

**20140919\_ccwgIG\_ID913325**

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Welcome everyone, to the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance Weekly -- it actually says Weekly Teleconference, but it's been quite a few weeks since our last call. Today is Friday, 19<sup>th</sup> September, 2014.

And we have a small agenda here, trying to basically put ourselves back on our feet, and trying to see what our next steps are going to be. We'll start with a quick status update on the Charter, and then afterwards we'll discuss the reaction to the NETMundial Initiative, or then NETMundial follow up, I'm not even sure what it's called now. And finally, a short report from the IGF Istanbul, if there is such a thing as reporting from the IGF on these issues.

So any -- does anybody wish to add anything to the agenda? Seeing no one put their hand up, let's proceed forward then with the Charter status. You've got a link to the Charter in case you've forgotten about it; we've got Version 3.2 which was the version that was then sent to all of the Chairs of SOs and ACs. That was sent a while ago, a few months ago, and there hasn't been very much movement on this. I've had -- I think on the ALAC side of things, the Charter has been agreed. As far as the GNSO Council is concerned, I've had an interaction with Jonathan Robinson, on this, and the way things work, is someone from the Council has to propose it and move it forward, and I'm not quite sure where we are on that.

Perhaps we'll be able to have an update on this from Rafik Dammak, who should be joining us shortly, or maybe someone else knows where we are. I see Michele has put his hand up, Michele Neylon, you have the floor.

Michele Neylon: Thanks. I didn't I had the floor, but okay. Sorry, I'll behave. It is Friday.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: We've heard (inaudible).

Michele Neylon: Now just on this -- if it's simply a question of getting somebody to propose it, then it shouldn't be that hard, we should be able to simply ask somebody to propose it. I mean, that's normally how it goes. I'm not sure, am I missing something obvious?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: No, Michele -- It's Olivier speaking. It is just a case, apparently, from what Jonathan tells me, of having someone in the GNSO Council proposing it. Now I--

Michele Neylon: Well if you need --

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: --I haven't followed this closely, so I don't know whether that is the case or not, and perhaps others here will know what the process is, but Jonathan, somebody needs to propose it and then we'll put it on the agenda. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Well, if you need assistance with that, Olivier, just ping me after the call, and we can both ping Jonathan and ask -- and if needed we can then just ask. All we need is one GNSO counselor to

propose it, and another one to second it, as far as I know. If there's something missing, I'm sure Jonathan will be able to tell us.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you for this, Michele. Are you aware whether there's been any discussion in the GNSO for or against the Charter? Has there actually been any discussion at all?

Michele Neylon: Olivier, Michele speaking. It's not on my radar. I mean, I'll be perfectly honest, there's been -- there've been several topics over the last couple of months that have been more on my radar than others, both at the GNSO and the Board level. This isn't one that has really, kind of, come across my desk, being flagged by anybody, in any kind of shape or form. So it is perfectly possible that it was discussed, but if it was, I don't recall. Sorry.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you for this, Michele. I wonder if someone else -- I see Avri is on the call, I wonder whether, and I'm sorry to put you on the spot Avri, but I wonder whether you have any further information on this. Has this been circulated or discussed somehow; and where we are, basically? Avri Doria?

Avri Doria: Yeah. You know, I'm just an observer on this group, but as we actually had it on our agenda, at the last meeting, it was not on the agenda as a motion. No one has brought it forward, you know, as a motion. I don't actually know if any of the members of this group are on the Council, but certainly -- and no one came to me as an observer in the group, and a Council member and said, can we move this forward. I believe we had a brief conversation about it that was sort of a: Why are we doing this? Is this still going on? Wait a second; have they solved the problems with the numbers of members in the group? Oh, we need to talk about this more at some other point.

I don't know that I captured the discussion exactly. I'd have to go back and look at the transcript. I admit that it was -- since it wasn't (inaudible/audio skip) that I planned to speak on, I didn't pack it really tight, but I think there's sort of a -- there's no champion for it in the Council, let me put it that way.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes.

