need a charter, do we need to work in parallel on goals. No, Rafik seem to come up with the idea that this question format would probably be a better start, so it seems to be too cold for talking about the same issues so far, which seems problematic in and of itself.

I have no idea how to read LUCID, and that is a problem in terms of participation, it's not as if I'm particular new comer to ICANN, but the instructions are weak, so if we are going to have participation, I really would appreciate some instruction about how to actually access different tools.

But really it's about what are the goals of this working group. And you know, there's a meeting coming up in April, and that seems to be what the discussion was when it was first mentioned. And the meeting in Buenos Aires, and this suggestion to have a cross-working was set up. So, just go back to the goals, and if a charter is needed at some point, but there's no discussion of substance whatever, and that seems to be consistent with all the discussions around the April Brazil Meeting. Not very much discussion about substance. An awful lot of discussion about charters and who gets to represent who, and so on.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Adam, for this. And I think you're hitting the nail square on the head here, that there is a concern from, I think, a lot of us as to what the goals are, and we do have to put our heads together on this. I heard someone else on the line right afterwards, but I will have to move on in this discussion, because we are reaching, we are on the last five minutes of the call.

Who was next in the queue?

Marilyn Cade: It was Marilyn. I wanted to make a comment, but I will defer to anyone else first.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: There's no one else in the queue and the moment, so you are number one in the queue, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I really want to support the comment that—comments that Adam made, and I'm not going to dwell on this, but I'm going to make a very bold statement that, I think we need to get rid of LUCID, right now. It seems to be a staff-driven—perhaps even have other complicating issues. We need to have tools that are much easier to use. We can take that up offline, and I'm happy to talk to staff and others about that. But the focus on the goals aspect of the meeting, why don't we—if we could have an open discussion for a few minutes, even if we can for a few minutes on this call, what do we think the goals of this working group are?

I was an active participant, designated by the CSG, and the hot topics on Monday as official, at a (inaudible)—a BA meeting along with several other participants on this call. I was at the follow-on after extreme demands and concerns expressed by a number of constituencies, SGs, supporting organizations, about the fact that there have been too much progress by staff-led initiatives on decisions but not enough consultation. We had a Wednesday morning consultation, and that's what led, I think, to the creation of this working group.

So, you know, what I think we want is guidance and input and understanding from within ICANN's entities, and I'm using that term not to be—just to be as broad as possible, to the ICANN staff, the ICANN Board, and the ICANN CEO, on what we think, as the community, the issues are. Isn't that what the goal of this working group is?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much for this, Marilyn. I don't see anyone having—put their hand up to respond to any of your questions, or your comments that you've just made. I think that

there is consensus on this. At least there's no opposition on the call, at the moment. I see Bill Drake just put his hands up. Bill, you have the floor.

Bill Drake: Thanks, Olivier. Just to follow up on Marilyn's question. I asked the question in the chat as well. I'm really starting to wonder—I mean, maybe this is not helpful at this point, particular because I missed the front end of the conversation, but I remember starting to wonder whether a formal community working group is really what's needed to address whatever joint objectives we might have in this space. I suggested it at that morning meeting, and we all kind of went, okay, but that's an established framework for doing things, but if we are going to spend so much time trying to formalize stuff, which is almost inevitable with the community—follow community working group kind of structure.

I'm wondering, you know, maybe what we really needed was just some sort of joint space for discussing the issues and seeing what consensus there was, and if people found that there was enough consensus, and making some sort of end-points—input on the main ask for the Brazil meeting, such as principles and so on, you know, we could do that in a more informal way. But if we are going to proceed with the whole apparatus of the formal community working group I'm really wondering if that's the most effective way—unless we can find a very quick and like solution, with the charter and move on from there, I just wonder if we are weighing ourselves down more than we have to.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Bill. So what I'm hearing is concern about the amount of time that we have until the Brazil meeting, and for more action and less discussion on process.

Marilyn Cade: This is Marilyn. I (inaudible) with that--

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I'm just going—I'm really going to object, Bill, with all the diplomacy in the tone on what I'm going to say. In fact. The broader ICANN community, not just a few people who get invited to special meetings at ICANN (inaudible) at a senior level, for whatever reason. The broader ICANN community does need to be involved in this, so I take your comments that we are spending a little bit of time on process at the beginning, and I think what we've proven over time, is clarity, about the purpose of the group is important. I don't see anyone on this group objecting to doing extra work to facilitate accelerating what happens. And I just want to strongly suggest that we move forward on the path of, we get a charter, we have a conversation about activities, and (inaudible), and we go from there.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Marilyn.

Bill Drake: Okay. If I could just clarify, I don't suggest that there shouldn't be a broad community involvement --

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Go ahead, Bill.

