

20140313_ccwgIG_Singapore

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening everyone. This is the Singapore Planning Group Weekly Conference Call, from the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance.

Today we are at the 13th March, 2014. It's a Thursday, and it's 21:04 UTC. Welcome, everybody. Let's have a quick roll call, please.

Renate De Wulf: Sorry. We have, Alain Bidron, Filiz Yilmaz, Kiran Malancharuvil, Sarah Falvey, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Rafik Dammak; and from Staff, Ergys Ramaj, and myself, Renate De Wulf.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much.

Renate De Wulf: Did I miss anybody else who's on the phone? It looks like that's it.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Renate. It's Olivier speaking. And I note that Kiran Malancharuvil -- I'm sorry for destroying your name here -- is standing in for Kristina Rosette. So, today we are going to have just a little call on the preparation for the Singapore Session. And there is a Wiki page that we have somehow sort of put together quickly for us to have a look at, and to build on.

I've put in the Chat, the Adobe Connect Chat, and I hope that we are all on the Adobe Connect. I've put the link to that Wiki page, and that provides some input from Bill Drake, some input from Leon Sanchez, and some input from Stephanie Perrin as well. The discussions really today is to put together a proposal to be able to share with a wider group tomorrow, which is in a few hours' time, a proposal for the format and the content of the Singapore Meetings.

There are two meetings, there's one on the Monday, and there's -- that's the public meeting -- and there's also one on the Wednesday, I believe, and that's going to be -our private, face-to-face meeting, and we have to work out what we are going to be doing in the both of these.

First a question to all of you with regards to the scheduling of the Monday meeting, and I just want to spend a few minutes on this, maybe not the whole call. But as you will have seen, there is the -- originally we were going to go for the first session after the opening sessions. That's the morning session, 10:30 to 12:00. It appears that we've been moved from that position to the first afternoon session.

I've seen some feedback to my message on the mailing list, saying that that the work group should really push having the morning session, and if this is really something we will be able to discuss tomorrow, and to action tomorrow, when we have the wider group meeting, but I wanted to gain your points of view here before we go tomorrow, as to whether we should really push for this.

The request that I did make at the time, and I wasn't very strong in making the request, on purpose, so as to see if there was some pushback. That request was actually pushed back, and effectively David Olive did say well, you know, "Please try and see if you, Olivier, can move your

ALAC and ccNSO meeting forward so as to avoid clashing with the afternoon, and so that's a bit of a problem, well, not a big problem -- a small problem for us because, of course, we would have to change the scheduling, but I haven't had any feedback on that first to see if that was possible. But I've seen that there is a strong will to keep our session in the morning, since it looks as though, you know, the CCWG session in the morning, since it looks as though if the session was moved in the afternoon, that would clash with some other parts, and it would clash, I think -- I don't know it by heart -- but I think a session that a lot of people want to attend simultaneously, and that's related to the new gTLD process.

So, I guess I can open the door -- open the door -- open the floor, sorry, it's been a very long day. Open the floor up for comments from people here, and whether we should really push forward then to be in the morning session, basically, for the Monday. I see Kiran Malancharuvil--

Kiran Malancharuvil: You can just say Kiran, that's fine, Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Let's hear from Kiran, sorry.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Olivier, it's Malancharuvil, it's just phonetic, so, very easy to do.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Malancharuvil.

Kiran Malancharuvil: You've got it.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: It's just late. And I usually get those things, but I think my mind is not working too well, so too much--

Kiran Malancharuvil: Yeah. I will say, actually, those with a French-speaking background do the best with my last name, which is strange because it's actually Indian, but that's okay. Yeah, I would encourage certainly a change to the morning session. The conflict with the collision session which, I think, was raised on the list my Marilyn and others is--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That's the one.

Kiran Malancharuvil: --is a real problem, especially for the CSG, because there are real problems, and the impact with business -- small businesses, especially with name collision, and there some really big initiatives going through the business community, so you just -- you simply won't have the support and the attendance from the CSG which is, you know, eliminating a pretty significant stakeholder group.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Kiran. So, I gather that that would probably mean that we would have to send an email to David Olive, that's really own only contact with people who are dealing with the scheduling, and ask for the -- ask for our session to be put in the morning, and needless refer to Rafik, and then I'd like to find out from Staff how these requests are made, and I hope that Renate will be able to help us out on that. Rafik Dammak?

Marilyn Cade: And then I'd like to get in the queue, please.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Welcome, Marilyn. Rafik, you have the floor.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. So, I think in the beginning when we wanted to have this public session, and we requested that the two -- the SO and AC leaders, if we can take -- I mean take their own vision, which is supposed to be after the opening, and we started with that assumption, so that the CCWG will have the first session of the (inaudible). I think that was the understanding in the beginning. The GovLab (ph) as a group which came later, it's something written, and I mean, we are not aware about that. We just discovered it on the schedule, nobody informed us before that, because we may ask about another time slot to avoid any clash with important session which is -- It's complicated, so if it was my -- I have to say, I think it's my position at the beginning... because we needed to

keep --- we wanted it to be in the morning session, and so I think we should really respond to David, because it's in fact as you and in the ALAC -- that you're in the ALAC to do it -- to change your session. Others really want to attend the Name Collision, so let's ask for the -- I mean, to deal with the transaction -- It was assumption that we would have the morning session. We will keep -- we want to keep that. We cannot make any other arrangement, just for us to please -- how to set -- and then try and do recent change that we were not concerned about in prior (inaudible/audio skip)--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Rafik. Let's hear from Marilyn Cade.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. Well, since I always want to be known for doing more research than anybody else, I've actually reached out to some Board Members, and it turns out the Board Members don't know what they are expected to do in that two-hour session. And there was no informal -- when I asked, "Would you mind if you got moved to an afternoon session?" The Board Members I talked to were like, "No. No. That will be fine. They'll be fine. They'll be fine." You know, we just got contacted by the staff, so my point about this is, first of all those advisory group meetings are -- I'm going to be a little bit harsh about this -- but the Board Members don't even know what those are about. The Staff person supporting them, there's nothing on the ICANN agenda that fills in the details. So obviously those Staff, senior as they may be, have not yet filled this in.