Avri Doria: And as I say, I'm not ever sure if there's a full member of the group, in the council. And there is the issue, the pending issue, of the number of people, the issues that I believe Marilyn and others in the Commercial Stakeholder (inaudible), and I don't know that that's been resolved, and it did -- what I'm not being exactly sure of, without back and checking, is whether the issue of the number of people came up in the mailing list, or in the actually conversation we had, because this meeting was one on behalf of the IGF and even the doing of the meetings is difficult. So I can certainly go back and check the facts first, to see if there's more to it, but there really isn't.

And now I guess it was Ammer (ph), or someone who was looking at trying to get it, at least, discussed again on the upcoming meeting next Thursday, but it's too late again for a motion. And yes, a motion just needs to be written, you know, in a sort of baroque (ph) style that the Council has borrowed from the Board with the whereas's and therefore's, and resolves. And then it has to be made and seconded for the Board to have a vote. But at this point I think we should understand where the commercial stakeholders group is on it first. You know, and basically I stopped being a champion -- I'm not sure I ever was a champion, but when the rules got made that an observer could be seen and not heard, you know, being moderated on the mailing list, I decided I certainly wasn't championing it, and (inaudible) -- I mean in the Council. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much for this, Avri. It's Olivier speaking. There are a couple of things which have since changed. I'm looking at the Charter itself, or the proposed Charter. The issue of numbers mentioned here, under Participants 5A, "There shall be a minimum of two members from each participating SO and AC, and a maximum of five members from each participating SO and AC." So that might be -- I think what you mentioned -- what you alluded to with regards to the BC having a problem with this. The other thing that you mentioned with regards to observers -- is

actually -- that's actually changed. On the charter it says, "All SOs and ACs may nominate observers if permitted by, and in accordance with their own rules and procedures, such observers are entitled to participate in world group deliberations on an equal footing with the members, except for formal voting, where voting is limited only to members."

So there should be a list, certainly, on the moderation of observers if there was any. I can't even remember if there was such a thing, but if there was such a thing, it looks like there should be a listing of that.

Avri Doria: There most definitely is.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: There most definitely is, okay.

Avri Doria: Oh, yes.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So that I think would probably have to be listed because the Charter itself says that the observers participate on an equal footing.

Avri Doria: Yeah. If I could make one more point. It's interesting because that minimum of two maximum of five, is the formula that we managed to use for the -- or similar to the formula we managed to use for the CWG-IANA, and for some reason it went through there, and so I was kind of surprised to see it popping its head back up here, but perhaps the people that care about representation care more about this issue. I don't know. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks for this Avri. What I suggest then, two action items from this; one, I would be -- first action item, I will be writing to Jonathan Robinson, and ask him for a status report on this, and depending on what his response is, I will be following up with members of the -- well, first with Rafik, of course, since he is in the GNSO, but he's not on the Council I understand, but he would obviously be able to speak to his counselors on the Council. Can I follow up with you as well, Avri?

Avri Doria: Sure. I mean, I am one of Rafik's counselors, and all things being equal, if observers are allowed to fully participate, then my issue is gone.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay.

Avri Doria: And either Ammer or I could make a motion, and/or Marila; I mean -- so yeah. But we would hopefully -- I really think that we need to have someone second it from another group if it gets that far.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah, sure.

Avri Doria: I think it unseemly when we have one group make it, and the same group second it, though it happens.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Avri. Michele Neylon?

Michele Neylon: Now, we've got three counselors as well. You know, it's like, if the motion is non-contentious then I've got three counselors I can ask, and just say; look, could you please support this. I mean it's not, it's that thing about the cross -- whatever the hell, type thing, Avri (inaudible) mentioned. I mean that shouldn't be an issue, if it's non-contentious, this should not be an issue at all. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you for this, Michele.

