

20140314_ccwgIG_ID862815

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. This is the Conference Call of the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance. Today is the 14th, Friday 14th March, 2014. The time is 07:06 UTC. Let's have a roll call, please.

Renate De Wulf: All right. We have Alain Bidron, Bill Drake, Filiz Yilmaz, Naresh Ajwani, Marilyn Cade, Michele Neylon, Olivier Crepin-Leblond; and from Staff we have Alexandra Dans, and me, Renate De Wulf.

Marilyn Cade: Olivier, if I could just--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: So we have IC, NCUC, Registries -- right Filiz; Registries?

Filiz Yilmaz: No. It's ASO and AC--

Marilyn Cade: Oh. I'm sorry. ASO -- right, right, right. Sorry. ASO, we have Registrars and we have the BC (ph) from the CSG, plus the ALAC, right. I just was trying to make sure how diverse our participation was. I think diverse.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Thank you, Marilyn. It's pretty good, it's not optimal. But let's see. Have we missed anyone from the roll call? We haven't? Okay. That's the full list at the moment. So welcome everybody.

The agenda needs to be adopted, and the agenda is as currently displayed on your Adobe Connect screen; or as displayed on the Wiki page which is, hopefully, the same as the Adobe Connect screen. Yeah. And what we are going to be dealing with today is just quickly looking at the action items, and then the majority of our discussions will be on the Singapore Meeting preparation.

Does anybody have any other business to add to this, or wishes to amend the agenda? And I don't hear anybody shout out, yes, so the agenda is adopted.

Let's have a quick look at the action items review, and those are from our call on the 7th of March, and there was only one action item in there, and that was for Petya to send a note to Naresh, welcoming his submitting ideas, along with others, into the CCWG session in Singapore. We happen to have Naresh on the call. Naresh, could you please send -- that appears to have been effected.

Naresh Ajwani: Sorry, for my (inaudible), I couldn't connect.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. The closed action item, Naresh, is for Petya Minkova to send a note to you, welcoming your submitting ideas along with others, into the Cross Community Working Group Session in Singapore. I think that this relates to some of the comments you had made on the main draft that

was sent to Brazil, and a number of them needed an expansion of some sort, and I think that was what the EI related to.

Naresh Ajwani: I appreciate, but let me just tell you how the -- just Council, they go for these meetings. We are given an opportunity of attending one ICANN meeting in a quarter. So this particular -- and we are three people from (Inaudible) area, so this Singapore Meeting is being attended by my other colleague, and I'm attending the next meeting of London, and the next to next meeting. So this meeting, that's precisely, I couldn't respond back to her, because I assumed that either Louis or my other colleague who is going to Singapore will be responding to -- back to her saying that Naresh is not going to be there. But yes, I'm willing to make a paper, otherwise, I'm going to expand whatever I have written, and I will be forwarding this in.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That's fantastic, Naresh. Thank you; and we've also taken note that you're not going to be in Singapore, but you will be able to join us remotely during the sessions in Singapore.

Naresh Ajwani: Okay. I can also do one particular, you know, elaboration on my side, I am a firm believer as a business guy, that we must understand what is the objection. And if we can understand the objection, there is nothing left for us to respond back effectively. In my viewpoint, I was observing that objections are not being understood, or the responses are overlooking those objections. I have to see that whatever my viewpoint on a multistakeholderism, or any other aspect, if accommodating the views which are very highly critical, if I can really bring a solution.

For example, multistakeholderism, if I can give more representation, if I can widen more cross constituencies, if that can really make everyone to acknowledge that this is the best way to do it, and yes, in terms of what you people are asking, in terms of wider or underrepresented has to be represented, we are absolutely open about it.

Similarly, if we can accommodate government in RIRs because they are not there, and approach of RIR is that it is an open meeting, they are most welcome to come. We have to understand the protocol required for engaging government. It never happens that it is open, and you can come, because any government will come, would like to have some kind of a say, so then you have to -- you know, give them that kind of a say, then we have to build the framework in the quadrants. So my objective of putting all these points was that we shall, instead of opposing, instead of ducking, if we can build a framework which accommodates the -- ICANN's -- more engagement, or ICANN's understanding as well as, you know, certain things which we really can do it within our framework. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Naresh. Do I understand that you're going to put this down on paper and send it to the Working Group then?

Naresh Ajwani: I will do that. I will do that.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: And I will be -- that would be great, thank you. Because I'm just concerned of how few people are here, and I think that this -- the points you've explained just now, are very much worth discussing in Singapore, and as you know we've got our face-to-face discussions as well. So that would be a great help.

Okay. Let's move on, and let's go over to the main part of our call, which is going to be the Singapore Meeting preparation. I've sent an email out to the mailing list yesterday, which was a follow up and a summary of the discussions that took place only a few hours ago. And I said yesterday, it's not even yesterday, for me it was yesterday, but for others it's not -- a few hours ago to the mailing list, which provided a summary of the discussions that took place in the Organizing Committee. If you haven't read that email, I'm putting it in the Chat at the moment. So this is the archive of that email, and I wonder if I could put this email on the screen somehow. Let's see, I could -- yeah, I do have -- right, I'll tell you what we'll do.

Renate, I'm going to press this Stop Sharing button, and I'm going to upload the PDF -- Ah, here we go. So share documents, and I'm going to add just one thing, so if you just bear with me for a quick second, here we go. And that's loading at the moment, and so -- oh, God, this is so annoying. I apologize for this. It says that the file name should not be more than 50 characters. Here we go. Let's start again.

So I don't whether you've all read that email or not, but I sent that a few hours ago, and it basically spoke of several things. Here we go; it was loading at the moment. This is just a PDF of the email that I sent out, and you should be seeing it all on your screen. Has it come up on your screen? It should do.