So, why don't we help them and say, "Actually, we want two hours. We want it in the morning, this is the Cross Community Working Group, we are seeking the participation from the Board and the Staff in the room to participate," and let's take it from there, and ask the Staff to support us; as opposed to advising us.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thank you very much, Marilyn. So, shall we say that tomorrow? I could do a consensus call on our wider call, and to ask whether there is any objection to sending an email back to David Olive; and basically insisting that the Cross Community Working Group would like to keep the morning session, or to have the morning session, rather than have the afternoon session.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. It's Marilyn. Can I just say this a little bit differently if you don't mind?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: The Cross Community Working Group is a bottom-up approach at consultation, and we have been working very hard, we are proposing a consultation with the community, the ideal time for community is the morning session that we requested. And we ask that the rest of the planning accommodate the request we've made.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. That works for me. I think we are all in violent agreement. I have a -- we are seeing from the chat as well. I see that Alain Bidron also mentions the session on collision is to be avoided. And Sarah Falvey is mentioning competing with new gTLD is going to be a problem, so we are all in agreement. And Feliz, as well, agrees, so it looks like, you know, as a group, as a planning team, we are all in agreement. Now it really comes down to how we will ask for this in -- by emailing -- I gather emailing Staff.

And I'd like to actually ask Renate, how do we address this? Do we write to -- do we write to David Olive? Or, who is in charge of this whole planning thing?

Renate De Wulf: As far as I know there is a -- like a small committee, otherwise the planning is also arranged with Nick Tomasso, but I don't think going through him would be the ideal solution; going through Sally, maybe; Theresa, David Olive definitely.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Because I tell you -- It's Olivier speaking -- I have a -- not a concern -- but my understanding at the moment is that the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance is, if you look at

the ICANN logical unit; is under the Global Stakeholder Engagement Logical Unit. It's under Sally Coserton's, and--

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. Maybe you could just address as to, equally to -- I think it is Sally, but maybe you could address it equally to Sally and to David.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: And to David, jointly, yes.

Marilyn Cade: Yes.

Renate De Wulf: I think that would be a good idea.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Excellent. And so, send to Sally and to David. And with regard to the text itself, how should be bring this forward?

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. I made a proposal. I think the response is, the Cross Community Working Group is a bottom-up effort at consultation with the community, and we have requested the morning session in particular. We request that there be no conflict at this time, and that the Board and the GAC be able to be full participants in the audience in this event that we are organizing, and we ask the Staff to support the request.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. And I don't think I'll have time to draft the text to propose to the Group tomorrow, but if -- are you going to be on the call -- well, for me it's tomorrow, for you it's probably later on? Are you going to be on the call later on, in a few hours' time, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: 3:00 a.m. I can't wait.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: You will. Okay. So then if you can propose that text then to the wider group, then we'll be able to have AI -- then I can act on the AI immediately afterwards, and send the email, the joint email -- well, the email to Sally and to David. Or, Rafik can do so and, you know, then we can take it from there. I think that we have a broad agreement, we all would prefer the morning session than the afternoon session, that's obvious. And, you know, and it's -- I further find it very strange to have had to negotiate with the SO and AC Chairs to be able to make use of their session, and then that this session was then moved to the afternoon. That, for me, was the thing which I didn't particularly like.

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: And I can understand these globalization panels, and so on, might be something of interest but, you know, these are things which have just landed suddenly, like UFOs, and it's just one of these things. I mean, it just doesn't sound very bottom-up at all. It sounds like it landed from above. Okay. Anything else regarding this subject; and then if we don't, then we can move onto the next thing? All right, so we have a plan on this one, let's have it as an action item please, and the action item is for Olivier to propose to the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance for a letter to be sent to David Olive and Sally Costerton.

Marilyn Cade: From and from Rafik, as Co-Chairs. Yes?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. Sorry. Yes. The letter has to be sent to David Olive and -- well, Olivier and Rafik. I think I'll be -- I'll be running the call tomorrow, so it's Olivier to propose that -- yeah, the letter will be, of course, sent from Rafik and I, on behalf of the Cross Community Working Group, to David Olive and Sally Costerton.

Okay. Now, that's the first thing. The next thing is the agenda, the actual -- not the agenda but the way this will run, and the questions which will be asked. I initially suggested an agenda, and then Bill Drake is suggesting a sort of slightly different meeting structure, and I thought we would want

to discuss this before presenting it to the wider group. I've put this -- I've made a copy of what Bill has sent, that I've put on the Wiki, and the link which I provided you with just now is -- I can send you the link again. Here we go. So the link here -- it links up to the Wiki page which has got the meeting structure, the proposed meeting structure.

Are we all on the Adobe Connect, or online, or--? Marilyn, I don't see you on there.

