SINGAPORE MEETING PREPARATION, Refine the questions
CCWG on Internet Governance Singapore Session – Questions to Community:
https://community.icann.org/display/CPMMB/CCWG+on+Internet+Governance+Singapore+Session+Questions+to+Community

Questions suggested (in no particular order):

- Given the compressed time frame and participants' varying interests and experiences in the Internet governance environment, the CCWG has experienced some teething problems, e.g. in agreeing a charter for its work, a statement for the NETmundial, etc. 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?

- Key and unavoidable issues at the NETmundial meeting will be the globalization/denationalization of the IANA function and of ICANN. Governments and other stakeholders from around the world will be keen to assess the breadth and depth of ICANN community support for the I* organizations' Montevideo Declaration and related statements by the ICANN board. What is your group's position on these issues?

- How can the CCWG and the ICANN community support multistakeholder cooperation and dialogue in other key settings, e.g. 1Net and especially the IGF?

- Please Comment on the contribution we have submitted to NetMundial -- focussing on the Roadmap

- Please Comment on the contribution we have submitted to NetMundial -- focussing on the Principles

- What does the community advise that ICANN's participation be at the Brazil meeting?

- Which input, additional to the CCWG document, should ICANN participants at NetMundial receive to better participate?

- Which output is expected from ICANN participants at NetMundial? Are there more specific recommendations?

- What happens to any output/input re: NetMundial?

- What are the main messages from ICANN Community members towards NetMundial? [Highlighting the main messages that seemed to be supported by the majority so far, with a note that there are varying opinions of course and unanimity is not the goal here…]

- What are the additional points for the document the CCWG developed? Are there missing messages that needs to be elaborated? Are there any points that need to be expanded?

- What does the Community expect the role of ICANN Staff/CEO; ICANN Board; ICANN Community Leaders will be during NetMundial? [As these can contribute the process in different ways, channels…]

Patrick: The first one of this list should be something like "What should be its next priority after the NETmundial meeting has concluded?" We should have less questions (around 6) and shorter.

Olivier: I would keep this question as the last question asked so we deal with questions chronologically. We need to keep the discussion with the community open enough with 3/4 questions. Maybe one general first question can be "did we forget something, additional points, Re our contribution for NETmundial?"

Chat>
Patrik Fältström: I claim the 2nd question (about IANA globalization) can be removed, as all of us at a public session probably will say "we support it"

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: @Patrick: are you sure we all support it? I have heard some voices in ICANN that are not supporting it as much... or some that are saying YES BUT

Alain Bidron: Agree with Olivier, and ICANN globalization is more than IANA

Olivier: I have another suggestion instead of the 3 or 4 questions. Build a list of questions distributed to all the community in advance and then not structure the session but give number to those questions so they can choose what question they would like to answer. This will allow a fuller input. We should all share those questions within our local lists.

Rafik: What approach should we chose: option 1 (3 or 4 questions) or option 2 (list of questions distributed in advance)?

Marilyn: we should concentrate on globalization of ICANN, not IANA (2 different issues). We need to stay true to the document we created.

Olivier: I want to propose a third approach. All the NETmundial related questions can be consolidated (many questions are the same asked differently), then the questions on the CCWG with a last big question on the IANA functions issue and the public consultation process and finally open floor.

Summary of different approaches:

Approach 1:

Focus on 3 questions only

Approach 2:

Give a sheet to the community with all of the questions, mixed together

Approach 3:

Divide the public session into 3 parts:

- NetMundial Questions

- CCWG Questions

- Open Questions

On chat >
Keith Drazek (RySG): I vote for #3

Keith Drazek (RySG): (vote early, vote often!)

David Maher (PIR): I vote for #3

Alain Bidron: Approach 3 for me

Aparna Sridhar: Approach 3 for me as well

Leon Sanchez: I vote for #3

Sarah Falvey - RYSG: Agree with #3

Marilyn: If this is a Fadi/staff show and very top-down, whether it is intentional or not, we will miss relevance. People will not stay 2 hours to listen about the CCWG.

Olivier: I think you are stating the obvious, if we arrive after the main globalization session, of course it will be very difficult to follow. We already sent an email to Sally Costerton and David Oliver and are awaiting the answer. But there is not much we can do about it. How far should Rafik and I go to push for the CCWG to have the morning session instead of the afternoon session?

On chat>
Keith Drazek (RySG): While I agree that the morning session would be preferable, we're not getting it. That said, I think it's worth pointing out to staff that the community process should take precedent over staff-driven process.

Olivier: Majority is undecided but there is a clear wish to avoid conflict with name collision.

Rafik: We will need to follow-up on the mailing list.