

**20140106\_ccwg\_IG\_ID843979**

Ergys Ramaj: On the phone and in the room we have Olivier, Keith Drazek, Holly Raiche, Martin Levy, Naresh Ajwani, Keith Davidson, Donna Austin, Rafik Dammak, Avri Doria, Caroline Greer, Cintra Sooknanan, David Maher, Kiran Malanchrauvil, Klaus Stoll, Leon Sanchez, and Martin Levy.

Did I miss anyone?

Marilyn Cade: Marilyn Cade.

David Fares: David Fares.

Ergys Ramaj: Apologies for that. Noted.

Robert Guerra: Hello. This is Robert Guerra calling in.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Ergys. Can you, please, share the agenda in Adobe comments?

Ergys Ramaj: Absolutely. One moment.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. So thanks to everyone to attend this today call.

So, if we share the agenda soon, if you have any objective or comment or if you want to add any item, please, say so. Otherwise, we will go to the first item.

Marilyn Cade: Olivier, it's Marilyn. May I make a point of order?

Rafik Dammak: Marilyn, this is Rafik. But, yes, you can go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry. Olivier? Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, it's Rafik.

Olivier Crepin Leblond: Marilyn, it's Olivier here. Rafik is chairing the call today.

Marilyn Cade: Wonderful.

(Multiple Speakers)

Marilyn Cade: Rafik, thank you. May I just ask (technical difficulties)? I promise that's not me.

Unidentified Participant: Hello?

Unidentified Participant: Hello?

Unidentified Participant: I think, Marilyn--

Marilyn Cade: Yes. So sorry. Could I just ask you to review the agenda? I'm only on my cell phone. Could I just ask you to review the agenda for us (inaudible) before we go into all the points? Would that be okay?

Rafik Dammak: Yeah. I was asking if you have any comment about the agenda.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, but I can't see it.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Ergys Ramaj: Is everyone able to see it on their Adobe Connect?

Unidentified Participant: No. I don't have a link. Can ICANN, please, resend the link?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Absolutely.

Marilyn Cade: And I'm not on Adobe Connect. That was why I thought you might just read it out for us, if that would be okay.

Rafik Dammak: Is everyone else able to see?

Unidentified Participant: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Great.

Marilyn Cade: So that means, although I'm not able to see, we don't need to read it out?

Ergys Ramaj: No. I'm shortly sending the agenda attached in the body of an e-mail to the entire group. Is that all right with everyone?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Maybe I can just-- In the meantime, I can tell you the items.

First is review (unintelligible) items; so, from the last calls, the 20th and 11th of December.

Then (unintelligible) update.

Bring me just back to the agenda, so I can--

And then, third, is ICANN's discussion about multi-stakeholder is (unintelligible).

And the fifth (ph) one is an update on Brazil meeting organization. And, hopefully, we'll have (unintelligible) from ICANN staff to give that update.

And then (unintelligible) and action items.

And any other business.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you, Rafik. It's Marilyn. I'd like to make a point of order.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Please, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. I'd like us to discuss the profile of this working group and reach agreement. And maybe that can happen in the discussion on the charter. But I think it's really important to focus on what the purpose of this working group is before we undertake other activities. And so the charter may be the place to take that on.

Rafik Dammak: Marilyn, can you just, please, repeat that? I'm not sure to get your point.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. I just said I think it's really important to undertake a discussion about the purpose of this working group - what its role is within ICANN and what its contributions can be within ICANN. And I think the charter is the place to probably discuss that.

So, let me give you a for instance. A for instance is this working group is focused on advising the ICANN board, the ICANN staff and leadership on what the participants of ICANN believe are ICANN's role and participation in the Brazil meeting. Or, more broadly, this working group thinks that they want to offer advice on ICANN's role and activities on the (unintelligible).

Those are two very, very different and very vastly different activities. And so the charter is probably the place to take up that discussion.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Marilyn. Understood. Okay.

So I think there are some updates about the charter. I'm not sure if you could check Wikispace about that and, in particular, what the sub-team thinks. Maybe we can discuss about that. I guess, also, about the role of-- in relationship to ICANN also there is about the Brazil meeting and other items. So maybe there is some overlap. So we can cover that (technical difficulties) two items about this. Okay.

(technical difficulties)

Rafik Dammak: Maybe we can extend the time for the first item. Okay? So can we start? Or there is any other comments?

Robert Guerra: Rafik, hi. This is Robert. Just, I guess, two first things. There's a little bit of a discussion taking place on the Adigo space, and it will be worthwhile for you others just to follow that as questions or comments appear.

And I think the second thing, whether it's something short or not, I think just coming to a consensus on the exact scope and focus or kind of a quick charter I think is a good idea to go forward because then we know exactly what we need to work towards.

We have-- It looks like another comment that's being posted is that your screen is actually really small on the Adigo, so your high-level fonts are fine. But the smaller fonts are actually really hard to read.

But I think that, whether we want to do it now-- but I think just having the scope or, as I mentioned, just what the exact charter is so we know whether it's (unintelligible)-- Marilyn mentioned ITU or something else. I think those are very important points to decide or have a conversation about right at the beginning.

Keith Davidson: Someone was going to post up the link to the Adobe Connect room, and nobody has yet, I don't think, though. Could someone do that, please?

Ergys Ramaj: Yes, Keith. I just would like to ask if you can, please, Adobe Connect (unintelligible). But, yes. I'm not sure. It was hard to hear you. So what do you want--?

Robert Guerra: I'll mention my comments again. I concur that it's important to define a charter, whether it's broad or not. There needs to be some quick definition about that before we start getting into the weeds. So your current view of what the charter is would be good to hear, so we're all on the same page. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So I guess we will discuss all this in the next item. Okay. I think we can move on. Ergys, go back to the agenda.

Ergys Ramaj: One moment, please.

Rafik Dammak: Try to make it much more bigger.