Renate De Wulf: Yes, it is.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So, the Working Group discussed three things. It discussed the timing issue of when the slot should go. You know, when the Cross Community Working Group should have its slots. Not the proposed agenda of the meeting, of only the first meeting. So the public meeting, basically, and it also looked at the proposed format of the public meeting, and then it also looked at the questions that were to be asked to the community. There was consensus among the members that were present, on the time, on the proposed agenda, and on the proposed format. But we somehow ran out of time with refining the questions. We did spend a serious amount of time on the questions to be asked from the community, and we just managed to put a few together and didn't really manage to converge very much on it.

What I propose here is to review quickly the first points, and then to spend most of our time today on the questions, since this other -- the really important thing that we need to settle on. And I'm a bit -- I do find it a bit unfortunate we didn't get much more feedback on our summary of yesterday's discussions on the mailing list. But I guess everybody is very busy, and of course there's also the factor of the Singapore Meeting coming up soon; so hoping that we'll get a few more answers, and a few more updates over the weekend.

Let's have a quick look. First, the time; I see Bill Drake. Welcome, Bill. You have arrived at the -- you've put your hand up. Let's find out, first, from Bill Drake. Bill, you have the floor.

Bill Drake: Thanks, Olivier. I just have a quick question because I couldn't make the call yesterday. Life intervened, unfortunately. When we were -- when I had participated in the last Planning Meeting, I had understood that the questions we were developing were ones that would be posed to the representatives, to the participants from the CCWG to get the conversation going, and then we would go to the floor. Do I understand reading this email now, this morning that the concept now has been actually, the participants from the CCWG are just making brief opening comments, and these questions would then be posed to the audience? And so the fundamental focus is the whole thing will be the audience. Is that right?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, Bill. Thank you. It's Olivier speaking. For the time being that's the plan as discussed. Your suggestion was discussed yesterday, and the -- it kind of transformed itself into what we have now. But if you -- I mean we can touch onto this in a moment. The first thing I wanted to touch on was the time, of the Cross Community Working Group. Then we'll touch on the format and we'll touch on the questions immediately afterwards.

So, first the timing, and the team yesterday felt that it was important to basically insist on having the 10:30 a.m. until 12:30 a.m. -- 12:30 p.m. slots on the Monday. That's a slot immediately after the opening ceremony.

I've also noticed on the CCWG's mailing list that this has been supported as well. If we want to have that, we really need to have Rafik and I send an email to David Olive and to Sally Costerton to insist that the CCWG and IG session be scheduled in the morning. I was hoping we would have

more people on this call than we do, but I do note that the additional number of people who are joining us today are -- well, additional, but people.

That's Michele Neylon, who's saying, "Just do it." We've already discussed it more than once.

Let me just ask for a consensus call here. Does anyone believe that we should not do it, that we should stick to the allocated afternoon session? Bill, you have your hand up. I can't hear from you, Bill Drake. You might be muted.

Bill Drake: I'm sorry. Could you repeat the question? I had to step away for a second.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Question is -- that's regarding the time. It's a consensus call, basically asking whether the -- whether Rafik and I, the two facilitators, should email Sally Costerton and David Olive to reflect and say--

Bill Drake: Yeah. Sure.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: --so the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance session be schedule in the morning, and be taking the two hours in the morning.

Bill Drake: Yeah. Right. We talked about this the last time, yes. Sure.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks. Well, I'm just sort of cross-checking twice, more than once. I think that this has now been circulated, this concept and this discussion has now being circulated for more than a week on the mailing list, and has been discussed on three conference calls. For the record, I believe that there has been no voice going against this so we appear to have consensus on Rafik and I to email Sally Costerton and David Olive to propose to the -- to propose to them that -- No. Sorry -- to request that the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance Session be two hours, and be in the morning and in the 10:30 and the 12:30 a.m. slots.

Can we have this as an action item, please, Renate? And I think that's pretty straightforward. Let's move on.

Renate De Wulf: Okay.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Then, now we have the proposed agenda and that's where the comment from Bill just comes in. So, the Group yesterday -- Sorry -- The group a few hours earlier discussed the various proposals that were made on the mailing list, including yours, Bill, and the overall consensus was found to be as it's now displayed, with the introduction being a pretty short introduction, and then the CCWG statements, being effectively a brief description of what the Cross Community Working Group statement sent to Brazil is. So effectively that statement will probably be put on screen and will be briefly summarized.

And then community statements, and those are actually statements from individual communities in the Cross Community Working Group, that includes any minor statements, or any points that any of our SOs, ACs, and SGs, would like to bring forward. Or, any points that any of the Working Group members, in the Working Group would like to put forward, bearing in mind that not all of the SOs, ACs and SGs will have time by that meeting, to come up with a consensus -- a short consensus statement. I know that some will have, some will not. So it's not a mandatory thing for every SO, AC and SG to come up with a statement, and we have to recognize also, we've only got 10 minutes there, and we've got a lot of SOs, ACs and SGs on this Cross Community Working Group.

And then the bulk of the meeting would be the questions to the community. And there are two times there, one being, if we have a 90-minute session that would last for about 50 minutes. If we have a 120-minute session, which would be the morning session, it's a 120 minutes, the afternoon

session is 90 minutes. We have a 120-minute session then the questions to the community would last about 80 minutes or so.

Then, there will be a summary of points heard from the community that would be performed by the rapporteurs, and then an explanation into the next steps, and the roadmap for the Cross Community Working Group. Where are we going next, effectively? What's happening after the call?

The proposed format would include having rapporteurs in our Group that would be chosen. I have no idea how many rapporteurs, or who these could be. They could be the session moderators, and those were suggested as being Rafik and myself, and there could be other people in our Cross Community Working Group. We could nominate a handful of people to support the co-moderators, and so your suggestion and the suggestions of people who were not on the call last night, are welcome on this matter.

And, of course, I now open the floor for the discussion of the proposed agenda. And Bill is, that's the time on -- Yes, I've anticipated this. Bill Drake.

