CCWG IG Public Session

Rapporteurs: León Sánchez and Marília Maciel

Olivier Crepin-Leblond stated the session explaining how the WG was created. The working group had to work at a very fast pace because of the deadlines for contributions, as a consequence, it does not have a charter yet. The WG expects to work on that in the near future.

Being an ICANN group, the CCWG on Internet Governance decided to work on both topics on the agenda of Net Mundial (principles and roadmap) keeping the focus on ICANN.

Explanation of the CCWG document sent to NetMundial

What did we miss in our document? What should we add?

Community feedback:

What is your group's position on these issues?

RSG: They will comment on the document but not right away. With respect to the CCWG initiative, is a reflexion, there should be more of this kind of working groups.

George Sadowsky: Appreciate it was done in a hurry. There are clearly things to improve although it's closed. How will this be used in the future? How can statements like these be made more visible and assure that they are considered from a very vast number of contributions?

Bertrand de la Chapelle: Congratulations on doing the work. Is it necessary to center the groups activity on NetMundial or should it be expanded and broaden to the whole eco-system that falls outside of ICANN? How other groups work? How much can the MSHM be transposed as is or modified to address freedom of expression and other issues.

Jonathan Zuck: it is important to establish a common language. Would be good to link mshm with bottom-up and transparency to accountability. State the difference between ICANN the institution and ICANN the community. Let's have a unified language that we all understand and use.

Gonzalo Navarro: Reinforce the idea of having a PCP. it is very important to give the chance to others to comment on the document so we have to find a way to achieve that goal.

George Sadowsky: The PCP would be very useful in terms of extending and refining the

document.

Milton Mueller: Presents an idealized version of the MSHM and implies ICANN works like that now. The NCSG passed a statement that is compatible with what is said by the CCWG. One of the potential problems is that it was obviously written before the IANA announcement.

Marilyn Cade: We need to hear from you. The NTIA statement came after drafting the document. We were trying to have a statement to come in that was originated in the ICANN community, that's why your input is so important. We could ask for an expedited public comment period.

John Curran: it would be nice if this is an ongoing group and doesn't dissolve after NetMundial. The document should state accountability for what in front of whom.

Chuck Gomes: ICANN community should participate in NetMundial representing the different groups. ICANN staff should be very cautious because ICANN is a community. They have to make sure the facts are straight and accurate.

Sam from NPOC: ICANN should watch the ripples that come out of NetMundial. It's an ongoing process that can't be seen as crystallizing at some point.

Patrick Falstrom: We should acknowledge that within the ICANN community there's not a process to bring this kind of issues.

It may be useful for the WG to develop a generally understood terms.

Greg Shatan: One of the things ICANN community can bring to NetMundial is how the MSHM can function in the wild.

What happens to those that are out of the MSHM environment? How do we assure these people are represented?

What happens after NetMundial meeting? What will be decided in NetMundial will be the process to be adopted for future discussion. How to develop an extended framework that takes care of the issues that fall outside the actual scope of the discussion.

Support that one of the best things would be support for a MSHM.

Cary Barret: governance for persons that are afraid of the MSHM. People need to understand how decisions are made.

Summary of the main points divided into topics:

General comments:

- Participants showed appreciation for the document and the work carried out by the CCWG
- The document should continue to be improved and be further used by the community. It should be given visibility, particularly during Net Mundial.

Document:

- The document should reinforce its outward looking aspect. It should particularly examine if ICANN's dynamics (ex.: the organization of WGs, the experience of carrying out work in networks etc). can be transposed to other environments.
- It is important to agree on a common vocabulary and definitions across the community in order to say things in a unified way. For instance: the difference between ICANN (the organization) and ICANN community.
- The document should be placed under an expedited public comment period.
- An e-mail address should be created as a channel to receive comments and contributions.

Net Mundial:

- Net Mundial is not the point of arrival. The community needs to make it one step in the process and relate it to other meetings, such as ICANN London and IGF Turkey
- It is important that those who attend the meeting in Sao Paulo show how the multistakeholder model works in ICANN and the benefits it brings to Internet governance discussions
- On the discussion of roadmap it was pointed out that the community could be involved particularly on the following topics: 1) how the process for IANA discussion will evolve. Seek consensus that ICANN will be a facilitator; 2) how to develop a broader framework to deal with topics that are not currently addressed. What will be the process after Net Mundial (and during WSIS+10) to discuss this framework?