

**20140317\_ccwgIG\_ID863236**

*Closed action: Olivier Crepin-Leblond and Rafik Dammak to send an email to David Olive and Sally Costerton requesting that the ccwg IG session with the Community be moved to the two-hour slot the morning of Monday March 24th after the Opening Ceremony*

- Rafik Dammak: So good. I think we can start the call. So, who can --? Renate, can you please do the roll call?
- Renate De Wulf: Yes. I will do the roll call. We have Alain Bidron, Bart Boswinkel, Caroline Greer, David Maher, Filiz Yilmaz, Hector Manoff, Keith Drazek, Klaus Stoll, Leon Sanchez, Marilyn Cade, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, RafikDammak, Sarah Falvey; and from Staff we have, Alexandra Dans; and myself. Renate De Wulf. And the recording has started.
- Rafik Dammak: Thank you, Renate. So for the agenda. We already have, as usual, the action items review, and then you will go the next item about, I would say, Singapore Meeting preparation, particular to refine the questions. And I see already that Olivier is raising his hand. Yes, Olivier? Please go ahead.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Rafik. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Just to let you know, to record apologies from Michele Neylon, and from Oliver Hope. Thank you.
- Marilyn Cade: Thank you. But also, I have a point of order, Rafik. It's Marilyn.
- Rafik Dammak: Yes.
- Marilyn Cade: I asked to have added to the agenda a quick review of who is on the call that was able to be on the Saturday ICANN call, since taking into account ICANN's discussions or plans that's going to be helpful to us. But I'd just like to add that to the agenda whenever you, our Chair, would want to do that. Thank you.
- Rafik Dammak: Sorry. Marilyn, what you want to add exactly?
- Marilyn Cade: Rafik, I think it's important for us to take into account the announcements made on Saturday -- sorry -- the announcement made on Friday, but also the call that was held on Saturday, and I just

wanted to do a quick understanding of, has everybody been able to -- not everyone may have been able to participate in that call. I just wanted to do a quick update on that call, and if there are any disagreements, clarification to know that we are able to on the call.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes, we can put that in Any Other Business. So I think -- let's start with the Action Items Review, I think we have only one action item, which was about sending the letter to change the timeslot. So that was done on Friday, if I'm not mistaken, yeah. So Friday or Saturday, it depends on the time zone. So that was done. I don't think there is any other open action items, so the next agenda item is really to prepare for the Singapore Meeting, the Public Session. So the last call we condensed, I think -- finalize and refine the questions. So, Renate, can you please put the question in the Adobe Connect so we can see them?

Renate De Wulf: Sorry. I missed that bit, Rafik. What did you say?

Rafik Dammak: I think we need to see the question, the list of questions that we have, and I think we probably need to select some of them, shorten the list. So can you just please put -- I think we have a page in Wiki, but just can you put them in the Adobe Connect?

Renate De Wulf: Okay. I need to go and get it. Hang on. I need to go and find it.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Renate De Wulf: As soon as I find it, I'll share my screen. Okay?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. And Olivier, just having shared the link to the Adobe Connect.

Renate De Wulf: Yeah.

Rafik Dammak: So we can start, maybe from Adobe Connect and then we go back to -- I mean, to go from the link shared by Olivier, and then we go back to Adobe Connect. So, as you see, we have several unanswered questions. They are not in particular order. I think we need to refine them, I guess also to maybe -- to select -- I'm not sure about the number, maybe three. I think that can be actual, maybe three or four.

Renate De Wulf: Can you see it not?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. It's small, but we can see it, I think.

Renate De Wulf: Sorry. That's as large as I could get it.

Rafik Dammak: Is it possible--

Renate De Wulf: Hello?

Rafik Dammak: Hello. Yes, it's quite small. Can we just zoom -- I think zoom out? Make it more -- bigger?

Renate De Wulf: I'm afraid, that's as big as I can -- as big as I can get it.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I think people can maybe try to -- yeah, in their own screen they can -- yeah. Okay.

Renate De Wulf: Okay.

Rafik Dammak: It depends, if others, they can see.

Renate De Wulf: Then I'll stop sharing. If everybody can look at it n their own screen.

Unidentified Participant: Can you paste it then in the Chat please, so we can at it in our own browsers?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yeah. So, we have several questions, many questions. So we can start with the first one given the -- Given the compressed timeframe, and the participants' public interest and the experience in the Internet Governance environment, the CCWG has experiencing some teething problems, such as getting a charter for its work, the Internet. What does your group think is the potential value of the CCWG and the best way to advance cooperation therein? What should be its next priority after the NETMundial Meeting has concluded?"

So, I think we can go through this question, have comments, or maybe just to start kind of ranking, to say, ranking or just any-- Any comment for the first question?

Patrik Fältström: Okay. This is Patrik Fältström, from (Inaudible), if no one else is saying anything, I'll just (inaudible) --

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Patrik Fältström: I think one of the problems we see here which is also, sort of, one of the reasons why I see many of us being sort of tired when we hear things happening, so fast Friday and during the week, and that is that we see -- that I think we see here that we have extremely good policy development processes in each of the SOs. We have well-working ACs that come with comments on what's happening in those PDPs, but when we are trying to do something across the constituencies we see that is extremely hard. And I think, unfortunately we -- so I think what we need to do, we have to come up with a more efficient way of coming up with conclusions of what -- sort of all of us believe and think in a -- so it still ends up being bottom-up process. We need to find a way of doing this in a more effective way.