Greg Shatan: This is Greg Shatan, can I get in the queue as well?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, Greg. Well, you have the floor.

Greg Shatan: Okay. Thank you. I've had, you know, some discussions internally with some other members of CSG, and I think, but I can't speak for the CSG, clearly, and I do that the issue on representation, given the observer status in being equal in all, but voting, which hopefully we do, and we rarely can reach a consensus, stick to a consensus wherever we can and should. That probably, you know, is a -- I couldn't say -- I would presume it could be overcome, if it hasn't already been overcome within the CSG. I thought we had kind of gotten there, and then I think the whole Charter thing kind of gets meandered off course bit. And, you know, probably could be set to rest within the CSG very easily just by a little focus, if as I say, it hasn't already been set to rest, and just that we've essentially kind of forgotten about it, as this group, kind of, got a little bit sidetracked.

I would also mention that unfortunately the motion deadline for the most -- for the next upcoming Council Meeting is -- it's already passed. It was the 15<sup>th</sup> of September for the meeting -- on the 25<sup>th</sup> of September. So I think the next meeting of the Council would be the Los Angeles Meeting.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Greg. It's unfortunate but I guess we'll just have to work with that. Next is Rafik Dammak.

Rafik Dammak: Hello? Can you hear me?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. (Inaudible) I think just for some context, when we work within the Charter a few months ago, it says that the idea for representation, we got it I think from the work of the Cross Community Working Group, Drafting Team (ph) between the GNSO and the ccNSO, so mostly we try to use what they worked on. So I think for following up, yes, we will try to contact GNSM (ph), and I guess we can -- I mean we can work to get a motion for L.A. Meeting; and so hopefully we can get the Charter voted there.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. That's great. Thanks very much, Rafik. I think that we are pretty much done on the Charter now. It seems that it was somehow left on the side. There's been just so much going on this summer as we all know. And so, you know, I don't notice the action item being listed there -- oh, now it is. Okay. Excellent. It's just been put on the Adobe.

Okay. So that's with the Charter, and as you know, because we are still unchartered, we can only act at the moment as a -- just in a -- as a group of people effectively, and so we now have the next part of our agenda, and that's the new milestones, of the action to the NETMundial Initiative, and also what are we going to be discussing during the session that we will have in Los Angeles.

Rafik and I felt it was important for us to have a session if only because we really need to have some face-to-face time, to decide on what our next steps are. There has been so much going on with regards to NETMundial. Is anybody here unaware of the developments with regards to NETMundial? Or do we have to go through them? I don't see anyone put their hand up, so I would take it that everybody is up-to-date on the NETMundial Initiative.

There is also an eBook which was written by Bill Drake and others, I think Avri was one of the penholders on that as well; to provide more information about what's happened next, et cetera, and the initiatives of the NETMundial Initiative seems to have now gone towards the World Economic Forum, the WEF, with ICANN somehow stepping back and not having as much of a hands-on organizational role as it used to have, or at least as it appeared to have in the earlier part of the year.

The question then comes to whether we will continue working on the NETMundial Initiative as a working group, or whether there are other issues in Internet Governance that this working group

would like to focus on. And I therefore open the floor for feedback on this, and your own reactions. I was hoping that we would have Marila with us, Marila Maciel with us, but I think she's unable to make this call as well, so anybody else wishes to take the floor and provide us with their point of view on what our reaction should be to the follow up, then you now have the chance to do so.

I gather we are all happy with this. Okay, let me just make this an easy question, should this group continue work on NETMundial and the NETMundial follow up?

Rafik Dammak: Olivier, I think you mean NETMundial Initiative, or also NETMundial follow up.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. NETMundial Initiative. I just called it NETMundial because it's faster, but yes, NETMundial Initiative.

Rafik Dammak: I mean, because--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Michele Neylon? Sorry, Rafik. I see Michele has put his hand up, and then we'll come to you. Michele?