Marilyn Cade: I'm not. I'm definitely trying -- just got in. I'm definitely trying to get on, but I'm not logged out. I'll do my best. Am I--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I'll tell you what. For the records, I'll be reading through it, it's not a very long proposal. So, the proposed meeting structure is, "Get it started by simply laying out cards on the table, so from -- frequent discussion with the audience. Three topics, or maybe two topics, to be addressed in turn by representatives of each of the groups participating in the CCWG so that all the groups are incentivized to internally agree on a clear position statement and share it with their colleagues.

What we shouldn't do, is to have a discussion that is skewed towards the just more ardent and consistent participants. So, equal time allocated for statements from ASO, ccNSO, BCI (ph), CCI, (inaudible), the NPOC, RrSG, RySG, At-Large, GAC and SSAC; and unless someone wish to avail themselves at the opportunity of each of these three topics. Now if all 12 reps do desire to speak to all three topics, then we want to reserve at least 30 of the 90 minutes, to open dialogue with the audience. And we think those should have to be very concise indeed. One-and-a-half minutes of top, so a total of five minutes per group, if you want to--

Marilyn Cade: Olivier? Olivier, sorry, it's Marilyn.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: The rest of -- I just have been able to get on the Wiki, if everybody else is on it, then I can respond to Bill's efforts to take this over. I'd like to return this to something but I -- but thank you, I've been able to get on the Wiki, so if everybody else is on the Wiki, I want to go back to what was originally proposed.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. And so the original proposal was a slightly more -- well, slightly less involved than this--

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Could you -- what do you mean by the original proposal was just like what? Quick introduction and then big, large -- well, a set of questions, basically that we should ask the community?

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: I'd just like to speak on the difference. I thought that we would be the listeners along with putting - - making sure the Board and the Staff are sitting in the audience, and we would be the listeners rather than the speakers. So I didn't actually -- I think somehow Bill had thought that there would be equal time for statements from three per group. I didn't envision it that way. I thought that CCWG would be listening, and asking the community about -- and where I think there is consistency here, is having clear topics, and asking the community, but in our last call, if all will remember, we do have a submission including a set of principles into the -- our NETmundial, and --

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Mm-hmm.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Yes. Sorry. And so I think on this call, we should figure out how much of this is the --how much of the meeting is about consultation on the submission to NETmundial, and how much is about the CCWG, thinking about life after NETmundial. But I personally don't want to -- I personally would not want to see statements from various groups, and that's not listening at all. And I think we are here to listen.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Marilyn. And I notice that Sarah Falvey is mentioning in there, that Bill's proposal might take a lot of time from the community discussion, if it's going to have the statements and so on. Now, Filiz also mentions in the Chat, "This is a proposal with various angles, and what we can do, is to discuss each point, and decide which points we can agree," and I guess that's one thing. But first let's hear from Kiran. Kiran, you have the floor.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Hi. Thanks. This is Kiran. I know that the IPC position is that we do want to have a statement. And the reason why I believe that a statement is valuable even in the listening exercise, is that the -- it focuses the discussion. I think that there have been a number of discussions within the ICANN Community where a panel just sits and receives input from the community and, frankly, in the event on this issue, and I remember this being the case in Buenos Aires where the discussion was all over the place. It wasn't focused, it wasn't directed, and I think, kind of providing a very brief one-minute statement from each of the leaders of the constituency and stakeholders, would actually focus the exercise in such exercise in such a way that it solicits feedback, and allows us to listen in a directed fashion.

And I understand that there is a concern that a statement would have to have full agreement of the constituency or group, and I suppose some constituencies and groups will have a harder time finalizing such a statement. But for those of us that have a structure within our groups where that is possible, like within the IPC, then I think that we would take the option to speak. And that that is the position that we've agreed on internally in the IPC. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: (Inaudible)

Marilyn Cade: So it's a -- it's Marilyn. I'm going to ask a question. Why can't you just put that in writing? So if you have a hard--

Kiran Malancharuvil: Because, Marilyn, nobody is going to read anything that comes -- that goes in writing at this point before Singapore. They've read our submission; they are not going to read anything else. They can listen to a one-minute statement, and we -- and that is our position.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Kiran. So, right. We have then two different ideas. We've got one, which is to have a statement -- well, actually we've got three different things. We've got statements and three different subjects, or we just have one subject and statements, and then a discussion afterwards, or we just have an open discussion. I see Filiz Yilmaz with her hand up, and we would like to hear from all of you as well. Filiz, you have the floor.

Filiz Yilmaz: Hi, Olivier. Can you hear me well?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. I can hear you. And I'm sure the others can, too.

Filiz Yilmaz: Okay. Great. My point is: I tend to agree with what Marilyn had said at the beginning. The reason we are having this session is to hear from the wider community. So that wider community is outside the CC Working Group. We have been doing some work. We produced some work, and you -- and we had challenges in getting, you know, wider input from that within our (inaudible) communities, and we want to make sure that whatever we are going to produce at the end, is going to have the understanding, and to some extent, maybe not consensus, but some kind of consent.

At least we are not diverting from our object or goals, that need to be highlighted through this session, and the only way we can do that, is to maximize the time, that we can provide, and we should prepare and listen. And to do that I actually do not agree, you know, having 12 statements there, and taking time for that, our statements should be part of the output of this work. The general messages that this Working Group had provided so far or, you know, manage to bring to surface, and we don't have those -- If you don't have those messages, then actually we wouldn't have done our work, or we have done it pretty (inaudible/audio skip) job. So, it is time to (inaudible/audio skip) to people so they can tell us if we are not

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Feliz, you're -- you're starting to break up Feliz.