Robert Guerra: I'm going to raise a point of order as well. There are a couple of people on the Adigo space saying that they cannot hear audio. And they are feeling that--

Unidentified Participant: That's the Adobe Connect space, not the Adigo space.

Robert Guerra: I'm sorry. The Adobe Connect. And they are just commenting that. I just wanted to make that known to the folks that are able to talk and listen right now.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. I had to dial in to the Adigo space.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So they just (ph) have the audio. So maybe if they try to dial in. I'm not sure what is the problem.

Unidentified Participant: Hold on a minute. Could we get some instruction? (technical difficulties)?

Ergys Ramaj: This is Ergys Ramaj speaking. The microphones on the Adobe Connect's room are on. I'm not certain what the difficulty is. And the Adigo phone number that was provided to everyone was for people to call in in addition to that. So I'm not certain what the solution is, since everything seems to be working properly. Is everyone having an issue in the room? Or is it just certain people?

Unidentified Participant: The question to ask would be: Could anybody hear through Adobe Connect?

Rafik Dammak: Right. I call that Adigo, so that's an issue.

Unidentified Participant: I tried to listen on Adobe Connect and couldn't, so I called Adigo. I'm getting used to it. It usually doesn't work these days or often doesn't work these days.

Rafik Dammak: (Unintelligible) using Adigo. I don't use Adobe Connect. I just--

Okay. So, in the meantime, I guess, maybe I can go to-- you know, it's now 15 minutes we started the call. If we can go quickly to the next item, and it will be Olivier. Olivier, are you ready?

Theresa Swinehart: Olivier, this is Theresa. I just wanted to say I joined. I'm sorry I'm late.

Olivier Crepin Leblond: Thank you, Theresa. You'll have to tell Rafik. Rafik is running this call today.

Theresa Swinehart: Oh, I'm sorry, Rafik. Rafik, I'm on the call now. Sorry I'm late.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. (Inaudible).

Olivier Crepin Leblond: Okay. It's Olivier speaking. We're now on item number two in our agenda, and that's a review of the action items from the last call that we had-- in fact, the last two calls that we had. You'll be able-- If you go over to the agenda on the Wiki page-- and, in fact, for those of you who are currently on the Adigo-- sorry-- on the Adobe Connect, this is the link to the Wiki page that you're seeing here. That one has got the full agenda.

And so the 11th of December, 2013 call, we had five action items. Three of them are closed. One's from Renate to send out a doodle poll and organize one more call before the yearend, Renate to add the Wikilist to the participant list, to the mailing lists, et cetera. If you look at the Wiki page, you'll find out that our homepage, the ICANN community preparation for the multi-stakeholder meeting in Brazil home, has actually got a whole lot of information on it now. And I invite you all, at your own leisure after this call or later on this week, to look through it and to start populating it as well. I think our home is a lot better than when it started a few weeks ago.

Sally is to provide or identify someone to provide a summary and update on what is discussed in the high-level panel in London. That has been done. And we had an update, which was sent to us by e-mail. And, today, we also have Theresa Swinehart, who is with us and who will be able to speak to us a little bit later on about what's going on in the OneNet (ph). And, as Marilyn did ask, we could also gain some clarification as to what this working group could be doing as well.

Next, we've got the action items that are open at the moment from the 11th of December, 2013 call.

Sally Costerton is to find someone to curate the discussions on the list so that staff can provide the back information to this working group. I don't think Sally is on the call at the moment.

Sally Costerton: Yes. I'm here. (technical difficulties).

Rafik Dammak: Go ahead, Sally.

Sally Costerton: Yes. This is something Theresa and I have been talking about because it needs to be the same-- We need to make sure that the content on the OneNet list is being curated and shared with this group. But it's essential (inaudible) OneNet. One of the (unintelligible) needs to share with this group. And I think we should be in a position to give you an update on that, I would think, Theresa-- what do you think? Probably towards the end of this week or maybe the early part of next week?

Theresa Swinehart: Yeah. I would say that's right. And, in the meantime, for those of you who are on the OneNet list, (unintelligible) did a very nice summary of the sort of threads of the first-part discussion in the first few months. But we could certainly arrange that that gets sent over both to this list and also put up on the Wiki page as well. And then, by the end of the week, we should have a plan moving forward that there's consistent curation both for (unintelligible) and other places.

Carolyn Greer: It's Carolyn. I need to make a comment here, if I might.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Go ahead, Carolyn, please.

Carolyn Greer: Thank you. I welcome ICANN's offer to curate inputs from an organization that is not ICANN driven and not about ICANN; so having the ICANN resources (unintelligible). What is going on in a broader group is very, very helpful. But I wouldn't want to have this in any way assumed to be driven by ICANN (technical difficulties) OneNet that I'm participating in on behalf of the business is much broader. And I thought I'd make that point. I think that's important and a relevant point we all want to support.

Olivier Crepin Leblond: Thank you very much, Marilyn (ph). It's Olivier speaking. I think that's a very valid point indeed. I think that seeing how staff could curate some of the discussion is probably just an additional amount of input that our working group would have. Of course, we have to do our own homework, and we also have to do our own work and not rely on staff to be doing this work by themselves and just have it as a single source of information. So your concern is well taken.

Shall we continue? Let's continue.

The next open action item is the clear set of objectives, the intended deliverables for the working group. These are needed, as we've heard earlier on this call just now, and we're going to work on that today. There was some input from some people on the mailing lists. If you haven't had a chance to read through them, please, do so. Ergys and staff have very kindly actually carbon copied those over to one of the Wiki pages as well. And I think that what we'll do is to continue putting those on the Wiki so they're all on the same page. Of course, you'll all be able to read them on the mailing lists. And then we will have at least one repository where we can then start work to put a set of goals together.

I think that this is something which we're not going to be able to achieve just in one call. But we also have to work in between calls so that, hopefully, by the next call, we've got a pretty clearer idea of what the objectives are. Maybe even by the end of this call, we'll have a slightly clearer idea of what the objectives are.

So these are the action items from the 11th of November-- sorry-- the 11th of December meeting.