Bill Drake:

Oh, you did anticipate it. Oh. So, predictable. If this is what people want to do, it's -- you know, I yield to the majority. I have a feeling that it will be rather formless, and I'm not sure what it will take away, but it's always valuable hearing lots of people get up and say things. So if we are doing this then, and I do recognize that my hope that we might have stimulated the difference of groupings in the CCWG to try to possibly come up with responses just as to the request was probably overly optimistic given the timeframe. So, okay.

So just so I understand, the CCWG statement is 10 minutes, and then so it's community statements 10 minutes total, so that's how many people there? How many people there are you anticipating speaking in those 10 minutes?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:

Yes, thank you, Bill. Olivier speaking. That's a good question I have no idea. I would have said maybe between 5 and 10 people would be making a statement from our Cross Community Working Group. I note that we have more than that number of SOs, ACs and SGs represented, but I certainly -- bearing in mind that we are Friday the 14th, and next week a lot of people are travelling. And certainly for my community, I don't see any statements being drafted by then. And I have a feeling that for others it might also be a challenge. I certainly heard this yesterday, and everyone else on the call here is welcomed to comment on this.

Marilyn Cade:

It's Marilyn. I can't seem to raise my hand. Could I comment on this?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:

Yes, Marilyn. Please go ahead.

Marilyn Cade:

We had one representative on the IPC, not Kristina, but a delegate she sent in her place, who noted that the ICC wants to insist on making a statement. That was news to me, I wasn't aware of that, but I think -- my own view is -- I've already said this, but I'll say it for the transcript. I don't think many groups will have prepared statements; I think that participants from their groups will have comments, and will want to participate. And so if we have a program that has questions, if somebody needs to make a statement, perhaps we have two timeframes when that can be accommodated. But we have to recognize that we shouldn't be giving priority to the CSG because -- to the CCWG participants over the rest of the community.

I think in this case this was a constituency making such a statement, not as a CCWG member, but as a constituency. And maybe we could just have two timeframes, set them aside, they are no more than two (ph) minutes, people get no more than two minutes to make a prepared statement, and then we move on with the audience participation, and even the sponsors throughout the set.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Thank you, Marilyn. I think, yeah that's, effectively, what we discussed yesterday, and I recall the -- I think that one of the concerns I certainly had -- It's Olivier speaking -- One of the concerns I certainly had was to make any statements from constituencies, and from ourselves, with the input that would be coming in from the audience.

The other thing, Bill, by the way, and that's just in reference to your input and the proposals which you had made, there was concern that we should use, we as the Cross Community Working Group, should use a maximum amount of time when faced with the community, to get their input, to gather their input. And for the Working Group in itself, to talk to each other and so on, we would reserve the Wednesday mornings.

And therefore one of the concerns was that when you have a panel and then an audience. The panel loves talking to itself, and the majority of the time is then taken by the Panel talking to each other and the audience just watching on, and eagerly waiting to be able to say something, only to be given a few minutes at the end. And you know, then we say, oh, but we've run out of time. So that was a concern. Bill, you've raised your hand.

Bill Drake: Yes. Thanks. I'm familiar with the dynamics that you're concerned about, in terms of you've seen it elsewhere. I wasn't anticipating that sort of thing in the case of what I was suggesting, and I'm certainly not interested in the Panel talking to itself. I would have liked -- there are other things where I would have liked, even if it wasn't formal statements that each community signed off on. If they have representatives, would they give a mandate to express a general view on a couple of specific points? It would be nice to get some specific responses on the table. I would like to hear -- from particular groups, I would like to hear, say, what they think about, you know, for example, globalization.

And I know other brothers who feel the same way. But if that is something that everybody regards as problematic then I'm certainly going to roll with trying it this way, and I, you know, will see what we hear.

The other question I had was, if you're talking about -- in response to Marilyn's point, having two segments for formal statements, and then another segment for group members to give a general kind response based on their community discussions. Do we have any real expectation besides the IPC, of people having formal statements? I mean I -- certainly NCUC wasn't contemplating writing a statement. We talk to each other, we have consensus on points, and I would simply kind of reflect that, but if those communities will make informal, loyal statements, do we know how many there might be? Because if it's only the IPC in there, and it becomes a straight (inaudible) -- Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Thank you very much, Bill. So, two things, first on the item number three in the proposed agenda for Singapore, it says, "Community statements --" I think that's just a placeholder for community statements/comments. And that's from the different various groups. I think that was to accommodate your suggestion of having the various SOs, ACs and SGs being able to either make a statement, or have members from the Cross Community Working Group make comments on the what they do say.

Bill Drake: Right. And Marilyn is proposing to split that in two, I thought. No? Or do you any more (inaudible).

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That's correct, yeah.

Marilyn Cade: No. No. Bill, sorry. Sorry. Bill, what I was saying is if we had too many then we just split it in two, but I don't think we had -- right now, the only group we've heard from is Kiran who is representing Kristina, right. So we've only heard from one -- frankly from the -- there are four BC liaisons to this Working Group. I'm the appointed rep to this. We are assuming our members are clamoring for the microphone. They are not clamoring to have one of us, speak on their behalf.