Filiz Yilmaz: (Inaudible/audio skip) to make in addition, or--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: We are having a technical problem here. Feliz, I'm afraid you've broken up a little bit, and we couldn't hear your last--

Filiz Yilmaz: No, I guess.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: --the last 20 seconds was what's cut up into bits. Could you repeat, Filiz, again please?

Filiz Yilmaz: Okay. I'll try again. So, anything that needs to be made more clear, or anything -- if any group has like, additional message that they want to bring to the floor, that should be made together with the community. So mike time should be opened to everybody else, and we can use them as -- by just going to the queue and waiting for our line, as far as I'm concerned. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Filiz. Marilyn, did you wish to follow up on this? I heard you earlier.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. I was just saying, you know, if a particular group, and I'm reading the Chat now, I don't think that the business liaisons are going to be able to force all of our business members into a single statement, but if a particular group needs to make a prepared statement, why can't we put that into the format when we come to the topic, and then make him go to the microphone, so they can -- you know, we can make sure -- I wouldn't envision standing (inaudible) vision -- there will mikes that we could -- we could make sure that anyone who wants to make a prepared statement can do that. And if the IPC wants to limit themselves to only one statement, that's okay, if that's what they want to do.

But that would be --that could come into the roaming mike format. I want to support what Filiz and I, I think, are both saying that is a -- are we trying to consult with the community and hearing what the community says?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Marilyn. Kiran, go ahead.

Kiran Malancharuvil: I just want to clarify that, and no point did I say that the IPC statement, which will be the consolidated position of the constituency, would restrict any individual IPC member from making their own statement during the open or roaming mike section. I don't think that I said that, happy to review the transcript if there was confusion, but I will just this opportunity now to clarify our position about that. Second, I want to say that the -- I think that we need to remember that when we say "the community" we also mean the constituency, and the stakeholders and the advisory committees.

So, to say that this is a session which will represent views of the community, I don't think that means that the leaders and the representatives from the constituencies are -- should be -- should just shut up and listen at that point. I think that we have to be a part of that conversation as well. It can be this group, and it can be the larger community, and I don't see why it has to be one or the other. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So whilst you've been speaking -- and it's Olivier speaking -- I've just started a little whiteboard on our CCWG Adobe Connect Chat. And I'm kind of thinking of, having heard all of you on this, that we could have an introduction, then we could have a statement from the CCWG that would effectively be a quick presentation of the work that the CCWG has -- and of the statement that we basically send to Brazil. Then any of the communities that could may their statement after that, and so that would include the statements from any of the SOs, ACs and SGs that wish to make their short statement, in addition to the CCWG statement, and then go for the questions to the community.

So the one, two and three would take, I would say, no more than maybe 15 or 20 minutes, and then the bulk of the time would be number four, the questions to the community. That's a bit of the mix between having the system where everyone makes statements on three different questions et cetera, or answers questions, and us talking to each other, and the tapping of the information -- the tapping for inputs from your community, because I do understand the concerns from Kiran with regards to having a session where we just sit down, and ask, and say, "Right, please, we are all listening, we are ready for you to say something," and then having something that is completely disjointed, and then we are not going to be able to do anything with.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. I'd like to get back in the queue for a different topic, if I may?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I probably suffer from being overexposed, since I'm a member of the One Net Steering Group, and I'm a member of the CCWG for Business, and I'm actively engaged in all these issues. So I confess to overexposure. I'm also a member of the Internet Governance for MAG (ph), and I see Filiz. Welcome, Filiz, and I and several others are also actively engaged in that.

I want to take us back to what we are trying to accomplish here. And Alain, I want to thank you for your comment about listening to the community. But let's talk about how we listen actively to the community and what we do with what we listen to. Because I think one of the frustrations we all have, is right now we are living in a top-down world with a lot of well-meaning staff, some of whom use spell check and actually misspell the word ICANN, they are well meaning, but they are new. And so let's do our job.

What if we had rapporteurs, so we are not just cramming to go to the microphone, or holding the microphone, but we are actually actively listening and we come back together, and at the end of the session, we really try to say, "Here's what we think the community agreed on, on those three questions. Or, what the majority of comments lead us to think as the priorities are, for those three questions." We can then revisit the transcripts, but wouldn't this be a great value if we could do this as a community?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. So having rapporteurs -- It's Olivier speaking -- having rapporteurs that would then -- sort of bring back or kick the input that we've received or how do you want us do this?

Marilyn Cade: So I see, as we are allowed 15 minutes, and we would turn to the rapporteurs and say, "You were following question one. You were following question two, what's the -- what do you think the majority of the comments addressed? What's not addressed?" Because, you know, public forums, town halls public forums are never the totality, and I realize, Feliz, again, is on the -- on with us and understand this, but that's never the totality, but let's see if we could give some feedback to the room. The majority of the speakers said this, "We have to realize we will not have gotten to all speakers, but that we need some kind of summing up at the end.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. That's a very good point. So, effectively, if we look at our thing, we'd have five -- there were some real points heard from community, so that the summary would be what? Another 10 minutes? So effectively we'd have 50 minutes on the questions to the community? (Inaudible)--

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. So Feliz just posted, I just want to comment, I'm putting it in the chat. I think we would saying we would support Olivier, and would be -- in doing the summing up, because you will have been listening that we should give you some support. That was what I was proposing, Filiz. But turning to the two Co-Chairs --

Filiz Yilmaz: Hi. Filiz, here. Can you hear me? I will try again, because it's Filiz (inaudible)--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Go ahead Feliz.