Now, the next call was the 20th of December. That's the next link on your agenda. And those have got six action items altogether - three that are closed, three that are open.

The first three are to do primarily with the Wiki page and the creating of all the sort of community access of the Wiki page, et cetera. Ergys Ramaj is to check whether the community can access the community Wiki page without a login name and password for read-only documents.

Has anyone on the call had a problem accessing the Wikispace? And, unfortunately, on my Adobe Connect screen at the moment, the chat has grown larger, but the names are still behind the chat. I think you can get rid of the video, whoever is controlling this, and bring the attendees up so I could actually see if anybody puts their hand up.

I'll assume there's no hand up here and that we're all able to access the Wikispace. So that's fine without a login. That brings more transparency to our group.

Ergys has also created another Wiki page for the objectives, goals, and clarity of purpose of this working group. And this is a page called Objectives, Goals, and Purpose of the Working Group. That page is ready to be filled. At the moment, there's been some input from Evan Leibovitch and Leon Sanchez. There's been some input from Avri Doria, from Olivier Sueme. And I invite you all to read through it as well. In fact, most of this has

already been also copied onto the mailing list. So, if you've been diligently reading the mailing list, you've heard some of the input in there.

Looking if there's anybody. No. No one's put their hand up. So let's move on to the last three.

Renate is to go through the previous e-mail correspondence and page (ph) onto the Wiki page all comments on objectives, goals, and clarity of purpose of this working group. Well, it sounds like I've just put the cart before the horses. Yes. That's been done. This could be ticked.

And then the next one. Renate is to set up a doodle poll to define the rotation, double rotation, or triple rotation. That hasn't happened yet because Renate's actually been away. So I think that we are still under a triple rotation (unintelligible) at the moment. I hope this is not causing any serious consequences for some of you. We can always discuss this and any other business at the end of this call if you wish to change this.

And then Olivier is to ask the global stakeholder engagement department if it's possible to organize a Webinar. And we will be working on this, I think, in the next week or so, so as to see if we can have a Webinar with GSC.

That's the action items for the time being.

And so, reverting back to the agenda, I guess, that section in the agenda is closed. If anybody has any questions--

Marilyn Cade: I do.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: -- put your hand up now. Yes, go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you so much. But I need to pause for a minute. What were the Webinars--? I want to raise a discussion about what the Webinar would be about, who would speak, what the process is, what the (inaudible) is. I'm not disagreeing about a Webinar. I'm just trying to bring us to reality.

And I think we still have a few people who are concerned they're not able to fully participate. So could we pause (inaudible) at the end of the call and address that with the help of the ICANN staff?

But I do want to talk about-- I still am not sure that we can have a Webinar until we agree on what the scope and the purpose of this group is. That Webinar-- what we talk about on a Webinar - an argument between various parties or discussion among various parties about we want ICANN to do development, (inaudible) development. We got to get back to the mission here.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. Thank you very much, Marilyn. I don't think that the Webinar would be something that would be part of this rotation of conference calls. I think that it could just be an ICANN-wide or group-wide Webinar to bring people up to date as to where we are today. And I'm just saying this from memory, by the way, Marilyn. I'm afraid the holiday period has somehow erased some of this from my head.

So, if we can just go along with the Webinar thing at the moment-- If you do object to the Webinar, then perhaps we can discuss this at the end.

Avri having putting her hand up.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Oh, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I object to creating a distribution mechanism until we figure out what the message is. Other than that, I don't object to having it (ph). But a distribution mechanism (inaudible) Webinar is. We don't have a message yet.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Marilyn, it's Olivier here. I think you're getting this wrong. It's not this group that is going to give a Webinar to everyone else. I think it's everyone else-- or not everyone else but GSC, global stakeholder engagement, is going to do a Webinar for us to bring us up to date with where we are today so that we don't take our valuable exchange time and discussion time weekly in actually having staff talk to us. I think that was what the suggestion was.

I see Avri has put her hand up. Maybe she has a better memory than I do.

Avri Doria: This is Avri. Thank you for calling on me. I'm kind of curious about this-- the meandering of this meeting at the moment and all the points of order and all the objections to moving forward on things.

I thought that we did have-- I mean, Bart was nice enough to put a charter in front of us. That charter actually includes the issue of what we're doing here, although what we're doing here was also established by those who called for a group of us to be available to give ICANN staff advice on the various things of IG (ph). That's why we're doing this. So maybe there are purposes beyond that that we'll find when we scratch our heads real hard, but, anyhow, this was all discussed, I think, within the context of that charter.

And, hopefully, instead of, well, whatever we're doing with the meeting so far, we can actually get down. And, hopefully, we can decide on a charter and know who we are and quit arguing about that. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Avri.

And a last (unintelligible) is again, please, to get rid of the video and bring up the list of attendees, so I can actually see who has put their hand up.

But, in the meantime, I believe that we've moved out of review of action items, number two, and we're over in the charter update. And so, with this--

Unidentified Participant: Yes, Olivier. I think maybe you can ask the members of the sub-team who are here to give us an update.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That was the idea, but I did ask for something else to happen before, and that's still not happening. Ergys, I'm very sorry. Just make me a host, and then I'll zap it.

Ergys Ramaj: Hello? Are you able to see now? I stopped sharing my screen.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I'm not speaking about sharing the screen. I'm speaking about making me a host, please. It's Olivier speaking.

And, in the meantime, let's ask for a charter update. And the charter drafting team-- It's still Olivier speaking. The charter drafting team has had a bit of time to look at it. And Bart Boswinkle has proposed a first sort of basic draft based on some of the past work that has been done in drafting cross-community working group charters. I wonder if Bart is on the call to be able to take us through that. And, if Bart is not, then maybe we can have another member of the charting (ph) team - maybe Evan Leibovitch - take us briefly through some of this.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi, Olivier. It's Evan. Unfortunately, there hasn't been any activity within the mailing list on that part of it since there's been a couple of small mails back and forth but not a whole lot of what I call discussion. I think what we have in front of us is basically what we had before the holidays.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. I see Avri is already asking to put her hand up. Avri, you have the floor.

