Notes CCCWG on Internet Governance call

May 16th 2014

Standing Agenda Items

1- Roll-call & adoption of agenda (Staff, Olivier: 5 minutes)

2- Action items review (Olivier: 5 minutes)

- **Call of 8 May 2014**

3- Charter: Finalising (Olivier: 45 minutes)

- Draft Charter document, version 4

4- AOB (Olivier: 5 minutes)

NOTES

On **Objective and Scope of Activities**, some bullet points were added

To improve one of these points and in response to Patrick's comment, Jordan Carter emailed this text to Bart and Olivier: "Convey to the ICANN community discussions about ICANN or ICANN matters that arise in other Internet Governance discussions and processes".

On **Membership of the Working Group** Greg made an extensive comment suggesting having 7 members (6 + Chair) instead of having 5 + Chair.

Support for this within participants of the call.

Olivier suggests that some SOs and ACs may not be able to have this quantity of people but let see their comments on this.

On this section "The Co-Chairs of the Working Group, in consultation with the Members of the WG, may also appoint Experts to the Working Group. Experts

are not considered Members or Observers, but otherwise are entitled to participate on equal footing as Observers", Bill Drake and Rudi Vansnick say that this seems unduly restrictive and unrealistic. No support within the participations to add this amendment proposed by Greg.

On the **Making Decisions**, Greg is asking for more clarity on what we mean by "consensus" or "no consensus". Rudi says that members should respond representing their SOs and ACs, experts may respond based on their expertise. We should adopt the definition of consensus as stated during the last call. David Fares agrees.

On **Omission in or Unreasonable Impact of Charter:** About the suggestion of Greg to change members to participants on the sentence "In the event the Co-Chairs determine after consulting the Members of the WG", Rudi Vansnick and Bill Drake think we should leave the text as is. Bill Drake says that in reality the observers would be part of the conversation in some manner anyway.

Avri suggest "Any such decision will be discussed with the WG and modified as necessary". No call participants oppose.

On **Review of the Charter**, Greg says that it seems odd to him that a minority of the participants SO's and AC's could force the WG to continue.

Olivier proposes a sentence to explain why just two are enough: "Consistent with ICANN general practice…" Support from call participants.

Action items: next steps

Bart suggests updating a <u>final version from the discussions in this call</u> and that Olivier and Rafik make a <u>final call of support in the WG mailing list</u> to avoid adding new changes for ever.

If no significant opposition is received by next Wednesday (May 21st), 19 UTC, the final document will be send to SO's and AC's chairs.

Send a doodle to see if we need a next call now that the Charter has been finished.