- Bill Drake: Understood. So, okay, I don't think we have to split that 10 minutes then into two formal segments, the IPC can just make its intervention and say, "This is a formal statement," and everybody will understand that they have -- some are different standing or forms, and the other comments, right?
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. Thank you, Bill. So are you proposing then that the community statements and comments are put into the questions to community? I mean, this is where I thought the 10 minutes in advance would let the IPC and whichever other SOs, ACs and SGs that wishes to make a statement or a comment, or any of the Working Group members that wish to make a comment in advance of the questions to the community. And then once we've got these through that might -- those comments or statements might be generating some feedback from the audience, depending on how controversial they are, or how insinuating they are. And then all we've got basically is to just go on the questions to the community, and generate the questions -- and generate feedback from this.
- I see Filiz Yilmaz has put a hand up. Filiz?
- Filiz Yilmaz: Hi, Olivier. Thank you. I basically typed what I wanted to say in the chat room too, because I couldn't wait. But I just want to repeat this again, and try to make myself as clear as possible. It's not about the number of expected community statements; it's 12 communities are expected to make statements for two minutes, this will already be transforming from the agenda. And I have a hard time justifying that for myself. But it's not even about how many there will be, it's about allocating, reserve my time already from the agenda. I think the fairest and most bottom-up reflection of what we are talking about here, would be using the laws to the whole community members in the same fora, and allowing people to queue up, and you can read their committed statements, or make their individual contributions.
- Everybody gets the same amount of time, yet, it can be the, you know, group contribution which has a consensus statement, which can be easily (inaudible), by the person who is reading the statement. Or, it can be an individual contribution. And I think that's the fairest thing. Why are we giving extra reserved, highlighted time to constituencies, while we are also running a public session? Thank you.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Filiz. And I'm still a bit confused, and it must be the early morning for me, although not that early, but notoriously slow at this time, and notoriously if I'd been very late last night as well. Help me out here. Are we keeping the community statements or not?
- Marilyn Cade: Keep them, I'd say yes--
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I hear "yes" from Bill. I see a "no" from Filiz.
- Marilyn Cade: Hmm?
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, Marilyn.
- Marilyn Cade: Look. We only have one week left for a community statement. It's not clear to me that that couldn't be accommodated by someone volunteering, raising their hand, and asking for a roving mike and makes a statement at that time, and then they could say, "This is a prepared statement on behalf of the IPC, rather than me speaking as Kristina Rosette, blah-blah-blah." So, I kind of think we could have it both ways here, not to designate a particular time, but to say, in your kickoff, you and Rafik say, "Some of the communities may have prepared statements and if so, this will introduce their comments in that way," and then they can be given the mike twice, so we are not saying the IPC only gets mike one time.

Individuals can stand up as well, but then we move it from a set time, and we just go into the questions, and people take the microphone if they want to say, "I'm speaking on behalf of the

GAC. Or, I'm speaking on behalf of the BC, or speaking on behalf of the ITC," they can do that. Maybe that satisfies both needs.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much. Thank you, Marilyn. So, what I seem to hear, and I'm reading the Chat at the same time. There seems to be flying well, it's to have one introduction, two CCWG statements, which is the explanation of the -- just a quick summary of what the statement sent to Brazil was, and then we go directly into the questions to community. But whilst we move from the CCWG statements to the questions to the community, we let -- and I guess we well know, that we will let the SOs, ACs and SGs, and whichever community statements wish to be made, to be made during the questions to community and it's -- I guess it's to be expected that these will be at the beginning of the questions to community session, since Bill will be able to jump on the mike right away.

And we'll make sure we also get a pony for Michele Neylon who is asking for this in the Chat; although I'm not quite sure whether that will be available in Singapore. Are we all okay?

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible/audio skip)

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Community input. Yeah, okay; questions to community. So the suggestion is to change then agenda item number four, which will become agenda item number three, into questions -- sorry -- into community inputs, rather than questions to community. And someone just said something, and I'm not quite sure whether -- who it was.

Bill Drake: Olivier, I raised my hand.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Hello? Yes. Is that Bill?

Bill Drake: Yeah, it is.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Bill, go ahead.

Bill Drake: Okay. I think it must be that I'm clueless, and haven't had enough coffee yet, so I have a feeling that we were talking a little bit past each other at some point. I didn't understand that the idea was that we were dumping any kind of comments from the members of the group, but if we are doing that, then is there any point the members of the Group being on the podium. I suppose we are just -- you could do this with you and Rafik at the front of the room, and it's a free for all, and everybody just gets up in the audience and says what they want, right? I mean we don't serve any purpose if we are not making any kind of comments on behalf of our respective groups. Unless I'm missing something, and it's highly possible.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Bill.

Bill Drake: I may well be missing something.

Marilyn Cade: Hi, Bill.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Bill. And Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. Let me see if I can respond to that. Bill, at least for the Business representatives, we are liaisons. We are not there to speak on behalf of the BCs, the members are there to speak on behalf of the BC, but we are there to listen, and so I do think it serves the purpose, just like when the Board sits in the front of the room, and nobody speaks except the Chairman of the Board, and Fadi. So in theory, the rest of the Board is listening.

So I to think it makes sense for there to be -- for us to be seated at the front of the room listening, and then also you may have noticed that I suggested that we assign that source to different

questions, and Bill's rapporteurs would be taking notes and supporting feedback to the two co-moderators. But I think, and I should say this, I've assumed that we could ask for the microphone, from sitting at the front of the room, but the microphone we would be handed, would be not from the roving mikes on the floor, but from the two co-moderators who would also have microphones, and they could hand the mike to the CCWG reps seated at the front of the room.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Bill, how does that sound?

Bill Drake: I'm really easy, so for whatever people are all comfortable with, I'll roll with. I do think that probably I would just like to make sure that certain -- that there's a real diversity of viewpoints represented, and depending on how the audience free-for-all goes, I think we may not -- it may be a little difficult to keep track of exactly where all the different parts of the community are standing in particular shoes, but you know, that's fine.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Bill. So if you look at the screen at the moment, so I've put now the whole agenda on the white screen. I've put square brackets around the community statements, so they are not really an agenda item, they will be folded into the community inputs at number four, and that just makes the community input a little bit longer. And then we've got summary of points here from the community, and the next steps.

How are we feeling with this? And I don't see anyone speaking against it, so that, effectively, what will happen is that the community statements or community comments will be folded into the community inputs, which will both include the questions and the address.

So what we will do then, is when we start the community input, we'll just ask if there's any points that anybody would like to make that could be the first few minutes, and then afterwards if there's no one queuing up at the mike, then we can start on our questions to the community and generate a dialogue, or least generate some input. I'll be very frank with you, my concern at the moment is that we'll be sitting there, waiting for people to come to the mike, and there will be very little input, very few people coming up to the mike. At least in the early moments of the discussion, and that's -- I'm saying this from experience on the ATRT2 saying, "We are open to your comments and questions, and we have no one step up." Then again, maybe the current subjects and topics on the table are more exciting than accountability and transparency of ICANN.