Marilyn Cade: And I'd like just say -- it's Marilyn -- I'd like to be in the queue. Sorry, I'm not in Adobe, but I'd like to in the queue to follow on to this when I can.

Patrik Fältström: Yes, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I can actually be a little more direct than Patrick was. We have effective mechanisms that we need to apparently -- this is a very controversial statement, but I'm going to make it. The Staff is not the (inaudible) in anyway a bottom-up process, but they are not -- they are well-meaning, I give all of our staff are well-meaning star of awards. But yes, Patrik, we have a processes which -- It isn't just that we don't have a cross-community process. We, as staff, we do not fully support, and we have a Board who does not fund, and we have a CEO and a President who does not understand the cross-community process. So that's a fairly strong statement, I know it's being transcribed, and I welcome that, but I think, you know, really, Patrik is right, that we need to insist on improvements in the support of the cross community processes, and not just say, "We are not getting it right."

We need to understand that the CEO, and with the support of the Board, are funding processes that bypass us, with the mystical, magical panels, and less inclined to the process at work. And I think the Cross Community Working Group is our first place to return to the process that we are -- those of us who own ICANN. We are not new, we don't go away, we are not staff. We are not CEOs, who hire or leave, we are here for the long haul, so why don't we insist on returning to the community.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. And thanks for the statement but -- so, Marilyn, just, sorry to ask this but, what's the question? I understand the comment from Patrik about the bottom-up and the cross community. This Working Group, I think it's really the first experience in cross community including all the SO and AC Stakeholder Groups. There was before, some Cross Community Working Group, including some SOs and ACs but -- So, my question -- what is the question here? I think it's just -- you know, as I heard this kind of statement? I mean, we are trying to ask a question to the community to get feedback, and to have interactions. So, I'm wondering to have those kinds of

questions, what we really want to get from the community, and that's why we are going through with the list, this list.

Patrik Fältström:

Okay. This is Patrik. Let me try in a different way. And yes, Marilyn, you and I talked about this so much, so I agree with what you're saying as well, you know that. But let me phrase it differently. Given that this -- for example, this and other Cross Constituency Working Group, is the future way of how we are coordinating whatever data we have collected from each other of the various groups of stakeholders, or call that whatever you want. I think we need to sort of, first of all, say whether we do believe that, for example, this Group, and this way of doing things is the right way. If it is, then it might be the case that we have to back to each one of the constituencies that we are appointed by, and have them adopt their internal processes so that it is faster and more efficient way of giving feedback and participate, and then we have to sort iterate back and forth.

I think at the moment we sort of tried this CCWG thing, but we are not really decided that we do believe that this is the most efficient way of doing it, and because of that, we are a little bit hesitant of going back and changing each one of our charters as well. And I'm not the best person in organization or management, or whatever, to say how you break this kind of -- sort of deadlock for how to do an internal bottom-up process in a more efficient way.

Given that, each one of our stakeholder groups is probably due and the -- well, each one of our groups do have a process at the moment to find a consensus within our group, and it has for some groups, more or less is -- some groups have been more tiresome and problematic to reach a consensus of a better process for that group, and now we might be asked to go back and change that, which might be a lot of work, but we have to do that, but when we are doing it, we need to know that we sort of are walking in the right direction. So, to some degree, maybe it's just a decision that has to be taken, but at the same time we also need to make sure that we actually do bring in all the stakeholder groups and everything else that is important for us.

Marilyn Cade:

It's Marilyn. And I could build on what Patrik just said. If I could, Rafik? So, a few years ago, ICANN, under a different CEO, announced a Version 19 of the (inaudible), no consultation of the community. I will take a lot of credit for the fact that I've said -- I said use language on this method, "What is that about?" And it's easily organized and stated as a bottom-up, representational, statistics-based approach to analyzing the first steps within ICANN.

I think what Patrik was saying, and I fully agree with Patrik, even this end, if you have CCWG, what's the authority, and pass through our various groups, whether it's the CSG, the GNSO, or an advisory -- why don't we delegate to that Cross Community Working Group, and we need to analyze that, and think about it, because I know it will have -- there's a CEO who has an unlimited amount of funding creating mythical, magical panels that are not really representational in any way.

And I think we need to ask this CCWG -- you know, it's not this -- let's ask ourselves. And really, that also, Patrik, since you are proposing, maybe you need to ask a broader question. So, what happens going forward? Is there a CCWG process which is authoritative going forward. Let's distinguish between this process, which is asking that question, and launching the question of, "Is there a CCWG authoritative process? And if there is, and that comes, the Board and the Staff, ability to create mythical, magical panels here, do not agree -- I'm sorry -- do not accept the community. So we have a short-term CCWG, and a longer-term question, I think, Patrik.

Rafik Dammak:

So, Patrik. I guess you are asking SOs and ACs position on that, and I understand if we go more towards Cross Community Working Groups that has some impact, they are own internal process. Just now we have only, I'd say, this one, and we need kind of, I mean, to find a way how to improve the process to go back and forth between the working group and the SO and AC.

I see Oliver putting his hand -- Olivier, yes. Please go ahead.