Bill Drake: I am just saying that I, of course, wasn't suggesting that there shouldn't be broad community involvement, I'm just wondering about this particular institutional apparatus, but if it's—what everybody feels (inaudible) to, then fine.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Bill Drake. I realize we are reaching the end of this call, and we still have two, I guess, very agenda items, one is the next step, so any other business, and one was the frequency of the working group calls. From what I can hear from this section here, is that we've got this ad hoc small group of people that are going to work on the charter, that's one thread. There is the other thread with the Wiki, and I'm going ask you all, on this group to actually spend some time over the holiday breaks that we have, yes, we've got some homework to do.

The holiday breaks that we have, and come up with suggestions about—well two types of suggestions, the first one is the goal of the working group and its deliverables. The other one is the—I guess to—each person offer some clarity as to the purpose. So it's the same sort of thing, goals, purpose, and deliverables. If we can all have this, and I would say discuss on the mailing list, but also put this on the Wiki page, then we will have—we can spend a majority of the time, if on the one hand, we've got a small group coming back to us with a fresh charter, and we have that page with all of that input, then we can start proceeding forward with being able to know where we are going.

And at least we'll all be able to sing for the same track, rather than, at the moment, I'm seeing a lot of discussion on the mailing list, and everyone who has intervened so far has been very, very correct in this. There's been a lot of discussion on process, and there's been very little discussion on the actual purpose of the song. And that, I guess, is part of the big concern that we should have regarding the forthcoming Brazil meeting.

We still have no idea about where we are going with that, what is going to be discussed, and I think that I hear from the process that this working group is going to make, that we can decide on what our purpose is, and we can decide—we, as in the working group, can decide about what is the direction that it needs to take, what its deliverables are. But whilst hearing that some people are saying this working group will probably continue after the Brazil meeting, et cetera, I don't think we should be worrying too much about this. We do have one specific path at hand at the moment, and that's the Brazil meeting coming up. That's the deadline, and we need to be prepared for that. And I heard from the CEO and from everyone who was involved that this working group will probably help in this.

Is that Marilyn who wishes to take the floor?

Marilyn Cade: Right. Olivier I just—I think I am—I don't disagree with anything you've said, but I just want to make sure we are thinking that Singapore and community engagement in Singapore is on the path to whatever happens—whatever then ICANN does and says in Brazil. Was that inherent in your conversation, in your comment?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes. Thank you very much, Marilyn, for reminding me of this. Of course, we do have Singapore. What we might wish to consider, and again, that's just something I'm throwing out into the room to stimulate your mind, is to see whether we want to have a face-to-face meeting in Singapore. Whether we want to use Singapore as a way to inform the whole community using an SO and AC, cross-community discussion, in the main hall. Whether we want to use that meeting to finalize the position that we, as the—as ICANN's community will be taking. Whether we want things to be ready before that time, way before the Singapore meeting, so as to be able to transmit some input to the Board.

Transmit some input to the CEO, this is all—irrespective of where the process is to get that out to the different components of where we want the outfit to go. We need to know what those deliverables are going to be, and where we want to row basically. In what direction we want to row.

So that's one thing. The other thing that we need to discuss now is this issue of meeting rotation. I'm aware we are eight minutes beyond the end of this meeting already. So I think we can just spend a couple of minutes on that. It's a yes or no answer, the meeting rotation thing. I realize, for some people, it is difficult to rotate meetings, for others it's fine.

Renate has come up with a rotation of full 7:00 hours, 14:00 hours and 22:00 hours UTC, bearing in mind that the meetings are recorded and then the recordings will go on the Wiki site, I guess that it means—and of course bearing in mind we've got some

stakeholder groups that have up to four representatives, active members of this working group.

Is this something that is palatable to everyone? And I guess that we are therefore not expected to be on each and every single call, if it is difficult to find that it's something that is going to be working throughout the world, the earth being round.

I see Avri Doria with her hand up. Avri, you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Okay. Yes, thank you. I just wanted to speak very strongly in favor of the rotation, but I tend to think of the rotation as pain-sharing, which means that, indeed, we are sort of expected to participate at all the meetings except, of course, when we excuse ourselves or don't. But to say that rotation means you can skip a third of them, I think is going in the wrong direction. Rotation is pain sharing, it's not an excuse for skipping meetings. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much.

Marilyn Cade: And, Olivier, it's Marilyn. I'd like to comment on this.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Marilyn, you have the floor.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. I'm going to actually ask Renate, to do a little more research with all of us, and try to come up with two shifts, to three. And I fully support what Avri just said. I will do everything I can to be on every call. That it would be helpful, and I don't mind how aggressive the schedule is, but if you can get it to two instead of three, I think it might help everyone in terms of their—it's just an idea, we have spent a lot of time in the business constituency, where we cover all five regions. We don't have all of the challenges of the nine regions, of the nine time zones, but we do have all five regions covered.

And perhaps we could try to come up—we could at least try—to come up with two schedules, and if that's 4:00 a.m. in the mornings for some, it's you know—and 11:00 p.m. for some. If we could try one more time to get it down to two times, it might be helpful, because personally, I think it will be so helpful for us to have as many participants and observers as possible on all calls.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Marilyn. Did you have any specific times that you felt would be the times that you've used, for example, in the past. If one uses just the rotation of two different times.