But who knows. Note the tone of my voice. Filiz Yilmaz.

Filiz Yilmaz: I just want to make a comment of your expectations, Olivier; about people not coming to the mike. I agree, it may happen, and I think it would be, once we open this part of the (inaudible), so the first two -- the first point is introduction, right. The second point would be the Working Group statements, in which we will lay out our findings or general messages that had been entered so far within the group. That's just triggered from (inaudible) anyways, from the audience. And the short agenda point, and it's one which -- the short agenda point, if you -- I think that the -- my opinion, the questions we are collecting, or we want to set forth right now, is to have that discussion going. It's not like -- I don't expect people to -- you know, come and answer the questions, per se, that we are raising, I think this is more like, that they are there to lead and steer the conversation, steer the discussion.

So this is why I also the community statements as part of that, and they can be given maybe you can, as the Chair, saying like, "Okay. So John's statement from our consensus of each statement per community who needs to be -- which needs to be said at the mike," maybe that they can be called out specifically, but I also suggest, is we do prepared time limits, per mike occupier. Say that, it's for a community statement, or an individual contribution. I think that needs to be clarified.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay.

Filiz Yilmaz: Like the statement-wide things that we do normally ask the public on. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Filiz. So, I note your suggestion of a clock, a count-down clock for people to speak, and I also note -- that's one thing, but I also note from Marilyn, that she would like to see roving mikes around the room and not a queue at the mike. I think the other clock, the timer is agreed on in the Chat. Everyone seems to like this, so let's -- in the interest of time, let's agree to this. Everyone is agreeing on the clock. With regards to the roving mike or the queuing at the mikes there is a -- at the moment there's no consensus. Some prefer the queuing, some prefer the roving. Any thoughts on this?

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. I'd like to speak on this, if I might.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I see we have also -- sorry, guys. I'm reading the Chat. It's a good thing I'm not a lawyer. The timer is fantastic, but I think -- I've been in too many of these meetings where people are expected to queue up and stand in line, and wait for their two minutes, and no one responds, because we just get on to the next comment. We haven't talked about how we are going to respond the comments, and before we make a decision about roving mikes or standing mikes, could we pause for a minute and talk about how the CCWG is going to respond to the comments? I propose rapporteurs, that maybe we should also talk about, you know, let's take a question, I'm being hypothetical here, we ask a question, we spend X-amount of minutes taking comments, and then what happens?

Do we say, "Okay, we've heard from -- in this timeslot we've heard from 12 speakers, we've heard a range of views, people are largely in agreement with what was submitted to the NETMundial Meeting, or additional points have been raised. And what are we going to do with the additional points, since our document is final into NETMundial," but we will know by tomorrow who is blessedly appointed to attend the meeting.

I think we should pause for a minute, Olivier, and ask what we are going to do with these -- if they are just statements, I see Michele said, "If they are question, that if we do get additional points that the community broadly agrees to, are we going to append something to our submission," which we could do.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. So, what I think -- what my suggestion on this is that the Wednesday session we'll review the input that was received on the Monday session, and then that the Wednesday session decides on adding the inputs to the contribution that was made in Brazil, and obviously make use of that additional input, in Brazil. The reason being that I don't think any of us in the Cross Community Working Group would be able to respond on behalf of the Cross Community Working Group during the Monday session, as we receive the input. It's going to be very difficult for us all to reach a consensus whilst the input is also coming in. Are you--?

Marilyn Cade: I'm not disagreeing -- It's Marilyn.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah, okay. That's, in effect, it's going to be very hard for the Cross Community Working Group to respond to any input immediately on the spot on Monday, except if a question is asked by the audience that is covered by the Cross Community Working Groups' statement that has been agreed by all of the members of the Cross Community Working Group. And so I gather that in having rapporteurs, and in taking note of the questions that are asked, if some questions are asked by the audience to ask the Cross Community Working Group to respond on, what we would have to do would be to take this into account, and let them know that the Cross Community Working Group will be working on it on Wednesday and providing an answer on this based on the discussions on the Wednesday session.

Marilyn Cade: And the only thing I would add, Olivier -- it's Marilyn -- is remind people that we know that communities are meeting on Tuesday, and they may have further feedback, they all have reps, you know, and maybe we have a sheet of paper that people can pick up, that has the names of the reps

for all the groups. When you say Wednesday is not closed, I hear you, but I think actually, Wednesdays, we are going to have other conflicts and the meeting room itself may mean it's -- there's -- either we are working or we are meeting in (inaudible), you can come back to that. But I think we've got to be practical about how much we can accomplish on Wednesday. That's it--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Thank you, Marilyn. I mean, Wednesday the aim is that -- it's not advertised as closed, as such, but obviously the work group members will be able to sit at a table, and will work and basically discuss the input and move forward with things. It's not a public session in that, it's not a session in which non-work-group members will be encouraged to provide input. But by not closed, I mean, observers are allowed to come into the room. It's not a session where we are basically closing the doors and saying, "Sorry, you can't come in." That was my suggestion to this.

I'm a little concerned we are spending a lot of time on the format, and we still have not refined any questions, at the moment, more than the current questions which are listed, and the interactivity of our public session is very likely to be influenced by how good our questions, and how punchy and how simulating our questions are.

Any further comments or questions on the proposed format? I've put here countdown timer, we still haven't got any consensus on whether we want roving mikes or a queue at the mikes. But I understand we do have consensus on the rapporteurs, and we don't know whether the rapporteurs should be session moderators, or other members of the Working Group, of the Cross Community Working Group. As one person has been designated a possible session moderator, I am a little concerned about having to be a rapporteur at the same time, especially it's -- being a moderator means having to move around the room, and having to draft something at the same time, it's going to be a bit hard. I would suggest that the rapporteurs be other people in the Working Group. And then--

Marilyn Cade: I agree--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes? Okay. I see "agree" from Bill.