Oliver Sueme: Yes. Thank you. Oliver Sueme here for the ISPCP, and I'd like to come back what Patrik mentioned, and also maybe some of the points that Marilyn mentioned, but I have to say I can understand Marilyn -- really hard so maybe I am -- I will repeat something, I apologize for that.

If we want to make the process within the constituencies more fruitful and coming to a situation where we can get more output from the constituency into this Working Group, I think it would be very helpful, and I suggested that already in one of the other calls. If we could discuss within our constituency some concrete and some focused questions, or like main issues, I mean, if we just discussed what are the general expectations on this working group regarding Internet Governance and things like that? I think it will be much too general, and what we need, I think, is a really concrete output.

So, maybe it would be possible that we agree on three, like, high-level questions, or high-level issues in this Working Group, that we can transport into the constituency so that every constituency in every stakeholder group, has an option to discuss along the line of, for example, three most important and high-level issues regarding Internet Governance, and the future process that we are discussing. We are all facing the Singapore Meeting. We will all have the possibilities to discuss concrete things within the constituencies, and I think it would be easier and more focused if we could discuss along certain lines that we agree on in this group. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Oliver. You can see we have several questions, in particular about NETMundial, and also about the contribution made by the Working Group in order to get feedback from the community. So it has -- it's somehow more concrete, I guess, but that's proven that we have several questions, and we need really to shorten, maybe to combine, maybe to refine so that's what we should work on this. Okay. So any questions? Yes, Greg. Welcome. Please go ahead.

Greg Shatan: All right. Greg Shatan. My apologies for being a little late to the call, although I have been listening for a while. Listening to the conversation as far as I've heard, I'm reminded of that Roman theory, divide and conquer, and I think we are in some danger of dividing ourselves and allowing ourselves to continue to be conquered. One of the things that struck me in this Cross Community Working Group is the extent to which we all agree on some very important principles, obviously there is a level -- there are levels of agreement and, you know, hopefully, too, you know, this reflects, to some extent, it's not a great extent, because we all try to, is the thoughts of our relative -- respective constituencies.

But I think it's important and the currently rapidly-moving atmosphere that we are in to overcome the -- whatever impediments there may be within our working group processes or charters, or the like, to be able to act with unity because one of the great and terrible things about concentrated power at the top of a corporate structure, is the nimbleness with which it can act. While a representative, democracy or whatever you want to call this, a representative organization, it's never going to be able to move quite as fast. We need to overcome these hurdles in order to make sure that we can guard what we all find most dear in a multistakeholder process, and the ability to influence what is going on.

I think that, you know, while there are, obviously, these hurdles, they are -- you know, should be readily overcomable. And whether they need to be overcome in an ad hoc, or a one-time way, here to some extent, perhaps by giving a brief to a certain extent to the representatives, you know, we need to find it in terms of a longer-term way of creating and managing Cross Community Working Groups to some extent that's outside of our mandate, I think, although not entirely, of course. I think there's a lot that we can do to inform that, but we need to keep our eye on the substantive issues that we need to be providing the communities of output on -- and I think that the dialogue and the voice that comes from this group are uniquely powerful, and should be -- we should find a way to maximize that. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Greg. I understand those comments, but the question remains, what kind of questions we need to ask in the Public Session, so I think that's our main task for today, and we don't have so

much time, we have just one week. And I understand that you have some listeners, but I think our goal today is mostly to (inaudible) in how to draft -- not to really draft -- but how to really find this question, and to ask the community to get feedback if we need. So, I see that Patrik -- Patrik, just one question -- at least I think three questions can be -- we have 90 minutes for that session. So, really, if we can go--

Patrik Fältström: Yeah. Maybe I should explain myself. So, the first question first of all, I think that it's talking about too many things. I think it's important to, like, cut the text, and you'll say, "The last question, what should be the next priority -- is the CCWG's next priority after NETMundial Meeting has concluded?" That's a good question for each one of the groups.

And then I think we could -- we probably have to have -- I was thinking we should, like to cut down the number of questions and then we cut down the questions to be shorter, so we have, let's say, one question every 20 minutes, so if it's two hours, that ends up being six questions. Right?

Rafik Dammak: Let's just say we -- we agreed in some format, I think. First I think we have, if I'm not mistaken, 15 (ph) minutes for the question. So, Olivier, is this correct, 15 minutes for questions, because I guess we will have only 90 minutes for that--?

Marilyn Cade: Hold on. Hold on. I need to intervene here. Before, Rafik, sorry, I need a point of order. It's Marilyn.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: We asked ICANN for a two-hour session. ICANN is failing -- or Staff, failing to adhere to commitments that are written into the Affirmation of Commitment and the ATRT about when major changes in the agenda would take place. Have ignored that. We came back and said, here's our request. We asked for a two-hour session, we are planning around lots of information from the ICANN Staff because, you know, they've driven a different agenda that they have we are leaving 90 minutes or two hours, we need to plan accordingly, right? We need to plan for both eventualities, is that right? That's what I'm trying to confirm?