Michele Neylon: Thanks, Olivier. Maybe it's just a question of parking it for the moment, because when this kind of move puts stuff over to the WEF and (inaudible) has kind of moved us away from ICANN, but I mean, not away from everybody who is involved with ICANN. Maybe it's just best to park it for the moment. I don't know. I mean, I don't have any terribly strong feelings about it.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you. Now, there was a question actually -- It's Olivier speaking -- There was a question which Jonathan Robinson had sent me by email saying, "Well, with all of this development with NETMundial Initiative shifting to WEF, does this affect this working group in its actual purpose?"

And Rafik, you were speaking a bit earlier, I can give you the floor.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. It was just the first -- sorry, but the recent follow up of NETMundial in terms of how to implement within the declarations, one, but for the NETMundial Initiative, since ICANN is involved in this alliance, or whatever, I guess the question is how the community, maybe through this working group, see how it should be involved or how to influence the process, so that's why I think it's more raising the question how we should react in such context, because ICANN is a part, and not just a part, but I think pushing for this initiative with WEF. So, what's the role of the community here, in such process? So still -- I think, still unclear; so just more questions than having answer for now. Yeah.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you. We are collecting questions, which is great. But it would be good to finance it at some point. Okay. Any other thoughts on this? I don't see anyone jump up and down to take the floor. It's one of these questions, really; I mean, this group started out specifically as a response to the NETMundial, in the case of this working group needing to produce some document that would feed into the NETMundial, but of course that was not its sole purpose. So there might be other purposes, and one of the things which we need to think of ahead of L.A. is also on the topics, and whether we want to expand on our topics, et cetera.

Greg Shatan, you have the floor.

Greg Shatan: Thank you. Greg Shatan. And actually I do think that we should have, you know, as part of our improvement, keeping an eye on, and participating in the NETMundial Initiative, and perhaps with some skepticism since it seems in some cases to be more of a stepchild, you know, rather than a direct descendant of NETMundial. And it's a little hard to see what exactly is supposed to happen after -- you know, from here on in, I understand there's supposed to be dialogues in certain regions in the rest of 2014, and then at the annual meeting of the West in Davos, a global

Multistakeholder Summit, and skiing, on Internet Governance and cooperation in January of 2015, and consultations of multiple stakeholders are also supposed to occur according to their, kind of, I wouldn't quite call it founding document, but it's the closest I could find in a few minutes.

So certainly I don't think we should turn away from it, and given that our -- you know, while we are not -- we are kind of staying away from the IANA transition, per se, you know, to the extent that the NETMundial Initiative is a relevant forum for Internet Governance, I think it behooves us to monitor it and to, ideally, depending on our Charter and other interests and other portions of ICANN to put ourselves forward, at least (a) if not the voice from the ICANN community, in regard to the NETMundial Initiative. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you for this, Greg. I have a question then. I mean, the NETMundial Initiative now having taken a certain distance -- or distance itself from ICANN, is this still in an ICANN working group's purview to be able to be involved in this? In other words, ICANN's mission is of course well defined in its bylaws. The NETMundial Initiative in its early days being closely linked with ICANN as one of the organizing parties was obviously in the remit (ph) of this working group.

Now that it's further out, would this working group still be able to operate on this; an open question? I note that Avri Doria has put her hand up. Avri?

Avri Doria: Wasn't Greg's hand up before mine.

Greg Shatan: Oh, sorry, that's--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I'm not sure whether Greg had a follow up.

Greg Shatan: That's an old hand.

Avri Doria: Oh, okay.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay.

Avri Doria: Okay, sorry. I think that first of all, while ICANN won't necessarily still be leading it, it's going to remain to some degree involved. And I thought that this group, I'll have to go back and reread the Charter, but I thought that this group was dealing with ICANN's reactions and interactions with external Internet Governance going on. So if the NMI, NETMundial Initiative, or as it's rumored, will be renamed something that doesn't steal the brand, is going on, I don't see why this group wouldn't have it within its chartered scope.