Marilyn Cade: Agree from me.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Agree from Marilyn. Thank you. Agree from Yunam Lee (ph). Okay, I see agreement around for that. Right. So, Rafik and I will be co-moderators and the rapporteurs will be others from the CSG -- CCWG. What I would suggest then is we'll just issue a call for rapporteurs on our mailing list, and we can have up to three -- four rapporteurs, let's say. That kind of spreads the load among various people, and often that will give us four different angles by which -- you know, four different sets of ears, that will be able to report to us and generate our discussion on the Wednesday. Sounds good?

Questions. Let's spend the last few minutes of this call on questions. Let me see if I can move down to the question. Board -- thing, what happens there? Here we go. No. It doesn't work. This is so helpful. Ah-ah, there we are. Questions to the community -- Ah, and this whiteboard is a real pain. How does that work? Oh. Suddenly it works, okay.

So the six questions at the moment which have been together, and this is a very rough first draft of the questions, those needs we are finding. The first one, "Please comment on the principles we have submitted to NETMundial, and we would be focusing specifically on the roadmap, a part of the contribution." And then, "Please comment on the principles we have submitted to NETMundial focusing on the principles that have submitted and the contribution, and what does the community advise that ICANN's participation be as the Brazil's meeting?"

Then the next one, "Which input additional to the Cross Community Working Group document should ICANN participations at NETMundial receive to better participate?" Bearing in mind, by the way, that I don't even know whether we will know who are going to be ICANN's participants

at NETMundial by then. Let's call the m Joe Blogs. And you know, what as input would Joe Blogs need to have to better participate at the ICANN -- sorry -- better participate at NETMundial.

And then number five, "Which good is expected from ICANN participants at NETMundial. Are there more specific recommendations?" I must say I'm a little confused about the difference between four and five, but maybe you can enlighten me on this. And then number six, "What happens to any input and output regarding NETMundial?" Maybe that also needs to be expanded a little bit.

The floor is open for comments, questions, suggestions, et cetera, and I'm afraid we have not had any feedback on the mailing list regarding these questions. Perhaps, might it be important to maybe have one email sent to the mailing list and collect questions by email after this call.

I heard -- Marilyn Cade, you wish to speak, I think?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I just want to -- I'm just going to restate something I said yesterday, but not very coherently. So, whatever we think about this, and I'm not making a comment about it, Fadi Chehadé has made himself a Co-Host of this meeting. So when we say number four -- number three, number four and number five, are we talking about stakeholders who are participating, or are we talking about Board and Staff who are participating? Can we just clarify that first?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Marilyn. My understanding was community members, but now that you've mentioned Board and Staff, you certainly have introduced a question in my head. And frankly, I don't know. If the question is aimed at saying, "Well, you know, what kind of -- what Board and Staff involvement should be going to Brazil?" That's an entirely different question to ask the community. And I have no idea. Bill Drake? Let's see if Bill has an answer or a suggestion on this.

Marilyn Cade: So, let me just clarify. I wasn't asking who should go, I was asking who we are providing input to. Do you understand the distinction I just made? That I, you know, I'm assuming the Board Members and others will go and Staff will go, and if they go in an official capacity, are we proposing input to them, or are we proposing only input to background and materials for stakeholders.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Marilyn. Is this a question that you think the community should answer? Or is this question that you think the members of the Cross Community Working Group should decide?

Marilyn Cade: I think we should ask the community what they think.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Bill Drake?

Bill Drake: I just don't see a hard binary choice here. I think we should provide our input to them, but we should also have our own voice as well, and if they have their own thoughts that they wish to express as members of the Board, or leadership -- organizational leadership, that doesn't bother me. And I don't think we have to -- one has to preempt the other, or that there isn't room for both. So I think as long as we speak clearly, has the community -- as community participants about our views, I'm not bothered if they also express their own views. So, let's share our ideas with them, and let's share our ideas with everybody else as well.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Bill. Just a little housekeeping note as we are reaching the top of the hour. It is 8:04 UTC. Can we extend by 10 minutes? Are we all okay for another 10 minutes on the call to -- because I sense we are reaching some good discussion here? Are we okay for 10 more minutes?

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. I don't hear anybody saying no. So let's go for another 10 minutes. And so -- Bill has just that, you know, it's not a binary thing, not one or the other. And let's hear from Filiz Yilmaz.

Filiz Yilmaz: Hi, Olivier. Well, I just want to point out that I have put a question on the mailing list. The same questions I raised during last night's call. I sent them to you separately, but I don't see them here. Anyways, give or take, they have been sent to the list as you instructed yesterday, and they were some further comments on them, from Marila, (inaudible), so it may be in fact, could consider them in as well. Thank you. If you want me to repost them here, I can do a copy/paste.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Now we just tried to that -- here we go -- if you scroll to the bottom of the whiteboard, in fact I've just done that. Ooh, that whiteboard is a pain. Let me put them here. Here we go -- Oh, God. Adobe Connect doesn't help me in the morning. There are three questions that you posted. What are the main messages from the ICANN community members towards NETMundial? Highlighting the main messages that seem to be supported by the majority so far, with a note that there are varying positions, of course, and the unanimity is not to go here. And between what are the additional points, the CCWG developed -- the further CCWG developed document, are there missing messages that need to be elaborated and--?

Unidentified Participant: He fell off. Hello?

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. Olivier has probably dropped--

Renate De Wulf: I'm asking if you could dial Olivier back in.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: Let me comment on number three, which is -- I'm not sure that I -- I'm just trying to go back, sorry; I'm trying to go back to number three. Let me go back up to that. What are the expectations on the Staff, CEO or the Board? I'm not sure -- happy to consider this -- but I'm not sure. This would mean you would take the microphone and go out to Board Members and the Staff, and ask for their expectations, that's not real bottom-up to me.