Rafik Dammak: Olivier, please go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Rafik. It's Olivier speaking. So, in regards to the -- it's Olivier Crepin-Leblond, there is an Oliver here as well, so it's a bit difficult, and there's also another Olivier as well. Anyway, with regards to the structure of the meeting itself, yeah, we have for our two-hour meeting, but we haven't received an answer from Staff yet. So I don't think that we should, you know, just say, "Well, it has been refused so far." I think we need to wait for an answer and then take it from there. For the time being let's assume we've got two hours. Let's say that we might have less than two hours, but for the time being, assume that, first thing.

Second thing, with regards to the number of questions, I've heard from several people, three questions are probably the right amount of questions. The question which Patrik has suggested, talks about after the Brazil Meeting, and I think chronologically, it would probably make more sense to speak about what happens after the Brazil Meeting, after we've spoken about what happens at the Brazil Meeting. So, that certainly is question I would support, but maybe as the last one of the three questions. But what I would suggest is actually that we have -- rather, we divide our two hours into four sections. So three questions, and then an open thing. You know, the last question being an open question, going like, you know, "Is there anything that we've forgotten that you would like to talk about."

I know it has the potential to get the discussion at the end to go in all directions, and basically go completely off track. However, we need to keep that discussion with the community open enough so if idiots want to come up with a stupid idea then they'll be able to air it. At least they are not going to be told -- you know, they are not going to say, "Well, this thing was too focused and we

haven't been able to express ourselves because the Cross Community Working Group people are trying to -- what is it -- to control the agenda, and control the answers that they are getting, and we need to have something open, and in fact I did, say, have one thing where you might have an idiot that asks stupid ideas and comes up with something totally tangential.

Similarly speaking, we might have some absolute genius suggestions that comes out on that, and I'm speaking from experience, having had, you know, some open questioning at the end of a session, and certainly someone comes up with a really cool, very, very good suggestion, or a very good question that none of us had thought on the Working Group.

So, that's how I would structure it. With regards to the other questions, I would suggest maybe we could ask one general question as to, "You've got our -- you know, the Cross Community Working Group's input into Brazil, what did we forget about?" Is there anything there that we should be sending in addition to that that? Are there any additional points that we might have forgotten?" And I think that that would, hopefully, generate some input from the community. That's, it for the time being. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Olivier. So we have center of the structure. And so just to be sure that we are covering everything. Renate, can you please take notes, so we think we are going to -- to try to collect some questions, just to be sure that we are capturing those suggestions.

It was Filiz, I guess we have to start with what was -- what do you think was missing in the contribution. Once again, if you have any suggestion, please write it in the Chat, so it's more easy for us to get -- I would say, to get it. And then -- I'm trying to go through the questions to find those that we can really use. So, Olivier, your first question was about what you think is missing in the CCWG contribution?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That's correct Rafik. It's Olivier speaking.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So then we can go to the next question. I understand the comments from Patrik, that we should not really talk about, and that maybe probably about NETMundial and Internet Governance and, let's say, except IANA. Yes, Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Rafik. It's Olivier speaking. So just a moment ago I have spoken of the suggestion of three questions; or four questions, including one that is very open. Now, let me come up with something totally different. And suggest something else, which is what the ATRT2 did, which is to build a list of questions that are distributed to all of the communities in advance, and then not structure the session along any kind of session, but basically gives numbers to those questions, and then get the community to speak to those questions. In other words, they can choose. Whoever is in the room can choose what question they would like to answer, and that might give us a wider set of input, than just focusing ourselves on three questions.

Yes. It is a bit more chaotic, but we have rapporteurs, that we will have, and the way we will be able to have the rapporteurs work is each -- maybe a set of rapporteurs -- well, rapporteurs will be able to share the different questions between themselves, so each would be reporting on one question if somebody answers to it, and it might provide us with a fuller input. The key part to this, is that the questions at that point need to be distributed to the ICANN Community, and I would imagine that this would probably -- the members of this Working Group here, would act as relays sending those questions back to their own committees.

So, for example, I would post it in the At-Large discussion lists, and I'd expect others in GNSO would post it in their local list as well, and ccNSO, et cetera. And so then we have a community that comes to Singapore in the room and is eager to tell us what they think, and what they feel, based on the questions, the wide list of questions that we've given them. Different folks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Olivier. Also, it is totally a different approach, so do you think that we can send those questions, as it is, to the community, and people -- I mean, they will pick up what they want to answer or now, so -- but -- so they have only one week to go through and just to answer that. Or, to work as we agreed, maybe do four, just maybe three, and now plus, and open question. So, I think it depends what they say -- if we get any -- the opinions among the members of the working group. Or the approach that we can follow. One, is just to hold this question to the community, and so people can pick up whatever they want to answer, in the public session. Or, we need to select three, plus open questions, so we have these two options.

So, who is we supporting., I mean, option one or option two, so that I see the way that we can get, I mean the support, or the approach that we want to follow.

Marilyn Cade: Hi, it's Marilyn. I'm not on the Adobe. Can I get in the queue, Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Okay. I'm feeling a little bit like we are ignoring what happened over the weekend. Where, you know, I'm going to be fairly clear here. So, yes there was a longstanding weeks to month-long discussion about how to address changes in the IANA function, and then the ICANN Staff they believe that's the issue to blow it up. So now in Singapore, you know, it's all about ICANN, it's all about ICANN Staff, it's all ICANN, it's all about ICANN's Staff. I'm not really happy with this.