Marilyn Cade: I'm happy to ask the Business Constituency Secretariat to help us on that. Olivier, could I volunteer to do that, and I'll talk to Vinnie (ph) and ask her to help on working with the staff on—you know, two might not work, and I'm not suggesting anything here, I'm just trying to get us to as much participation as possible on all calls. But if I can volunteer the Business Constituency Secretariat, I'll be back with her and ask her to assist Renate and others on the ICANN side.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Please, Marilyn, that would be fine. So that's an action item over to you. So, Marilyn will get the BC Secretariat to provide suggested times for a double rotation. In other words, just two UTC times for calls, and then because we are not a full set of people on this call I would then suggest that staff—our staff send a Doodle Poll to choose, because I know that everyone is agreeing with rotation. I haven't seen any notes so far in the chat with people saying, we want no rotation.

And so we can have a Doodle Poll with the choice where Choice A would be the double rotation timings, and Choice B would be triple rotation timings. That would probably be

the best and most efficient way to get the group to choose between one set of times and the other set of times. That's the second action item.

Have you got this, Renate?

Renate Dewulf: Yes. No problem.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's perfect. Thank you. Okay. So now we are set on this. Thank you, for the suggestion, Marilyn, that's very helpful. And finally, I guess we've got to any other business part of this call. The floor is open.

Marilyn Cade: I'm so sorry. I seem to be speaking so much, but I would like to make an offer. It's Marilyn.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Marilyn, you have the floor.

Marilyn Cade: There's a significant number of activities on Internet governance that are not about ICANN about at all. They are much, much broader, and some of the participants in this working group are aware of, and following them, while others are kind of just getting up to speed on those other issues, and I don't want us to confuse the purpose of this working group, but I would like to think about, you know, when we might—or, or if we think a informational sharing of information on a factual sort of basis.

On the one hand, there's groups that Nora reported on, has a set of presentation about what else is going on that is relevant and affects the ICANN implication. Would it be possible to utilize, or ask the ICANN staff to report back some more details for a set period of time, on the information that was shared on the auxiliary challenges in other states. That affects ICANN at our next meeting or it's at different meetings.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Marilyn. So that would be a suggestion for a webinar?

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Is there anyone against this idea? I think that the—and unfortunately I haven't got any idea—well, any way to actually have quick polls on this system, on the LUCID system, but I would say that there is certainly—there must be support. I'm only speculating here, but there has—there's probably support for this idea, of having a webinar. Let me ask staff to investigate with the Global Stakeholder Engagement, whether it would be possible to have the webinar in January, with the right people, to be able to give us a briefing, that's an excellent—I personally feel that's an excellent suggestion. I don't see anyone speaking against this. In which case, that's another action item then.

Renate Dewulf: Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes.

Renate Dewulf: Could I just speak--

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Who is this?

Renate Dewulf: Could you just please rephrase, if you would like a webinar from the GAC in January to receive—to give a briefing on what more specifically?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: On the Internet Governance, and where we are at basically today. Marilyn would you be able to, by e-mail, share the exact text with Renate?

Marilyn Cade: I'm happy to, but let me do it for the full group. I think it's a summary from the kinds of presentations that came into this magical and mystical, marvelous (ph) panel, held in

London recently, which was, you know, high-level, blah-blah-blah. And I don't mean to diminish that, but I think, at least the summary of the kinds of presentations that were given to them, should be shared with this group.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Fantastic. Thank you.

Renate Dewulf: Okay. I have note that down. Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Super. Any other, other business? And I see no one put their hand up, so I thank you all. I apologize for the 17 minutes delay that we have in closing this call, but it was important. We have some homework, can we just have some run down of the action items, please, Renate?

Renate Dewulf: Yes. Of course. Hang on a second. Okay. We need to get—on the Wiki page, and members to participate and obtain the goals, the deliveries and the clarity and the purpose of this working group, I need to send an e-mail to the working group regarding the Doodle Poll for the rotation of the call. And we have the volunteers for the sub-groups to work on the charter to prepare a draft for the next call, so that the working group members can work it. The volunteers being Bart, Cheryl, Avri and Evan.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right. If they can start on it. If you can publicize this to the mailing list as well. I don't wish to restrict this working group to just the people who are on the call today, so just in the interest of transparency and in keeping our work open, letting everyone on the list know that this small ad hoc group has come together to put the charter, and that it would accept any other people that would wish to be part of it. And for them to get in touch in with you, if they want to be added to this.

Renate Dewulf: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: With the suggestion—it's Marilyn—sorry—that Bart is helping to work with that group. And I don't know--

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: To work with that group, yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's right. With the suggestion that Bart Boswinkel would be helping out with the drafting of this. Excellent. Well—I was ready to close the meeting, but any other, other business?

Hearing no one speak up. I thank you all for this call. And I wish you all to have a good holiday period. Please think about the goals of this working group, please participate and put this on the Wiki, and you should be receiving a listing of where to put your input, very shortly, in your mailbox.

Thanks to all of you, and have a very good holiday period. This call is now adjourned.