Filiz Yilmaz: Marilyn, they're not asking Board Members their expectations. We are asking the community what their expectations of the ICANN Board to do in next one-to-one. I think that is where this--

Marilyn Cade: Ah. It is, yeah.

Filiz Yilmaz: In fact, we can use these decisions very productively to channel that message too.

Marilyn Cade: If it would be worded to say, "What are the expectations from the community of the ICANN Staff and CEO, and the ICANN Board, during NETMundial?" Then I would feel more comfortable with that wording.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I'm back on. It's Olivier speaking. And I did follow some of the discussions which we had -- which you had -- sorry -- just now. I followed it, let me just do a little bit more cutting and pasting, so as to have a bit more space. I'm just taking records of this so you can actually see the whiteboard a little bit better. And I noted that I think we are in agreement with regards to the type of questions to be asked from the community regarding the role of the Board Members and of the ICANN Staff. Having noted that though Filiz's question and the question which was developed earlier, is basically asking the community, "What does the community think the role of the ICANN staff feel, and ICANN Board, and ICANN Community leaders should be doing at NETMundial?" Is that the wording, a better wording?

I am going to lose my temper on this whiteboard thing.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I think -- I reword it, I think Alain said okay, Bill said, okay, Filiz said she wasn't sure what the problem was with the current wording, but I think there's general support for rewording it to make it clear. We are asking the community what their expectations are or the CEO, the Board and the Staff. And that keeps the intent, I think, that Filiz put forward, but just makes it, and I think Filiz you're okay with it, right?

Filiz Yilmaz: Correct. The intention is we are asking to the community what their expectations from these different roles, the role being ICANN Staff, CEO, ICANN Board, and the community members who will attend the meeting at NETMundial. What will individual community members expect from these people to do in NETMundial?

Marilyn Cade: Can I--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you--

Marilyn Cade: Yeah, I need to ask Filiz a clarifying question. If an individual attends NETMundial they are unlikely to be there in a designated slot, they're just -- I mean, I'm -- and I'll pick on Michele, and likely Michele would be there as the Chair of the Registrars. He would be more likely to be there in his individual capacity. That same thing is probably to Alain, or of me, or if Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Mm-hmm. Yes. That's understood. But again, I think that's something which we don't have an answer to, because I don't even know how the NETMundial -- this is Olivier speaking by the way -- I don't even know how the NETMundial is going to be organized. Whether people are going to be there representing entities or whether there will be individuals there, or whether -- it's all very much out in the clouds at the moment. I don't know if anybody has any insight as to this, but I certainly don't.

What I've done though, whilst we had our discussion just now, is I don't know if you can see the whiteboard, but the line on the white board, question number three in brackets, "What does the community expect the role of the ICANN Staff and CEO, the ICANN Board, the ICANN Community leaders will be during NETMundial? That's, I think, capturing the question that Filiz has suggested. And also that was suggested by others earlier. Filiz, is that okay? Filiz, you have the floor.

Filiz Yilmaz: Yes. And I think -- you know, regardless of what format we will see NETMundial, I mean, I want -- I don't think I will be there in person, because I don't have funding and I didn't -- you know, I missed the deadline to prepare -- show of interest, whatever they are called, in time because I didn't think like, I would get to the funding. Anyway, it doesn't matter. You being there or not, is just an example as a community member actually. So I see myself, that I'm not going to be there, but you're going to be there somehow. You may be wearing your Chair hat, you may be wearing your community member hat, you may be wearing your -- just individual capacity, but you will be reflecting something there through me, and I do hope you will. So what are my expectations for that? I think this is a good place to channel that out, and we keep talking about all these other formations.

You know, ICANN Staff going in and collecting feedback or making statements for the Brazil Meeting. This was just raised yesterday during the meeting, and that was one of the concerns, all this effort from different parts of ICANN going towards the same meeting. So isn't that a good idea to ask the community members, "Okay, how do you see these different roles, and do you think, you know, ICANN Board should be channeling the different message that maybe a committee member," because their involvement is different obviously.

Yeah. That's what I'm proposing, and it has nothing to do with the logistics of the NETMundial, it is collecting feedback from the community as we have the chance, so that people can act upon what they can, for the (inaudible).

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Filiz. I think that's well -- you know, that's well noted in the question as it was rephrased. That certainly is the gist of the question which I think we should ask; any other thoughts from anyone else on the two other suggestions of Filiz? What are the main messages from ICANN Community members towards NETMundial, and what are the additional points for the CCWG developed document? I certainly see much interest in this. I mean, the feeling I had was we would like to hear feedback on our documents. Have we missed anything in there, have we misrepresented ourselves in the definitions, for example, because these really are supposed to be facts? Are there any factual errors in that document? I'd be surprised if there were any with that many eyes having looked at it, but who knows.

Is there any blatant omission in that document that you know -- or blatant points that Joe Blogs, the representatives of the Working Group in Sao Paulo and NETMundial, should drive forward, or should insist on?

These are the sort of questions that I was going to ask, or I was going to suggest asking. "Brazil principles and then roadmap," okay let's switch the two. Okay. Look, you know, we've had our additional 10 minutes, I know we've got a few more questions that we are bringing in, but I think - I don't know if time that we are spending on the phone at the moment is time well spent, or whether it would be better spent if we continue thinking, and continue the discussion online and build on an agenda -- no, sorry -- build on, not an agenda, but building on the questions online, further questions online.

Because that, I'm also concerned that we are -- very few people on this call, and obviously there needs to be more input to that, from other people outside the call at the moment, or people who did not attend today. What I suggest is that we take those questions which we've got here at the moment, focus on sending this to the mailing list, get more voices from others online, and that will also allow us to end the call today.

And in addition, I see that Marilyn is asking "Could we have a complete list on who is on the CCWG?" The Wiki page which is -- I'll ask Renate to please put in the Chat, the Wiki page link that has got a full list of all of us on the CCWG list. It's quite a number of people.