The CCWG is about governance of ICANN. That is not governance of IANA, that is governance of ICANN. So, when we come up with questions for the CCWG, and the rest of you -- you know, I understand you may not agree with me. This is about governance of ICANN. Governance of IANA is one thing, but governance of ICANN from a bottom-up approach, is quite another, and so whatever questions we are devising in my view, need to be about governance of ICANN. And we seem to be drifting away from that and thinking, here now we can't ask those questions.

The CCWG sends a document forward to NETMundial; NETMundial itself is quite confused driven by multiple pressures, driven by (inaudible), and governance has a strict agenda, but we need to thinking about who we are, and I think we are getting lost here. We created a document, we need to stay true to the document. If the document is not fully adequate, then the community will tell us that on the call.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So it means that we have to agree on what approach we want to follow, and--

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. Rafik. What happened to our discussion about the document we created?

Rafik Dammak: Sorry? The question about?

Marilyn Cade: The document we created with principles. Are we now professing we are not going to ask the community to comment on this?

Rafik Dammak: So, I have to say, we sent all the questions, there is already some questions about the documents that we develop, and then we are asking the community if there is any missing part, and I think that the same questions in the other upload (ph) we have just three questions. We start with mainly what do you think about this document, and if think if there is any missing part. So we are still asking the community about the document that we created. So, I'm trying to explain that, Olivier suggested two approach. I guess we have all these questions, which I'm not sure if you can -- you are reading them, or just we connect three plus an opening question.

So, it's totally different approach, and till now I don't see any reaction to which direction that we need to follow, and it's just now 15 minutes left in his call, and just one week before the public meeting. So I guess we need really to made decision quickly, and to decide which direction we want to go towards.

Okay. So once (inaudible) I guess it's actually for us, maybe, a full polling, between approach one, and approach two, and see what the numbers here on the call support, so at least to get some guidance. So if it's possible to use the Adobe Connect capability to vote, and to see if the people are supporting one approach. So approach one is just to use one of these questions for the community, and so we will ask that you ask members from different SOs and ACs to share that with your groups, so people can answer, to pick up and answer whatever they want the policy in the Public Session, that's option one. Option two, is just where you can -- I started to do -- just to have three questions plus one open question. So, is supporting option one? Just please use the Adobe Connect and vote. And Marilyn, since you're not in the Adobe Connect you can just express your support or objection. Yes, Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Rafik. It's Olivier speaking. I'm sorry. I'm actually confused about the question you're asking here. I tried to understand what you were saying and I didn't get it. Could you please clarify what we have to choose, between what and what?

Rafik Dammak: How to say? Olivier, you suggested two approach. First one it was -- you said that we have three questions and we started working on those questions, and also you suggested that we have for open question. So that people come and just, you know, answer or make any comments, and you suggested a second approach, that we have all those questions, as I understand, I'm trying to -- that's my understanding. Those questions to the community, and that's the list of questions you have now. The community, so the members of this Working Group sending them to their respective group, and then people in the CCWG public session, they will pick up which question they want to answer. I guess, I'm not sure now if I understand your suggestion correctly or not, so. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Olivier. Please go ahead.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Rafik. Yeah. My two suggestions are as follows. Either we set monthly questions, or we take all of the questions that we have so far, plus more, and we put them all on a piece of paper, and we let people answer -- let the input comment from -- from the audience on any of these questions. But whilst looking at the Chat as well, I also notice that it was in the current chat on the Adobe, I've noticed are also concerns, internal concerns, and that probably might need to think a bit more, so I have another suggestion now. I hope I'm not (inaudible)--

Rafik Dammak: Olivier, if you say -- Okay, I think we are -- I meant the same explanation like you but -- So you are going to take the third approach?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: The third approach. Yeah.

Rafik Dammak: Because, Olivier, I'm just wondering, so we have to find a way, but what I was thinking, so we propose two approach -- if the approach is a failure, right? It can be okay, but then we need to do polling, just to pick one -- pick at one. So that was my thought.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. It's Marilyn. Look, I can't even get in into the Adobe Connect, and so maybe if we could hear what the proposal is from Olivier, we have a limited amount of time. We also have three (inaudible) on the part of the ICANN Staff. I have (inaudible) little things, which I wish it to be, and plead ignorance on the part of the ICANN Staff, but keep ignoring the bottom-up input of -- so if we could hear Olivier's third approach, and then we can come back to probably get a credible timeframe, and a credible role for the CCWG which is sort of our priority (inaudible).

Rafik Dammak: Olivier, can you just please, explain your third approach? And as for -- Marilyn, we are going to -- I mean, unless you want this section to thrive as other business. I think we are going to discuss that, so no worry. Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Rafik. It's Olivier speaking. So, I've looked at some of the questions which were asked, and some of the chat in there, and I suggest the following then. The main session, so our public session could be divided into three parts, the first part being the NETMundial-related questions, and these actually are all of the NETMundial-related questions if you want, are already listed on that Wiki page which we built with all of the questions that came in.

I realize a lot of people suggested questions that actually are the same question being asked in a different way. So we could consolidate all of NETMundial's questions, and in there, you've got, "Please comment on the contribution we have submitted to NETMundial, focusing on the roadmap. Please comment on the contributions we've submitted to NETMundial focusing on the principles. What does the community devise that ICANN's participation be at the Brazil Summit?" Which input, additional to the CCWG document should ICANN's participants at NETMundial receive to better participate? Which output is expected from ICANN's participants at NETMundial? Are there more specific recommendations? What happens to any output and input at NETMundial, and what are the additional points for the document that the CCWG developed? Are there missing messages that need to be elaborated? Are there any points that need to be expanded?"