But I suppose, you know, going back to the first item, you'd better check the Charter to make sure that that is indeed -- I see no in-principle reason why. If it's going to affect ICANN and if ICANN might affect it, then it would seem to be in the scope of this kind of group. We are not saying it's policy development process that puts any obligations on the Board to do X, Y or Z, I guess I can't use that A, B or C, but it certainly seems within scope. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you for this, Avri. Next is Greg Shatan.

Greg Shatan: Hi. It's Greg Shatan again. And I just quickly opened the Charter, and it says our objective is to increase the participation of the ICANN Community in discussions and processes pertaining to Internet Governance. It's not limited to those where ICANN is involved as a -- kind of a chartering member itself, or that are ICANN-driven. I think in that regard our remit is clear. I'll also say that I'll just modify some of my earlier remarks; it also says, for the avoidance of that, the working groups do not act as a representative of the participating SOs and ACs collectively or individually.

So we are not so much a representative unless we are specifically asked to do so, by the SOs and ACs. But nonetheless we can represent, you know, a sense of a portion of the ICANN Community

and certainly act as a bridge and monitor of NMI, or whatever it becomes. Certainly turning our back on it, if it's -- whether or not it becomes a major Internet Governance initiative I think will be, to some extent will be failing our remit. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you for this, Greg. It's Olivier speaking. Actually just reading the next line, the scope, the Charter does mention, "The scope of activities of a working group is to do whatever it deems relevant and necessary to facilitate and ensure engagement, and participation of the ICANN Community in the global Internet Governance scene, and multistakeholder decision-making processes. So I guess, yes, we are -- with this Charter we are in line with things.

And I note in the chat, a note from Alain Bidron who mentions that, "The ICANN CEO priorities given by the Board are not to concentrate anymore on NETMundial initiatives. It does not mean that the ICANN Community shouldn't keep an eye on NETMundial initiatives."

So what I would suggest then, and it's not even an action item, I guess it's an ongoing item, is that we will keep the NETMundial thread, the NETMundial Initiative thread going, and keep a close watch over its activities. I mean, should we allocate someone to this? Or are we all just, as a group -- I guess as a group we'll probably be able to have a -- you know, be able to monitor what's going on, and I'm sure that some of us might even be directly involved with the follow ups.

So that's the NETMundial thread. Now, of course, the life and the Internet is not all about NETMundial, there were so many other things that took place at the IGF, Internet Governance Forum in Istanbul.

I open the floor for suggestions on other topics now that this group should be looking at, or at least should be monitoring, so as for us to be ready if there is any consultation or request for input from the global Internet community, and is sometimes asked; that this group would be in a position to know that this is coming up, and to then make decisions on whether there might be some interests in our community to contribute. I open the floor, the floor is still open, actually I've never closed it, but you are all welcome to comment. Greg, you've put your hand up?

Greg Shatan: It was more that, I'll just ask the question with regard to the last item, whether there's anybody who might--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes.

Greg Shatan: --and maybe given the small number of people on the actual call this is something that should be put out to the list as an action item; is whether anybody is already involved in the NETMundial Initiative, or whatever it will become. And would it be likely or possible attending the World Economic Forum Meeting in Davos so that they could, you know, perhaps be tasked by us to be -- to report back. Since for those of us who were not necessarily, you know, buying our plane ticket for Davos, could -- or not as likely to be well informed on what's going on there, as intimately as somebody who is participating because of other commitments that they have to do so. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Very good point, Greg. Thank you. It's Olivier speaking. Let's have this as an action item then; for Olivier to send an email to the list, the mailing list, asking if any working group participants are involved in the NETMundial Initiative. I think that would be a good--

Do you have this Renate? I'm not really sure who is taking the notes.

Renate De Wulf: Yes. I have it.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Renate, you're taking the notes?