Avri Doria: Yeah. I don't know about discussions on the list. I do know that Bart put together and, in fact, sent it to this list a fairly good first attempt at a draft, where he also went through kind of a set of issues that we need to have resolution for in that and, in fact, starts off with issue one - Who establishes a cross-community working group? Issue two - Link (ph) with participating. And this was all sent to the list. I don't know if it got stuck in the Wiki yet, but it was sent to this list earlier today. I'm sure a few people were-- had the time to read it yet.

For example, on the one on link with participating SOs and ACs, he offers two alternatives that come out of things that we've been talking about. He offers an alternative for closure that I had some issues with, but that's beside the point and then gives the straw man charter that we could go through.

So, I mean, there is now a draft charter for people to start throwing stones at. Bart was nice enough to put it together. And, in terms of the mechanics of a cross-community working group, not the substantive purpose, mission, et cetera, milestones-- But in terms of the mechanics, he basically borrowed from several of the successful cross-community working groups that have been like JIG (ph) and some of the others to indicate processes as a starting place.

So, at the moment, we do have a real charter-type charter draft there for us to work further on. As I say, I don't know-- Bart isn't working today. It's a holiday for many. Just like Patrick said, it's a holiday in Sweden. And it's like the last holiday of the holiday season. But we do have something. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Avri. Thank you for that quick update on this.

So the charter has some elements. And, in fact, what Patrick did say in his e-mail was that he wasn't so happy with the charter or the proposal for the charter as it was for the time being due to the fact that, in his view, it wasn't focused enough as to what the goals of this working group are. And that certainly is an important-- I guess a very important point, which I hear being echoed by others as well.

And perhaps, since we can move things a little bit, we could, and this is just a proposal-- This is my part of the call. The multi-stakeholderism (ph) and multi-lateralism (ph) discussion we could probably crunch and expand our discussion on the charter update and then finish off with Theresa Swinehart, who will be able to speak to us about the update on the regional meeting organization committee.

Avri, you have raised your hand again.

Avri Doria: Yes. I did because, if we're going to start talking about the charter, and I agree with that, I actually wanted to offer a counter opinion to Patrick's and to those others that say we have to have a very specific agenda and milestones and such. I think that the group was originally brought into existence because we were asked to put together a group that could give advice on the things internet governance that ICANN as an organization was dealing with so that there was an address for them to come to with questions. And so I think let's define a more general purpose than to give advice to ICANN on how to deal with the various internet governance issues of 2014 is something we can't go deeper than because then we're actually getting into discussing the specifics of it. So that would be my recommendation in terms of not trying to get ourselves too specific, not trying to decide this issue is good and now this issue is bad.

Another thing that I want to bring out, and then I'll put my hand down and keep quiet for a while, is that I don't think we should be so ITU oriented. One of the things that the charter says - we close at the end of 2014. I think we should review our existence at the end of 2014, but I don't think this group is an ITU-based issue. There's a whole lot going on in internet governance. ICANN is in the middle of it. We are ICANN. We need to be organized to give advice to the operational arm of ICANN so that they can do the right thing. Thank you.

Mauricio: I have a comment. Mauricio.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Mauricio, please, go ahead.

Mauricio: Before we get into this discussion of the charter, can we explain what was the process of drawing that current charter?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Sure. It's Olivier speaking. Back to you, Avri.

Avri Doria: The process was very easy to describe. At the last meeting, volunteers were asked to work on it. But then someone volunteered Bart, a SAS (ph) member who is quite skilled in putting together cross-community charters, to please put together a first draft for us to beat up on. He graciously did that. He got it done in time for today's meeting, even though it was a vacation day for him. Thank you.

Mauricio: (Unintelligible) the committee was asked to be set up, and there were volunteers, including me.

Avri Doria: Yeah, but we did nothing. We did nothing. There was a list made with people on it. We did absolutely nothing. And, at the last minute, Bart came through for us.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Avri, for this candid affirmation of we did nothing.

Just one thing. This is just a first draft, so, obviously, by it being a first draft, there is going to be definitely some changes to be done with it. And that's why I think that we've got this on the page at the moment. And it's for us to discuss as a larger group.

That said, what I'm hoping would happen is that we discuss the points that are here on the page at the moment and then come back to that working group. And that working group will then be given a week until our next call to integrate the comments which were made today about the charter and come up with a second version, an updated version of this charter for next week.

Marilyn, you have the floor.

Marilyn Cade: Olivier, (technical difficulties). I think you need to take (technical difficulties).

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Marilyn, I'm sorry to be stopping you here. There's a horrible echo at the moment. I can't hear you. And that could be because the Adobe Connect room has also been enabled now. So it works. And then some people might have echo. So, if you're on the Adigo call, please, mute your computer speakers so that we don't get feedback on the call. Marilyn, back to you, please.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks, Olivier. I don't want to limit the input on strong man charter to those of us who were able to be on this call. That is point one.

Point number two is I have significant concerns about the strong man charter. I'll submit those in writing after I take further input from business because I am only a liaison to business (inaudible). There are other parties from business on this call. But I need to check in with a broader group.

But my initial comment is limiting, limiting, limiting. And I will go back to business and ask this question. But I think we have to limit the role of this group and focus the role of this group and the charter about what ICANN does in a variety of settings, not what ICANN is more broadly. That's a different question. I think we need to-- But I'll go back to business and ask these questions. And I can't do that today. I need more time, along with my colleagues from the business sector.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That's absolutely fine, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. In fact, I think that the-- If you can post your comment, and that's valid for not only you but for everyone else-- I realize you are all discovering the charter right now. You can post your comments on the mailing list, these will also be copied onto the Wiki page where the charter is being drafted and being built up. And then, at the same time, I'm sure that the members of the small sub-team that is doing the task of putting that charter together will then be reading those comments which you are sending on the mailing list and incorporating them onto-- into the charter for next week.