All of these questions are actually focusing on NETMundial, and are the same kind of questions, so we can have one set of questions on NETMundial that would be one segment of the time. Then we move on to the next part of the time, which is the questions about the Cross Community Working Group, and these are the questions, given the compressed timeframe and participants varying interests and experiences in this Internet Governance environment, you know, what does your group think is the potential value of the Cross Community Working Group and the best to advance cooperation? What should be its next priority after the NETMundial Meeting has concluded. I think that's the question that was asked by Patrik.

There's also how can the CCWG and the ICANN Community support multistakeholder cooperation, and dialogue and other key settings like One Net and the IGF. And finally, which actions, if any, should ICANN avoid on its task of driving the public consultation on the IANA function issue? And I think that's a big question there, hearing the concerns that the IANA functions issue, the public consultation of the IANA functions issue is seen as being potentially a staff-driven thing, when many here believe that it should be a community-driven thing.

And that, I guess, is maybe the discussion that things will hone onto. And then finally, the final part of that session could just be an open Q&A and statements in case we've missed out any questions that we've had in there. So, really three parts. NETMundial questions, CCWG questions and open floor.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Olivier. Thanks, with coming up with three different approach. We need to pick one, and so I hope that the members on the call just -- I mean, select one, so that's why I was thinking if we have really, that's the way we get direction, and for those who are on the Adobe Connect, they just can -- they express their vote -- by vote, that's okay. So, shall we proceed like that? Just we need -- just put the different approach and maybe in the notes of people, everybody note what we are going to select. Is everybody okay with the polling?

Marilyn Cade: Rafik, it's Marilyn. I'd like to ask a question.

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: So, given Olivier's point -- I want to think out loud and ask your advice, I think Patrik is still on the call, and the other. Look, ICANN just announced a process, without easy consultation, and there's a fair amount of information that indicates that ICANN reach information in order to drive this. But I'm not going to go there. I'm going to try to be above that thread. ICANN should have been taking consultation with the community, they didn't, they decided to do their own thing, that would be a staff thing, (inaudible) art. What I'm trying to figure out really, I think it's important, since ICANN's point the -- doing their own thing on their proposal for freeing the IANA -- you know, there's a lot of confusion, most people don't understand this, but whatever it is, ICANN is doing their own thing. They are planning sessions on Monday, and they are doing their own thing, and some of us still expect the engagement of those discussions.

Are we really going to try to consume a view of the CSG or the CCWG on the IANA functions agreement? Or do we want to try to keep that separate? And I'm just looking for, you know, if ICANN is spending two hours for the community's time, which is what they had on the agenda right now, on their thing, that's not a bottom-up thing, it's their thing. And then we come in, if we manage to move ourselves back to the session that we had asked for, then I understand and accept your suggestion. But if ICANN, too, in their two-hour thing, before we come to the floor, I've got a problem on relevancy.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Marilyn. It's Olivier. I don't know if we've lost Rafik, but--

Rafik Dammak: Yes, (inaudible)--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I have a question too -- Thank you, Rafik. So, Marilyn, you have a problem on relevancy, in what way? Is that, if we arrive -- if our session arrived after the session that Fadi and Staff will run, we will be seen as being irrelevant. Is that what you mean?

Marilyn Cade: (Inaudible) here, if this is a very staff-driven, top-down, Fadi Chehadé show, and then we come in and say, "No. No. No. We are the -- the floor open players on the -- you know, we think this, we think that." Fadi will have already captured the message. Whether he intends to do so or not, and people are not going to spend two hours talking about -- the basic two hours talking about the IANA function agreement. They are just not going to spend two hours talking about the CCWG, they are going to go to have lunch. They're going to go onto other work. So this matters to us.

Rafik Dammak: Well--

Marilyn Cade: Or, we can just come together and talk to ourselves, but it's just completely -- just, does the CCWG matter? Are we going to insist on the relevant time? In which case, then Fadi can follow that with can follow that with a bigger -- focus on just the IANA function agreement, which most of us on this call understand is one part of the agenda. But if we are following a two-hour road show, Fadi and the Board, I've got a problem.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Rafik, may I speak?

Rafik Dammak: Yeah, Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Rafik. Marilyn, I think you are stating the obvious in this. I certainly feel also that, of course, if the CCWG session arrives after the main session, on this -- the main globalization session that has been now mentioned and so on, of course this is going to be very difficult act to follow, simply because we don't have all the bells and whistles that some might have. Certainly, you know, the email to Sally Coserton and David Olive has been sent out, and the request has been made. And there hasn't been a reply yet, but of course the hope is that ICANN Staff will come back to us and provide us with an answer that will satisfy us, so as to be able to start with what seems to make sense. Get the community to first talk with each other, and then continue the dialogue, then, with Staff afterwards. And I think that the case for this has been made.