Filiz Yilmaz: --in audio, obviously. Yeah. I think we need to -- I mean, this is all good what we are doing, I think this is the pilot process, we are talking about, how we are going to stage this session. We are talking about what agenda is going to look like, what the timing is. I also suggest that we also agree on the chairing part. If you don't want to call it a chair, call it a moderator, but I think (inaudible/audio skip) Rafik and Olivier, (inaudible/audio skip)--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: You're breaking up, Filiz. I'm afraid I don't know whether you're -- you're probably using Adobe Connect and it's not working very well at the moment. Would you like -- connection to the audio bridge has been lost. Oh, dear.

Filiz Yilmaz: (Inaudible/audio skip)

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: At the moment something is not working. Can you hear me?

Filiz Yilmaz: (Inaudible/audio skip)

Marilyn Cade: I can hear you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Audio Bridge connected. Okay, there was a -- there seems to be a problem with the audio bridge for some reason. Filiz, can you speak again, please, because we lost you for a while?

Filiz Yilmaz: Yeah. That wasn't me, that (inaudible/audio skip) -- Okay. All right. Thank you. I don't know where you lost me, but what I was saying, I support Rafik and Olivier to (inaudible/audio skip)--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Something has--

Filiz Yilmaz: --of the moderators. I don't mind about the name, but the lead, and make sure there's enough space, enough time, to make their comments, if different people are (inaudible/audio skip)--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Feliz, I'm afraid we are -- I mean, I'm not able to hear you, I don't know if anybody else -- Are you all able to hear Feliz well? Are you able to hear me?

Marilyn Cade: We can hear you. I'm just going to rewrite--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. Maybe we can get Filiz to -- Can you hear Feliz, well, or not, or she also was cut off?

Marilyn Cade: We lost her. We lost her.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: We lost her. Okay. Feliz, I don't know if you want to dial in, it probably will be easier for you to take part, because it looks as though the Adobe Connect doesn't like working well tonight. It must be something to do with the Internet, maybe. Yeah. So, as I understand it, what Feliz was saying is that there should be a -- the rapporteurs could be Rafik and I, I'm not sure whether she was suggesting that Rafik and I moderate that session or not, or I thought that it would probably be -- it would probably need to be someone else moderating the session at the same time, I think it's tough to be a rapporteur and moderate and be well aware of all of the people that wish to speak, at the

same time, especially since the rapporteurs would have to be glossing, or at least summarizing what is being said. I know some people are able to do that, but--

Okay, we'll support Filiz's suggestion that the Co-Chairs are the final moderators, and then -- I mean, I guess, yeah, we could say that. So, having rapporteurs regarding each question asked, and then you just add them, because remember this is something which we'll propose to the group tomorrow. So I'm sure we can discuss it more tomorrow anyway.

Marilyn Cade: Right. And then I think -- and then rapporteurs could be others, and they would support you, and that would be -- it's Marilyn -- that would be -- I think that was what Feliz was saying as well. So you'd be the Co-Chairs, and then rapporteurs would support you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Here we go. So I've put the format in there. Are we all okay, with this format? Well, are we all okay with presenting this format tomorrow? Yes from Alain? Collect feedback as that comes in, and coordinate. Okay. Fine. Now, with regards to the questions, let's move on to the questions. You're okay with moving on with the questions?

Marilyn Cade: Please. Yes. Go.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I hear no one complaining against that, so with regards to the questions there were five questions, that have been so far, down on the paper. Bill, was of the point of view that we should ask our group, and ask for the topics -- you know, the topics would need to be specific enough to come clear and concise position statements. And that Bill was against us working on the questions right now, he wanted to get some more feedback on the mailing list. Unfortunately I haven't seen very much feedback so far on the mailing list; the only suggestions that I've read so far from Leon Sanchez and from Stephanie Perrin.

And Leon mentioned, "What does the community, as a whole, expect ICANN's participation to be in the Brazil Meeting? Which input, additional to the CCWG document should ICANN participants receive to better participate? Which output is expected from ICANN's participants at the ICANN Meeting, and should the CCWG continue its works on a more broad scope regarding Internet Governance in general? Or should it close after the Brazil Meeting?" And then a question from -- suggestion by Stephanie Perrin, "What is the roadmap likely to be after the Brazil Meeting?"

Marilyn Cade: Can I -- it's Marilyn. So where do I find that? Is that in the Wiki?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: These are in the Wiki, yeah.

Marilyn Cade: I'm on the Wiki and I don't see anything. Sorry. Other than the pending --

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: It should be -- if you scroll down to Questions Suggested, yes--

Marilyn Cade: There's nothing on the Wiki that says Questions Suggested -- I'm sorry--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Ah. Then you could be on the wrong Wiki. You could be in the wrong location. There you go. I've sent it to you by Skype, and it's also on the Adobe Connect as well.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you --

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: And then you should be on the right Wiki at that point.

Marilyn Cade: You know, pointing me in the right direction could be a fulltime job.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Oh, you go. In the meantime, others on the call, any comments, any other questions you would suggest; any questions here that you don't feel suitable, any amendments to the current questions? I think I've covered all angles here.

Marilyn Cade: So, thank you, for doing that. It's Marilyn. I'm going to say two things. First of all, if we have the morning session, we have two hours. So let's park the idea that we are filling two hours and then we have to come for 90 minutes, if we could, for just a minute.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Mm-hmm.