I'm just trying to separate the tasks so as to make sure that we don't lose all of our time and just concentrate on one thing at a time. We're a fairly large group, and I think that we can divide tasks such as that so as to gain efficiency in being able to move forward. That was the only reason for having the side group, et cetera.

Mauricio: Can we have a process in terms of at least even the sub-team, because I had (unintelligible) that I need to be part of the sub-team. And I was told that (unintelligible) people's concern, and there is no real work so far. So one can be candid to say we didn't do any work, but one can't be candid enough to say why there was not a proper process of setting up a group.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: It's Olivier speaking. Thank you. Were you part--? Were you on the call last week-- not last week but the previous call, because, at that point, we asked for volunteers. And, as far as I know, all of the names came over to me and then were added to that small group. If you want, just drop me an e-mail - Olivier - or drop an e-mail over to Ergys Ramaj, and they'll make sure that you're in that small team and you can take part in the drafting of the charter.

Mauricio: Okay. I have already done that. And it is not necessary during the conference (unintelligible) that they would like to be. And I have got an acknowledgement of the (unintelligible) that has been forwarded to all of us.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Did you get an acknowledgement from me?

Mauricio: From Renate (ph).

(Multiple Speakers)

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Well, then I have to apologize. I think I might have not received-- or it might have just gone through my copious quantities of holiday post and gone over to the (unintelligible) bucket. So, please, send a note, or I'll ask staff to send a note again.

Mauricio: Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Let's move on. Thank you.

So, back to the charter. Any other comments on the charter? Or should we just move on then to the next part of this call? I realize we are already 43 minutes into this call, and we've only been through one and a half agenda items so far.

David Fares: This is David Fares. Could I just raise a quick-- ask a quick question, please?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Please, go ahead, David.

David Fares: And, like Marilyn, I need to consult with the broader business constituency.

But a question. In both alternative one and alternative two in the straw man, it says that the goal of the working group is to coordinate and facilitate an increased participation of ICANN community members in internet governance, discussion for and processes. When Avri was explaining this, she indicated that it was for us to provide advice to ICANN related to internet governance issues. And that's what I thought our task was, rather than facilitating participation in those other (inaudible). It was to provide guidance and advice to ICANN as they continue-- as ICANN staff continues to participate in internet governance discussions.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, David Fares.

Avri, do you have anything to respond to this very fair point? Unfortunately, we cannot hear you at the moment, Avri.

Avri Doria: Sorry. I was turning mute off. It takes time.

No. I mean, I think I actually tend to agree. I think we have this, and I'm kind of hoping that we can walk through these issues one by one. I tend to agree with what was just said. But that's the moving forward.

I think, though, that these two are really not as different as they seem because us giving advice is us being involved in the process.

But you're right. It does need editing, I think, and I agree with that. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Avri.

David Fares, are you okay with this?

David Fares: Yes. That's a very helpful clarification. If that could just be posted as one of my initial comments but, again, with further consultation with our constituency.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That would be great. If you could post that in writing, that would create a good record of it. I don't know how quickly we can get the transcripts from this call. So it's always better to be able to post this all in writing on the mailing list.

I realize time is ticking.

And, as I said earlier, the working group will go back to-- the sub-team will go back to work based on the comments that you're all going to be able to post to the mailing list. And I hope that there will be plenty of them.

I hope that, if you do-- If you are the only person from your community that is in this-- on this call, please, go back to your colleagues and ask them as well. And I realize that some people are here as individuals, and some people are here as liaisons to their community. Patrick Folstrom (ph) has mentioned earlier that the SSAC (ph) is not able to appoint people to speak on behalf of the SSAC. So they're all-- The SSAC is here as individuals. But, if you are a liaison to your community, then, please, ask your community. And this is the week to do so. We need to get moving, so this needs to go quite fast. This is a high-speed putting together of the charter on the one side.

Now, going back to the agenda, I realize we've got several more items that are here. I suggested earlier that we get-- for the time being, we sideline the multi-stakeholderism versus multi-lateralism discussion. Maybe we can have this on the next call.

But we have the luck of having Theresa Swinehart here to provide us with an update on the Brazil meeting organization committees. There's been an enormous amount of e-mail on the OneNet mailing list. And, frankly, and I'm speaking for myself, but I think that I've read also the case for you other people on the mailing list. I have had no idea about what is being discussed there. It's going in all directions. And there is such a volume of e-mail on that list, I have trouble being able to keep up with it. And trying to find the potent, proper information about what is going on in the organization committees and how our work is fitting with this or doesn't fit with this and what the roadmap is up to Brazil is something that I thought would be helpful for Theresa to be able to share with us.

Theresa, are you here with us?

Theresa Swinehart: I am. Yep. Hold on just one second.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Welcome, Theresa. And I realize you've just stepped off a plane, so thank you for joining us.

Theresa Swinehart: Not a problem at all. And thanks so much for having me.

Sally, you're also on the call?

Sally Costerton: Yes. Sorry. I was on mute.

Theresa Swinehart: Okay. Not a problem because, on some of the things, specifically with regards to Brazil, I may ask (unintelligible).

First, let me wish everybody-- I know I wasn't on the call at the beginning. But I hope you all had a wonderful holiday and to a great 2014. And thank you, everybody, also for the work that this group is doing. I think it's incredibly useful to have these conversations and to continue these kinds of dialogues, both from a staff perspective with the ICANN community members but also to have these kinds of conversations (unintelligible) community members of ICANN itself. I know it's a lot of work and time out of people's schedules.

Olivier, I think, from you and Rafik, I was to touch briefly on-- I'd like to touch briefly on some of the OneNet-related areas and then into the Brazil aspects.