Now coming back to our next steps, let's take those questions that we've got so far, and let's then send them to the email list, and generate some more questions from this. The question I have to ask you all is, as next steps now, right now, do we need another conference call, before Singapore? Bearing in mind -- Yes, Marilyn, I think that's also an action item, let's take this as an action item. The questions that the group will be settling for should be prepared in a suitable manner to copy and hand out on Monday.

The only concern I have at the moment is, do we want to have them printed? Renate, we have the budget to have a few hundred photocopies printed and shared with the community?

Renate De Wulf: Honestly, I don't know.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: This is the great thing about ICANN; \$100 million budget, but not sure for photocopy, and Renate, I'm just being sarcastic here on the overall ICANN thing, that's unfortunately the thing. I'm faced with this question on a daily basis. No worries. Let's assume that we do, and I think that we do, yes. So let's assume that we do, and put this as an action item to make sure that the paper -- the question, the final list of questions, will be printed somehow. I certainly know that Staff has access to a printer, and so just printing a hundred copies of something will be possible in Singapore.

Yes, to print. With regards to another call, the suggestion would be Monday or Tuesday, because I think that from Wednesday onwards, everyone is travelling. So would you be open to a call Monday or Tuesday? I note at the moment everyone is flat out. Marilyn probably cannot -- she's drowning in other work. Michele could do Monday--

- Marilyn Cade: Did you read what I just said. Okay, I'll do it if it's at 3:00 a.m.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: If it's at 3:00 a.m., well that's great. We'll, see if we can accommodate your request Marilyn. I don't see anyone -- Well, look, I'll tell you what, what about sending a quick Doodle, because ultimately we are very few here. We'll do a Doodle for Monday, and Monday is St. Patrick's Day, so that will be a special Irish occasion for having all of us being able to wish Michele, a Happy St. Patrick's Day. And let's do a Doodle then, just for Monday, to ask if people are okay with a conference call on the Monday, and the timing. Renate, what would the timing be if look at our rotation?
- Renate De Wulf: The timing would be 2:00 UTC, around 2:00 UTC but -- yeah, that would be it.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: 2:00, 0200; 2:00 in the morning? Is that correct?
- Renate De Wulf: No. No. No. 14:00 sorry.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: 14:00, goodness, gracious. You just gave me a heart attack just now; thankfully not a fatal one. So, National Hangover Day, 14:00 UTC, Michele will probably be surrounded by a few empty pint glasses, and we will probably be surrounded by -- well, not much unfortunately, we'll all be hoping that we were Michele. So I think that's good. A Doodle on Monday for 14:00 UTC and Bill will be seeking -- Yeah, go ahead.
- Marilyn Cade: Olivier, you're going to have to be more flexible on the timeslot, if you only have one day, we have to be more flexible on the timeslots, and only (inaudible).
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: How about the three timeslots then, because we were thinking--
- Marilyn Cade: Right. Right.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: --between three timeslots we could do mornings, lunchtime, nighttime, in UTC times. Yeah?
- Marilyn Cade: That's fine.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Perfect. Let's do that. Thank you, Marilyn, for the suggestion. So the action item for Renate, let's issue a Doodle poll today please, after this call for Monday, at the three rotating times that we usually have, I think early in the morning UTC, one is around lunchtime-ish, or 2:00 p.m. UTC, or 14:00 UTC and one is late at night UTC.
- Renate De Wulf: Okay. I will do that.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Renate. And thanks to everyone on this call. What I'm doing, and in a couple of hours' time is to send those questions to the Cross Community Working Group, and ask for more questions, and then we'll see with the Doodle if we will have an additional call on Monday to firm up on the questions.
- Filiz is asking, "Why do we need an additional call?" It's just to firm up on the questions, it's easier to do it on the phone than to do it online. I'm a little concerned that we might not get that much feedback, so it's good to have one last call before we meet in Singapore.
- And with this, ladies and gentlemen, I thank all -- I heard someone shout out, the call is still open, please, go ahead.
- Renate De Wulf: It's Renate. Sorry, it was just as if you are proposing a 7:00 a.m. call on Monday morning. I need to close the call tonight so that I can give enough time for Adigo to schedule this; which means that a lot of people will not be able to do the Doodle Poll, due to the time difference.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Ah. That's a small technical problem, technical thing, for not--

Marilyn Cade: Really? But that's--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. I'm just amazed we -- I wasn't aware of that since we often got our meetings scheduled for the BC more flexibly, but if we close the Doodles today--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Do you need -- Renate, do you need to then, book the Adigo lines before midnight UTC today? Is that what I understand?

Renate De Wulf: Yes, because we have to have an operator available, because it is the middle of their night.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Ah. That's a problem. Well, maybe then we can just skip the 07:00 UTC time and we'll just have the 14:00 and the nighttime one.

Renate De Wulf: Yes. That might be -- that might be more practical.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I tell you why, because I'm a little concerned about a Doodle that's only opened from now, which is already 08:25 UTC, all the way to 23:00 UTC, we might miss a number of people from watching their -- you know, reading their emails just in one day. I would say if the Doodle gets open for 48 hours, we'll get more people responding to the Doodle; so maybe to close the Doodle on 23:59 UTC Saturday.

Renate De Wulf: Okay.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: If that's okay with you. And I'm sorry to have to get you to work over the weekend, but time is of the essence and, yeah, hopefully it will just you a minute to launch the Doodle and just launch the email to whomever you need to launch it to make that magic happen.

Renate De Wulf: Yes. I think that's feasible, so at least everything will be arranged properly.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That's appreciated. Thank you. Any objections to dropping the 07:00 UTC time on Saturday -- Oh, sorry, on Monday? I don't hear anybody objecting, so that's fine. So we drop the 07:00 UTC, we'll have just the two times for the Doodle. That will introduce, hopefully -- it still is flexible.

With this, I apologize for the 27 minutes over time that we've been faced with just now. But I thank you all for remaining on the call, and I thank you for your participation. And look forward to speaking to you all on--