Marilyn Cade: We made a post to the CCWG, and I think we owe it to the community; I obviously did not support this, but I now do; we owe it to the community to listen to what we've said in that post. So, I think that's a primary question. I think we have to be a little bit careful about understanding what NETmundial is and what NETmundial is not. By the 15th of this month, it will be known who is permitted to attend NETmundial. There will be a public list of who gets to attend, as well as a public list of who from ICANN is attending.

So, Leon's question about what does the ICANN Community expects ICANN's participation to be at the Brazil Meeting, that's a little bit after the fact. If you look at the ICANN website, Sally and Comps Team have already undertaken a major promotion of ICANN taking a leadership role in the Brazil Meeting. We might need to change the question to say, "What does the community advise ICANN's Board and CEO participation to be?" But I think a lot of that's already done. It looks to me like there's a huge amount of financial commitment, and other commitments that's already been made.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Mm-hmm. So what? Do you think we should be asking -- or waiting first to try and see what arrangements are being made before asking those questions? I don't quite catch this?

Marilyn Cade: No. No. I'm thinking we need to revise the questions, and we need to recollect the fact that we are already aware that the ICANN CEO and his staff have made a huge number of commitments already to the NETmundial Meeting. Our comments need to be what we want to advise the Board, I think, and the ICANN CEO, and staff, on what happened to any output, and any input into NETmundial. But you guys must have already seen that Fadi's magical panels have already made submissions. So, when we say, "What does the community, as a whole, expect ICANN's participation to be, we need to take into account there's already a lot going on that we were not consulted about. And so how do we phrase this?

Should we be saying, "What does the community advise the ICANN Board about? ICANN leadership in the niche of this, it's like NETmundial, because I think we've got to change this a little bit to be timeless.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. I'm a little baffled by the questions being asked at the moment. I'll be very frank.

Marilyn Cade: Have you seen the latest submission that is the ICANN Panel's submission, that Fadi funded, that went into NETmundial?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I have seen them, and I'll reserve my comments on it. But, yeah; I mean, they've made a submission and it looks as -- the principles of Internet Governance and it's -- I don't think it's anything ground-breaking either, or earth-shattering either. And I guess it's just another contribution.

Marilyn Cade: So, do you think we can keep the question then. Leon's question of, "What does the community, as a whole, expect --" Can we modify that question to say, "What does the community, as a whole, advise that ICANN's role be in the broader Internet Governance issues?" Because I think we are too close to NETmundial --

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Mm-hmm.

Marilyn Cade: Do you see what I mean? We are meeting in Singapore, and NETmundial is practically around the corner.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Marilyn, it's Olivier speaking. And I will give the floor to Feliz right afterwards. I'll provide you my feedback on the question that I've seen so far. I was under the impression that when we are going to go to the community and we've got our 90 minutes, or two hours, whichever amount of time it is with them, we would be presenting the CCWG statement that has been made, and that has been presented for Brazil, and then we would be collecting feedback on the statement, and asking the community to let us know if they wish us to expand on any of these when we go to Brazil.

We as in -- I don't know if 1, 2, 5, 10, 30 people from the CCWG will be funded to go to Brazil. I have no idea that what is -- what I feel is going to happen is that all of these statements that everybody has been sending over to NETmundial, are going to be discussed, face-to-face, in Brazil. I'm not sure if they will be discussed one at a time, or if a joint document will be discussed, but certainly I think that some of the points which the Cross Community Working Group has made, will need to be expanded on, and having that fodder from the community, to be able to expand on those points, if something that will probably be very valuable for us when we expand on these.

And so the concern I have with the questions that are currently being asked, or questions that are inward-looking: what does the Committee, as a whole, advise that ICANN's participation be at the Brazil Meeting? Well, I mean, as an answer I'd say: full participation from the community is important to the Brazil Meeting, because if we don't have full participation from the community at the Brazil Meeting we really are in a stuck position. We are not getting our voice heard.

Which input addition to the CCWG statement should ICANN participants receive to better participate? That is probably the sort of -- the hinging question that we would need to be asking through. Which output is expected from ICANN participants of the Brazil Meeting? Well, hell if I know. I have no idea what output is expected from ICANN's participants, because there are probably other people, and I have seen that. A lot of people have made personal contributions, or contributions on behalf of their own SO, AC, SG or outside organizations.

So, that's the sort of thing. Should the CCWG continue its works on a more broad scope, regarding IG, in general, and should it close after the Brazil Meeting? I think that, you know, this really is not something we need to ask now, and I was under the impression when the CCWG was started, that it was going to be there in the long term, not just for CCWG to look at Brazil, and then: goodbye, thank you very much. We've had some fun, and we are finished with it. So, that question I would say is completely -- you know, it's out of scope. What is the roadmap likely to be after the Brazil Meeting? I have a feeling that, again, it's going to be pure speculation.

I mean, I'm sure we can discuss the wonderful travel schedule which Marilyn has been sharing but, you know, I don't see any worth discussing this at this moment. And what happens to any output and input regarding NETmundial? That's probably one of the big things -- the big questions, but we really need to be working out on what input we need to put in.

I'll let you think about that, and let Filiz speak. And I'm sorry, Filiz. You've waited for a little while.

Filiz Yilmaz: Hi. This is Feliz. Thank you, Olivier. No. that's all right, I'm happy to have waited, because you already make my job easier, more ideas to express myself, in terms of specific questions. I agree most of what you said. I think these are good questions what we have already; they just needed the top three. First of all, I do agree with you that what happens after Brazil Meeting, or what happens to the CC Working Group, you know, the Cross Community Working Group, shouldn't be here.