Now, you know, short of taking over the -- the scheduling is such that the Staff-led session, or ICANN Staff-led session, or Board-led session. I don't know how that will be marketed, happens before the CCWG session, short of occupying that session, or walking out, and I hate to be mentioning either of these two things, because I think it's not conducive to a harmonious environment. Short of that, there's nothing that we can do. I mean, the only other thing we could do would be to write to Fadi before that, and absolutely insist. But really, at that point what we have are two clashing points of view, and I'm not sure how that is going to be resolved.

And, again, I'm not also sure whether it is the wish of this Working Group to come head on regarding the scheduling, and make a very big deal out of it. That's a question that I'm not sure I can answer, because I don't know. In the meantime--

Rafik Dammak: (Inaudible)--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Might I just say? In the meantime, just to have something positive here, I notice that the majority of people, and in fact everyone seems to be agreeing with the -- approach number three, to divide the public session into three parts, NETMundial question, CCWG sessions -- questions and open questions, and then publish the suggested questions on each of the first two parts, in advance of the public meetings. So it looks like we might have a (inaudible) preference for dividing our public session into three parts, as I've just described it.

I think we do have some -- and I see Keith has asked whether anyone prefers option one or two. So just as a reminder, one was focused on three questions only, and two was give a sheet to the community with all of the questions mixed together, and it appears -- Keith has asked whether anyone prefers number one or two. And no -- it appears that there's no support for one or two at the moment. So three seems to be the approach.

Back to you , Rafik. And sorry about this. I would like to obtain -- you know, get something out of this call, and certainly obtain closure on this. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Olivier. So it's really support for this approach three, and I didn't see any objection. I guess even if we follow it, we still need, maybe some, you know, simple -- just volunteer to really to proofreading. I mean, just they are writing this question to make them maybe consistent, and so on. And we feel that also to -- how do I say -- to put them in the correct group of questions. So maybe we can do that after the call, and must maybe checking later with the Working Group, but at least we have -- I guess we can say it's either that we have an agreement, too, for the approach number three.

Okay. So, if people, you know, I guess do agree with -- I'm not sure. Olivier, you're raising your hand again, or it was raised from before, but yes?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Rafik. It's Olivier speaking again. So, just trying to get things moving forward. I note here, so three seems to be okay. Now, I'd like to ask, with your permission, if we could ask the members -- the people present whether -- you know, how far should the Co-facilitators, so you and I, Rafik, push for that morning session, scheduling wise?

Rafik Dammak: Sorry? Could you just repeat?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: How far should Rafik Dammak and Olivier Crepin-Leblond go to push for the morning session for the CWG to have the morning session, instead of the afternoon? This to me sounds like an arm wrestle at the moment. It's turning into an arm-wrestling thing, and I don't know because we haven't had any feedback from Staff. I note there -- both Sally Costerton and David Olive are not on the call, so I'm sure, without any feedback whatsoever I have no idea what is being planned now with regard to the scheduling.

- Marilyn Cade: I'm going to drop off in just minute. It's Marilyn. I'm just going to make a short comment. I would urge the Co-Chairs, based on the concerns raised and the importance of the input from the bottom-up process, to make their strong suggestions. That the CCWG event happens. If it doesn't then we are going to spend two hours hearing from Board Members who don't even know what their job is on this. The community is going to wander away, the GAC will wander away, so I think you really ought to say to yourself, Ignore the fact that ICANN blew a discussion up that was supposed to happen at a later date. It's an important discussion, but it's only a part of the important discussion, and go back to what the original intent was. And then let ICANN justify why -- let the ICANN Staff and CEO justify why the CCWG event is not important.
- Rafik Dammak: Yes, Olivier?
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks, Rafik. It's Olivier speaking. I've put the question in the Chat, really, while we still have people on the call before they all drop off. We are six minutes beyond the theoretical end of this call.
- Rafik Dammak: Yeah, we just want--
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: How far should we insist for the Cross Community Working Group session in the morning of the Monday? I just want to gain a temperature of -- what they call a temperature of the room.
- Rafik Dammak: Okay. That's, we get a moment I guess. So just to create a--
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Not a vote.
- Rafik Dammak: I think maybe it's more quick if people use -- you can write or have -- you can put, like "agree" or "disagree" so we can quickly ask to see the position of people on the call.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: It's Olivier speaking again. So there's a simple question here, let's do it this way then. Lukewarm, I see at the moment. So let's see how the lukewarm goes. Should we -- we can put a green tick if we would insist that the Cross Community Working Group Meeting -- Public Meeting would be in the morning, on the Monday morning. Or a red cross if we want -- if we are okay with having it in the afternoon of the Monday. So that's going to be a clear one. Green tick, or red cross: green tick is insist for the morning. Red cross is, we are okay with the afternoon.
- Marilyn Cade: Olivier, it's Marilyn. I can't -- I'm not in the Adobe, so I'll give a green tick, but I'll also say you cannot accept being against Name Collision issues, and I find it amazing, amazing that you, who I thought expressed a concern that you had conflict as well. Are we ignoring the concerns of the community? So when you're voting on this, you seem to have ignored the concerns that have been expressed about the timing.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Marilyn, it's Olivier. I have not voted, I'm asking the question. I have not voted yet.
- Marilyn Cade: The staff --
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I have a preference, obviously, but I haven't voiced yet, because as the person asking the question, I wouldn't want to get any of you to steer your vote one direction or another.
- Rafik Dammak: And so if everybody to vote, just have only two people holding, so--
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: The few people who have voted, yeah, I've seen a couple of a couple of green ticks, and I've seen a red cross as well. It's a lukewarm -- it's kind of undecided at the moment.
- Marilyn Cade: And I vote against doing the session in the afternoon. It seems to be adjusted, but right now I vote against it.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, so please--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. So the vote all right. I think a lot of people are undecided, Rafik. That's really, I see more abstentions than anything else in this. And knowing full well -- it's Olivier speaking -- and knowing full well that there are a lot more people on this Working Group than the number of people who are on this call at the moment, but I know the majority of people haven't really decided one way or other. Although there is a preference, more people have put green ticks than red crosses. And so, thank you. Back to you, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Okay, so we are going to follow approach number three, so we still need just maybe after this call, to work on the cutting the calls, and the respective question in the correct part. And also maybe to help them in some proofreading, maybe combining them, and getting in the mailing list, if it's okay also. And then sending them to the different groups, so hopefully the members of the Working Group will liaise with their own -- I mean, stakeholder group, SO and AC. So, for the session, again, I'm not sure. I didn't see a real guidance here. So I guess it's remaining an open question.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking again. So two last things then, looking at the chart and that's for the transcript record. I note that it appears some people are not fanatical about the morning, but certainly there is a clear wish to avoid conflicting with Name Collision. So that is a significant -- I can't call it consensus, but significant point that a number of people are making. And finally, the reason why I'm mentioning this for the transcript record, is I've been told my Staff that Adigo has confirmed they can do a 24 turnaround -- a 24-hour turnaround on this call, so as to have the transcript ready, and that can then be shared with the Working Group. That's it. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Should we ask the Name Collision Workshop to be, say, changing its timeslot if we -- Yes, okay. So I guess we need to follow up on the mailing list anyway, it's already 12 minutes after one hour, and I guess we should really, perhaps it's just this session. Having just -- just concerns that we didn't really finish form the question that's still remaining. And we have to come down on the mailing list. So we don't have so much choice, but at least we get some approach in how we will kind of structure for this question. Okay, so if you say so, Olivier, they are okay, then they are okay.