On the OneNet itself, I think everybody's seen that, over the past few months, we've had some quite lively discussions and then, also, as has been pointed out, some very substantive threads of discussions that now we'd like to be looking at-- not we ICANN but, I think, we as a community overall should start looking at how we can move those maybe into some discussion forums and mechanisms of discussion forums that could occur, potentially, on the Website itself or have thematic headlines to them. And so thoughts from this group and people with experience in this in contributing those ideas to (unintelligible) and to the OneNet list itself how we can move to some substantive dialogues and ease the mechanism by which one can follow some of the threads - any ideas around that. I would really encourage people to contribute to those dialogues.

As you have seen, (unintelligible) sent out today both-- two things. One, the mailing list for the steering group itself has been put into place. And then he also sent out a note updating on the call that took place last week in the preparations of the Brazil meeting. And, for those of you who have ties into civil society, technical, and academic community, if you could really encourage the stakeholder groups to identify their names for the committees that go for the preparations of the Brazil meeting, that would be really, really helpful to encourage those.

The intent is to have a preliminary planning meeting on the 10th of January - so, this coming Friday - and to invite those who have been identified as the names being put forward from the different stakeholder groups for the preparation of the Brazil meeting to have an invite in order to participate in that. And huge congratulations to the business community, which was able to get their names put forward through that process. But, again, those of you who have ties into civil society, technical, and the academic, please, also encourage them-- those groups to put their names forward.

The planning itself will begin through the communities that have been outlined, and I can let Sally touch on that further.

I think one question for this group is also how to provide some of the work that this group is doing. And, for that, we foresee that there will be a Website through which all the substantive contributions and input into the substantive preparations of the Brazil meeting would be one really good avenue in order to do that. It's going to be part of the preparation calls that will be taking place this Friday and onward, the committee's work.

Rafik, I will leave it at that. And then I'm happy to answer any questions whatsoever. I'm just cognizant of the time and the opportunity for discussion here.

Rafik Dammak:

Thank you, Theresa. I have myself one question. It's more about the role of ICANN in the whole process; so, more clarification about that, not just about the executive committee and so on. So can you just clarify? What's the role of ICANN, and what's the role of the community in such process?

Theresa Swinehart: In which process? In the OneNet overall or in the Brazil or overall internet governance?

Rafik Dammak: About the Brazil meeting.

Theresa Swinehart: Oh. I see.

Sally Costerton: So the role of ICANN in the Brazil meeting is part of the organization, along with the other members of the committee. Some ICANN people may be on the committee if they are part of the nominations that go through from the community. That might include staff. It would certainly include community members. And they will qualify through one of the four stakeholder groups that you're aware of - academia, technical-- probably not government, although potentially government-- but, certainly business. And that (inaudible) at the moment, I'd say.

Let me just explain on the committee. I think you all know because it's been on the list. The two committees that will do most of the heavy lifting around the organization at the conference. One is the-- what they call the executive multi-stakeholder committee, which will be chaired by (Unintelligible). He will be probably looking for co-chairs for that committee that I think will offer a balanced representation across the different stakeholder groups. And that will be one of the things that is discussed at the meeting on the 10th. That will contain-- I think it's eight representatives from the OneNet (technical difficulties). I think it's been published quite widely on the list.

And the second is the logistics committee, which will be chaired by (Unintelligible), who I think most of you know. And he will have Nick Tomasso from ICANN on that committee. We already know that. Obviously, the ICANN experience in running very large meetings and the logistics and technology associated with that will be helpful to Hartman (ph) (inaudible). But there will also be others on that logistics committee. And that second committee will also run the secretariats that will run all the committee meetings. That's CTI, Hartman's team.

So a key goal at the meeting on the 10th is to answer many of the questions that have been moving around on the list about invitation strategy, about enter approach, and about exactly how the committees will run and how public the conversations will be. And there's a recognition from the local organizers that those questions do need answering. And that needs to be done as quickly as possible.

So I hope that's a helpful update.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Sally.

I think we have people in the queue, starting with Patricio and then Olivier.

Patricio Poblete: Patricio Poblete here. Just a question for Theresa. When you were mentioning that representatives from the business, technical, academic, and civil society stakeholder groups were being thought (ph)-- I'm here as a liaison with the ccTLD community. Where is the ccTLD community supposed to fit in that taxonomy?

Theresa Swinehart: The ccTLD community is part-- would be part of the technical community. My understanding is that the same process is being used as has been used in the past for the selection for the internet governance forum multi-stakeholder advisory group. And that process is one that is led by the Internet Society in that they have done a call out for nominations for both the OneNet steering group or coordination group, whichever name you want to use for that, and for (technical difficulties)--

Rafik Dammak: We've lost her.

(Multiple Speakers)

Rafik Dammak: We can hear you.

Theresa Swinehart: Oh, you can? Or have you lost--? Which part did you lose me on?

Rafik Dammak: If you can repeat the last part.

Theresa Swinehart: The last part? Okay.

So George Podowski (ph) is the chair for that nomination committee process that is being used and has been used in the past and is facilitated by ISOC. And he would be the point of contact in case you have not heard or received any information with regards to the technical community nomination process.

Is that helpful? Or did you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yep. I heard you.

Theresa Swinehart: Okay. Sorry. My phone has been dropping off left and right. So my apologies.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Theresa. I think now we have Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Rafik.

It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking and here with (unintelligible) as chair of the ALAC. And I'm going to ask the same question as Patricio Poblete.

We've had discussions in the ALAC as to what the process is with regards to this Brazil selection of people and the fitting of people in boxes such as civil society, private sector, et cetera, et cetera. Where does the ALAC fit in that? Sorry. Where does at-large fit in this, bearing in mind these are internet users that are a mix of all of the above. That was (inaudible).

And the second question was: Where are the safeguards for geographical diversity? I see that the discussions currently taking place are 99.9% led by the usual suspects based in Europe and in North America. Are there any safeguards as to being able to have a higher proportion of people from Latin America, from the Caribbean, from Africa, from the Middle East, and Asia?

These are my two questions. Thank you.

Theresa Swinehart: Olivier-- Go ahead, Sally. Do you want to--?

Sally Costerton: No. You start.