Let's stick to our immediate goal and job. We were assigned to -- we were assigned with a task, and let's focus on that. So, in that regard, I would suggest maybe -- I understand from the first question, it's mainly, what are the messages from the community members towards the Brazil Meeting? What do we want to say?

I suggest we move as a whole, because I do not think we can have a unanimous or agreed messages from the people, the underlying views, but the main thing, I think, is to pack them along for the -- must supported ideas, but need to go there. In that -- connected to that, the related point would be, if we do a good job as the Cross Community Working Group document, are those messages really there, and should there be more edits there? And I think we need to do some outreach before this session so people already read this document.

In regards to the third question, so first and second, I see as a question, "What are the key messages that ICANN needs to bring to Brazil Meeting, and the top question would be probably the preferred -- the Cross Community Working Document, Working Group document? What is missing? Is there anything additional that needs to be focused here?"

The third one I would suggest maybe getting a bit more in regards to -- yeah, are there more specific recommendations from the community members towards ICANN's Staff versus ICANN Board, versus the Cross Community Working Group, because we have our different roles? I can see Fadi, you know, doing the very different job than me, as a community member, and what are those expectations in regards to Brazil Meeting, could be a question. And I would leave it there. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Filiz. I do realize we are on the top of the hour, but I would -- I did start about five minutes late, so we've got a couple more minutes before we end this call. And, Alain, Marilyn -- Marilyn too, Rafik; Kiran mentions she tends to agree with the suggestions, and Alain agrees with Filiz as well.

Marilyn Cade: I'm happy -- it's Marilyn -- I'm happy with Filiz's suggestion. But I do just think -- and I'll say this again, this nails down when this is going to happen, and realize that there's a lot going on that many members of the community are not aware of, on what's happening. And so, we might also want to be careful that when we pose questions or, you know, we've got a document, if we pose additional questions, we need to do -- we do need to do some kind of outreach. When I look at how abysmal the agenda is on the ICANN website, most of the staff don't bother to fill in an agenda until the day before. I hope we can do better than that.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Mm-hmm. Agreed. So, if I understand correctly from Filiz -- It's Olivier speaking -- we can scrap five and scrap four. Is that correct? Filiz?

Filiz Yilmaz: Correct, Olivier. That's what I am supporting. Sure.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. It's Marilyn. Actually I don't think you can totally scrap five, unless we want to suggest that this is only about NETmundial, and I hope we are not suggesting that. So I think we actually can't suggest that this is only about NETmundial. This is -- we provided a contribution to NETmundial, that that is only -- unless we are proposing, and our principles don't propose this, we are not proposing that NETmundial make decisions, we are proposing that the ICANN community makes decisions. So, actually we can't -- we can't actually totally scrap five, we may need to reword it, and that is--

Kiran Malancharuvil: I think we can scrap five -- this is Kiran -- I think we can scrap five because it doesn't mean that this is all about preparing for NETmundial, but we could be saying that we will deal with the roadmap after Brazil -- after Brazil happens. I think that that five is kind of wishy-washy and somewhat conditional question at this point, because how can we know what the roadmap will

look like until after it's happened, especially if this is still community-focused. It's just -- to me it seems like a waste of our time to have a conversation about what if, and what the landscape is going to look like. We just have -- we have no idea at this point. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Kiran. It's Olivier speaking. What I've done is to add on the proposed agenda about number six. Next step/roadmap, because remember what we were speaking about just a moment ago, where the questions to the community and -- you know, asking the community for a roadmap is -- you know, for someone to stand up and just make up a roadmap like this, doesn't seem to very productive, especially since people are just going to go, "What do you mean by roadmap? And why are you asking us for a roadmap, you should ask the people at NETmundial," and then we are just going to put this meeting totally off--

Unidentified Participant: No--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: ---because we don't want -- as we said, we are dealing with our own roadmap of what we are going to do next, not NETmundial, not just the Brazil Meeting.

Marilyn Cade: So, I'm a little confused. We said in our principles that the community owns developing ICANN's presence.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Well then, that's a different thing. So what, you wish to discuss -- during the CCWG Meeting, you wish to discuss both the Brazil Meeting and also ICANN's future roadmap?

Marilyn Cade: No. No. Remember, we are asking the community to comment on the principles we submitted.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Correct.

Marilyn Cade: So, you know, I think a lot of people are putting a lot of eggs in the NETmundial basket, and I'm just going to be pretty clear here. If you hangout only on Brazil, you're missing a lot, really. There's a lot going on that is not about Brazil, and I know a lot of people, including Fadi, are putting a lot of eggs in NETmundial's basket, but we've got to be real here. ICANN needs -- we are the community, we need to be owning developing ICANN's ResNet (ph). So that was what I was objecting to, that we are suggesting that NETmundial would advise us. Are we the community? Or are we basically, you know, just part of a Brazilian Meeting that we are going to, and assuming that somebody else is going to dictate what community does? I've got a problem. I've got a problem with that.