So going to the next items, if there is any other business. I guess we talked about that other business and that issue, so several times join nearing the call. Okay. If I don't hear any objection maybe we can adjourn this call for today.

Marilyn Cade: I do have a description, Marilyn, but--

Rafik Dammak: Marilyn? Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Can you hear--?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I'm not sure. Marilyn is speaking but we cannot hear her well. Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. Can we just have a quick assessment of when we would reconvene.

Rafik Dammak: Reconvene when, this week?

- Marilyn Cade: No. If we are going to reconvene and plan for the event, we should probably have some ideas on when we would reconvene to plan for -- whenever the event is, whatever time it is, shouldn't we be reconvening the plan of that on ground in Singapore?
- Rafik Dammak: Reconvene in Singapore, I'm not sure, but I think -- Did you mean before the public session?
- Marilyn Cade: Yes. Thank you for that clarification, Rafik. That was what I was suggesting we ought to have some ideas when we would come together in Singapore, right before the publish session. Regardless of when it is, what the topic is.
- Rafik Dammak: Okay. I think it's better perhaps we send the mailing list, and just have an action item, and ask people, because it depends when they will arrive to Singapore. So is it okay? So we can ask in the mailing list, and check when people will come, and then maybe we can decide if we can have kind of informal meeting, if possible, and then we need really to ask if we can get room for that.
- Marilyn Cade: Sorry. It's Marilyn. Let me be clear. I was actually suggesting we need a prefatory session before we go live. So, I'm not calling for a meeting of the CCWG, I'm calling for a prefatory session whenever we reach agreement, so we don't walk onto the stage without having coordinated with each other. If your proposal works for me, Rafik, I do think we need to understand we are going to do such a -- if we are going to have rapporteurs, you know, we have the moderators already agreed to, but we need to identify the rapporteurs. We need to have a little bit of stagehand planning on ground, and I don't know that we need a room, but I think we need to propose the time for it, and we can do that by, as you suggested, doing it effectively. If we can do that on the list.
- Rafik Dammak: Okay. And the (inaudible), so okay. We noted it in the action item, can you please add it, so and ask in the -- so we need to ask this in the mailing list. Okay. So, I guess at home there is no any other business.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Rafik, Olivier.
- Rafik Dammak: Yes, Olivier. Please go ahead.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks, Rafik. May I suggest to make the thing simpler -- it's Olivier speaking -- To make things simpler Doodle -- Saturday morning, Saturday afternoon, Sunday morning, Sunday afternoon, that will give us an idea of people's availability, and I know that we are all busy, but we can -- you know, I'm sure we can all give -- find like an hour or something of informal meeting at some point. Maybe, I don't know if we need to suggest, go all the way down to the number -- the timing, the hours and stuff, on Saturday morning, Sunday afternoon, Sunday morning, Sunday afternoon. At least vaguely on that. And we can follow up by email. Thank you.
- Rafik Dammak: Okay. So, I guess we have some action to follow up, okay. So any objection to adjourn this call for today? Okay. Hearing none, so this call is adjourned. Thank you everybody. So, see you soon in Singapore, and have safe travel there.