Theresa Swinehart: Olivier, in the broader internet governance sphere, which stakeholder group do ALAC members-- how do you say it-- not fit into-- it's the wrong words-- But in which stakeholder groups do ALAC participants consider themselves to be falling into, because that would be-- The whole process is really not based on ICANN stakeholders, but it's based on the broader internet governance stakeholder groups. So I guess I have to pose

the question back as well just for clarity is there. Is that traditionally the technical community, or is that traditionally civil society, academia, or a mix there above?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: There is a bit of everything. It's Olivier speaking. There is a bit of everything. And this is the problem, fitting-- polarizing the at-large community onto one group would obviously then disenfranchise another part of at-large. We have some people who are in the technical community, some people who are in civil society, et cetera. So there is a mix. Others might know more.

Theresa Swinehart: So then the participation would be through those respective stakeholder groups for the purposes of these discussions.

I'm sorry, Avri. I interrupted. I'm sorry.

Avri Doria: No, you didn't. I was interrupting you because I wasn't sure if anybody was watching the hands.

I think we're getting confused in terms of looking at the various layers. At-large is indeed a multi-stakeholder group in and of itself. And so I think, as you say, it makes very much sense that they do participate through the various other communities that they all belong to. I mean, so, you know-- And I'm a member of at-large too and also belong to civil society and technical community groups, et cetera. And there are some that also belong to business. So I think within ICANN we certainly have a different subdivision with ccTLDs, et cetera, and at-large and ALAC.

But, in the internet governance space as it's currently constituted, we don't have that degree of subdivision because that's within ICANN itself, being a multi-stakeholder organization that is self organized and (inaudible).

But I think we get confused sometimes when we try to cross the boundary and we're sitting here in ICANN talking about our multi-stakeholder understanding but how ICANN participates within the larger internet governance environment. And I think it's important to not confuse those two different multi-stakeholder stakeholder divisions. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Avri. I think we have also Holly in the queue.

Holly Raiche: Yes. Thank you. Holly Raiche for the record. I'd just like to support what both Olivier and Avri said. And that is it's inappropriate to think that the ALAC members belong to a particular sort of UN (ph) categorization. I could say I belong to the lawyer group. I belong to academia. I belong to a user group. I belong to a consumer group. So I've got three hats to wear. And I think a lot of people within ALAC have many hats and many different qualifications to where it's just-- it doesn't make sense to try to break down the participants the way that you've tried. It makes much more sense to say a lot of us have a lot of hats and a lot of expertise that we bring to the table as an at-large community. And perhaps, as Avri put it so well, it's a very good ICANN example of the multi-stakeholder groups. Thank you.

Theresa Swinehart: Do you want me to go through the second question, Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. (Unintelligible).

Theresa Swinehart: I'm sorry?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, please.

Theresa Swinehart: Okay. Sorry. To the other point of the geographic diversity and the safeguards around that, that's an area where it's really essential that the stakeholder groups and the processes that they're using are looking towards achieving that objective. It would seem quite inappropriate for people from outside of those stakeholder groups to determine what the process has been. But I think the responsibility does lie with the respective stakeholder groups to ensure that, through their processes, they have identified what they feel is the best representation, including the best geographic representation.

And so I realize that does not answer the full question and actually puts the responsibility back onto the stakeholder groups. And I'm cognizant that there's been some discussions on the OneNet list with regards to (unintelligible) made by respective selection processes. But I think those things need to go back to those respective stakeholder groups for dialogue within those communities themselves and then looking at the processes they have.

I would be certainly uncomfortable from an ICANN staff standpoint questioning the selection process of a different stakeholder group, irrespective of which one it was. But that's just my personal observation with regards to that. But I would really welcome some thoughts and input on that and whether, through community dialogues in this broader internet governance space, there should be mechanisms looked at.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Theresa.

Before passing the floor to Evan, I think we are now five minutes past the call. But, if we can get additional five minutes to respond to any additional questions, then we can roll out (ph) this call.

Yes, Evan?

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks. Hi. This is Evan Leibovitch (unintelligible).

Theresa, you're asking for input. I'm more than happy to offer some.

I think it's a bit of a dereliction of duty for ICANN staff to just go back to the advisory groups and punt it and say - Go back and find yourself a place in the existing silos. That is exactly what you don't want to do. That is exactly not defending the multi-stakeholder model. The advisory groups, both ALAC and SSAC and all the advisory groups, with the exception of the GAC, as Avri has mentioned within the chat, are creations of ICANN. They're components of the multi-stakeholder model. And it is absolutely inappropriate just to go back and say - Well, figure your own place. These advisory groups are a creation of ICANN. They're an integral part of the multi-stakeholder model. And it is an absolute dereliction in my opinion to say - Okay, you've got to go back, and you've got to reposition yourselves in the existing silos.

So, if you're looking for feedback, you've got it. This is not the way to approach it. Thank you.

Theresa Swinehart: Could I ask a question? How-- We'd really welcome suggestions on how to approach it then, because, as we know, these discussions in the dialogues around both the Brazil meeting and around the OneNet and other things are broader internet governance related discussions. So I would actually, very frankly, welcome suggestions on how to look at the ICANN multi-stakeholder model process and the supporting organization and

advisory community structures that we have, which has the very unique, as was observed earlier-- very unique multi-stakeholder components in of themselves. And how to look at the engagement of that while also being respectful of the communities in the broader internet governance space and being respectful of the community processes within the supporting organizations and the advisory committee processes. So I'd be quite candid. I would welcome suggestions on how to look at that.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. We're not going to resolve that in this call with seconds left. But I know I for one am happy to have that conversation.

Theresa Swinehart: I'd be very happy to have that because I think it's a unique situation. And I would suspect that ICANN is not the only organization that faces that. So I think it's worthy conversation.

Evan Leibovitch: Okay. We can take that offline afterwards.

Theresa Swinehart: That's great. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Theresa. I think we have Avri. Thank you. Yes, Avri?