Kiran Malancharuvil: Well then, why don't we make the questions not about the Brazil Meeting at all? Why are the first -- you know, what, three questions about the Brazil Meeting? I think that this is -- we are preparing for this at this point, and then we can develop a broader roadmap after, because we need to take this piece by piece, meeting by meeting, as it comes, but if you don't want to do that. If you want it to be broader, then we need to make the session then about broader input, and not then, about one specific meeting, which does influence the landscape especially given the importance of many members of the community are placing on it, including Fadi.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Kiran. Let's hear from Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Olivier. Okay. I think for roadmap from Brazil, we don't know what kind of outcome. They have more than 100 AG contribution, and even the format of the meeting -- the meeting itself is not clear, but I think that the NETmundial will start to process, which will go till the IFG next year in Brazil, and so, for us, we need to think. I mean maybe that's why (inaudible) -- What we can do as the working group for the next -- after NETmundial, because there will be several steps in IGF in Turkey. We will have the Planning (Inaudible) -- Meeting in South Korea, and so on.

So, I guess if we can just get some guidance from the community. I don't expect that we'll have a lot of detailed response, but some guidance what we should do, and what direction we should we should follow. But I think for the first question, we need to focus on NETmundial, because we have contribution, we need really to get the community feedback on that to see, is really -- we are really matching what -- their expectations, and so on, and because -- just to highlight -- it seems we don't have any official endorsement from SOs and ACs, so we submitted the contribution as a Working Group and we need to get such endorsement to make our contribution more, stronger.

What we can do in NETmundial, it's not clear, because it's -- in fact, it's less than two days, and it's not just about attending, because even though how -- the position there, and what kind of format, how the people attending will work on the -- how to say -- to deliver something, all these are open questions that the committees -- from the Brazil Meeting didn't answer yet, so.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Rafik. Filiz, your hand is still up?

Filiz Yilmaz: Oh. I'm sorry. It was from the previous part, but I want to add that I support the idea of sticking to NETmundial exclusively in our sessions. And then any surrounding issue or broader issue, I think we should coordinate among ourselves and in our constituencies, we can suggest topics towards the public comment. I hope that it's still the process at ICANN, and then those can be covered there. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Filiz. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I just wanted -- can we, on our questions, can we move item four on our questions -- can we move item four up? So it's clear we are focusing on our submissions.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So where do you want to push it forward to? Do you want to put it one, two or three? Or where would you like to add it? It's Olivier speaking.

Marilyn Cade: Well, you know, again, I'm just saying, you know, I wasn't disagreeing with our focus on NETmundial, but I was cautioning people to think that we let NETmundial make our decisions. But I think we need to move our -- let's move our topic up. Please comment on the principles we have submitted to NETmundial, focusing on the roadmap, or focusing on whatever. I just -- you know, move that up, rather, because otherwise people are going to get lost.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Do you see that -- It's Olivier speaking. I have concerns at the moment that these questions are a bit too broad, and I thought we might wish to look at each part of our submission, and ask specific questions on each part of our submission, asking if anybody had anything to add on this, on the section. If there was opposition maybe, from some people; or from some parts of ICANN on the points that we have put in the contribution, this sort of thing. So basically, looking at, you know, spending like 10 minutes on each one of those paragraphs that we build.

Marilyn Cade: Right.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So looking through the contribution itself, and then that would probably take, I would say, a good 30 minutes or so, and then opening the floor for more open questions on this. And, Rafik, your hand is still up.

Rafik Damak: No. It's from -- okay, so I will lower it.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I tell you what we'll do then, because I do realize that this call is going on, and we are now 15 minutes past the top of the hour. Let's freeze this as we have it, as it is right now, and we can continue the discussion tomorrow -- I'm sorry -- well, tomorrow for me, but later on for you, in a few hours' time. Picking up where we stopped here. I think that we've got a proposed the agenda which fits quite well here. We've got an interesting format, and it really is down to focusing to the questions to the community.

Rafik Dammak: Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: So we will send this proposal, hopefully we get some comments prior to the call, let's always do that, to know -- to see that the virtue of the (inaudible). And I guess, yeah, we need really to focus on the question. I understand that some people see that as growth. I'm not sure what level of details, but maybe if we can, kind of, for each question then become -- I mean, if it's really working or not, but sure description, kind of bullet point to explain what we are asking for. So maybe it's we have, at least we have half of the next meeting -- I mean the meeting of the Working Group, meeting focusing on that, and hopefully we will get a quick agreement on the format.

But, anyway, just we have, I think, just like, maybe 10 days before meeting in Singapore, so maybe the message that we should really agree on -- by this meeting that, you know, next week is more (inaudible) -- most people will be traveling and flying, that will be hard to get any comments.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That's absolutely correct, Rafik. So, what I'll do, I'll do a cut paste into an email right now, and forward the email to everyone, maybe at the end of this call. So we can get some more input before the call in a few hours time, and we'll pick things up from there. Marilyn, it's all fine with you as well?

Marilyn Cade: I'm just saying we've got limited time so -- and I'm going to say that I was very disenchanted of how the Staff handled this last time, where we agreed to questions, and then the staff changed the questions when were standing -- before we went on to the stage. So let's be sure that we are driving this, Staff are supporting this, whatever we come up with has the full support from the CCWG, and then Staff supports us.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. That's fine. That's really great. Okay. I don't see anyone having put their hand up. So, I thank you all for having spent a little bit more time. In fact, 19 minutes more time than was originally set for this. We've got the proposed agenda format. We haven't really got much of a focus on the questions to the community yet, but I'm sure we can do that tomorrow. Sorry, we can do that in a few hours' time.

The next call of this core Working Group, and so the second item -- the second action item is that I shall be sending the contents of the whiteboard to the wider mailing list asking for comments, ahead of our next call.

Thanks, everybody; and good morning, good afternoon, good evening and good night. This call is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

Filiz Yilmaz: Thanks.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. And thanks to you and Rafik. Bye.