Avri Doria: Yeah. Again, I'm getting into the difference between the various layers at which we work. ICANN is a technical community organization, as I understand it. So, if ICANN is going to put names forward, those names forward-- those names that ICANN puts forward for technical committee or technical community consideration via the ISAC process should be names that are formed from our multi-stakeholder process. And, had we gotten our stuff together a month ago, this committee, indeed, could have been useful in putting together a set of names that ICANN could have then put forward. Here are some of our technical community members that we think should be considered for these roles, because, at the second layer, you basically look at this as we are stakeholders. We are a technical community stakeholder organization, a multi-stakeholder technical community organization. So that means that we give advice in that particular aggregate model. At least that would be my advice. Thanks.

Holly Raiche: Olivier, can I get in the queue?

(Multiple Speakers)

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I think we have Holly in the queue. And maybe we should cut it after. So it will be the last question to Theresa. But, yes. Theresa, then Holly. Theresa?

Theresa Swinehart: It wasn't me - Theresa. It must have been somebody else.

Marilyn Cade: Rafik, it was Marilyn.

Rafik Dammak: I didn't see you. Okay, Marilyn. So we have Theresa. I think she wants to reply. And then Holly and then you. Yeah. And then we can cut the queue. Theresa?

Theresa Swinehart: No. I think we're confusing Marilyn and Theresa.

Rafik Dammak: Oh, okay. Sorry. So Holly and then Marilyn.

Holly Raiche: Who's talking here, sir? I'll go ahead. It's Holly Raiche for the record.

I'd like to just expand on what Avri said when she said ICANN is a technical community. It's in one sense technical. But I'd like that very widely defined because technical is very specifically technical, but it's also the surrounding issues of things like security. It's also surrounding things like communities that are interested in IP law and other forms of law and consumer protection. So technical, but, please, listen to that as a very, very broad term. And perhaps it's better defined as the focus on the mission of ICANN, which is domain names and IP addresses. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Holly. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. I'm actually going to ask us to focus ourselves back on what is ICANN about and what is ICANN not about. So I'm a little concerned that I'm hearing we want to present names, we want to present strategies, we want to present positions that are outside of scope or ICANN. I'd like ICANN to focus on itself, its role. And, as someone who works both in ICANN but also outside on internet governance, I understand we may want to bridge different perspectives. But I'd like us to in this group, which is only about ICANN-- this is only about ICANN. This is a cross-community working group about ICANN. What are we doing about ICANN and its role? Making ICANN invested and accountable will prevent certain other challenges or (inaudible). But I don't hear us understanding that. I hear us thinking, okay, we're going to work in this working group, and we're going to do a broader set of issues. I don't agree to that until I go back to business. I need for business to come back and tell me this working group can be about everything under the sun (inaudible). I want this group to be focused on what is ICANN's role.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Marilyn. Theresa, you want to respond to that?

Theresa Swinehart: Sure. I think that Marilyn raises an important point for this group's discussion, and I think that was also reflected somewhat in the dialogue around the charter as well. And so I think that's really something for this group to discuss further and to see how they want-- how the group itself wants to coalesce around this. I can't really answer the question, but I think it's worth identifying where to utilize the enormous expertise that this group brings together but also (unintelligible) more broadly in how to leverage that for both the broader dialogues around internet governance and then, more specifically, in the context of ICANN.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Theresa, for--

Theresa Swinehart: Okay. And why was that funny?

Rafik Dammak: I'm not sure. But, anyway, thanks for that and being on this call today and giving us a briefing and responding to our questions.

And so I think we have (unintelligible) 15 minutes after (unintelligible) on this call. So I think we raised more questions than answers today. And I think many people are leaving the call. So I would like to wrap this call. If there is any other business or any actions that we would like to take-- Also, I really encourage everybody to continue the discussion in the several threads that we raised today in the mailing list so that everybody can participate.

It seems that Olivier might want to (inaudible). Yes, Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Rafik. It's Olivier speaking. I was going to volunteer to do the wrap up and the action items, since several people have asked for this to take place. May I?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks. So, from my notes, there are three basic next steps to take out from this meeting.

The first one is for the charter sub-team to work on the next version of the charter with the input from all of the participants, both on this call but also all the participants in the working group. And the input is to be sent to the mailing list so that it actually generates discussion as well and so the charter sub-team will be able to pick that up from the mailing list.

The second action item and next steps is for the follow-up on the conversation of the standard UN silos. It's recognized that there are some ccTLDs that are civil society and some are business led and some are government led. And there are some at-large that are technical, and some are civil society. Same also for the private sector with the IPC and others who don't quite fit in the silos. So perhaps a follow-up conversation on the mailing list on these would be helpful.

Third next step is the question: What are we going to do about ICANN? What is ICANN's role - the concerns, the questions raised by Marilyn. Also, follow up on the mailing list.

I was just going to ask perhaps-- Actually, it is late to ask whether we wanted to have Wiki pages made on those. We probably won't. Let's just have it on the mailing list for the time being. And, if Wiki pages need to be created, then Ergys will be able to create them and copy what's on the mailing list onto the Wiki pages.

Have I missed any action items and next steps on there? Now is your time to speak if I've forgotten anything. I don't hear anyone shout out, and I don't see any hands apart from mine up in the air. So I think that's all the next steps.

There's just one more next step, and that's just for a little summary of what we've agreed on just now to be sent to the mailing list. And I guess that what we've agreed on, really, are just the next steps at this point in time. Of course, staff will also be sending the chat over-- the chat text over to the mailing list, as well, so that we can all peruse it. I'm told that the recording of this meeting will be made available immediately afterwards, and the transcripts will be made available within 72 hours. And so, when these will be available, could I ask staff to, please, notify the mailing list about this?

That's all with regards to the next steps. Back to you, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Olivier. So we have actions to follow up. And I would like to thank everybody for attending the call today. I'm sorry that we were not-- ran out of time. And so thanks. And I adjourn this call for today. So thank you, everybody.