Renate De Wulf: Yes. And I'll be putting it in the (inaudible) in two minutes.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Super. Thanks very much, Renate. So, Olivier speaking now. Back to the question of other topics that this working group should at least be monitoring, or individuals on this group should be able to monitor.

I note a question from Leon Sanchez in the chat, "Should we be looking, as a group, to the proposed bylaw changes that gives the GAC a bigger weight?" Open question, any thoughts on this? Michele Neylon?

Michele Neylon: Hi, Olivier. Michele for the records. If it's within our power to look at, I think we definitely should, because it's something that's -- I get the general impression that most sections of the ICANN Community are quite opposed to it, to whether or not ICANN will pay attention and take that message on board, and it isn't 100% clear.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. How should this group then look at this? I mean, should it come up with its own text; or should it should try and see if the -- sort of a coordinated text between the different SOs and ACs? Because this, again, is a very time-sensitive thing, the proposed dialogue changes of the public comment and in a few days' time, if I can remember correctly. So it's one of these things.

Michele?

Michele Neylon: Olivier, just very briefly. I believe this topic is up for discussion in L.A., regardless of any timelines around the public comment, but as for these (inaudible), I mean, if you are asking me a simple, open question, should we, as a group, be concerned about something? My answer would probably be yes. If you asked me a specific question, as to what exactly we should be doing, my answer is; oh, hell, why are you asking me questions? Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you for this, Michele. Yes. The reply closes on the 9<sup>th</sup> -- sorry, not the 9<sup>th</sup> -- the 30<sup>th</sup> of October, so that will close right after the L.A. Meeting, and so this is likely to be one of the topics for discussion. Let's put down a list of topics then that people are suggesting. And so, Renate, I guess you are taking the notes, so that's one of the topics for L.A., we could be discussing the proposed bylaw changes that give the GAC a bigger weight, that's one. Of course the NETMundial Initiative will be another one.

Any other potential topics? And I hope you realize I'm being very open here, and accepting, and I'm not one to choose the topics, I'm just saying, well, these are interesting threads, let's see if we can explore them when we have a little -- a few more people on the table -- along the table.

Michele, your hand is still up?

Michele Neylon: Ignore it.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks. So what else? IGF questions which were around. There was question of ICANN and human rights. I don't know whether that -- I think the Council of Europe was -- has presented something, a document that looks at ICANN and at the operation of ICANN based on their human rights and freedom of speech, et cetera. Is this something, I guess, that could be taken up by this group, or not? There was also a discussion on the IGF funding. There were many different discussions in Istanbul.

Michele?

Michele Neylon: I'm not -- Look, I'm picking up on the keyword "funding" I'm ignoring what you've put in front of us. ICANN, its budget, how it uses the sources of its revenue, and all that; it's something that really does need to be discussed more. Earlier this week, there were the first set of auctions which brought in, what was it, \$15 million in extra revenue to ICANN? And yet they still haven't decided what the hell they are going to do with that money. It's all a big question mark.



ICANN's entire thing around the New gTLD Program, was apparently, "cost recovery" but some people were saying to me over the last couple of weeks that a lot of those numbers were based on a much lower number of TLD applicants. And if you look at the ICANN budget at some of the predictions in terms of volumes and everything else, are probably -- being diplomatic -- a little off.

On the most recent call that you were on yesterday with me, and maybe one or two other people on this call, with Fadi, he was talking about, I suppose to paraphrase him, since he used a lot of buzz words, I think he was talking about the greater level of transparency with respect to certain aspects of your expenditure, and everything else, and involving the "community" in -- earlier in ICANN's process to decide how it's going to spend money. But there's a lot of stuff around this, I think, that does need to be discussed.

I mean, ICANN spent a lot of money on IGF this year, has probably spent a lot of money in the past. I'm not saying that's particularly bad, good, or otherwise, you know, but the other money is being spent, the entire transition thing has run into millions. I mean, I don't know, if it's under budget, over budget. You know, it's not a bottomless pit and, you know, the money has to come from somewhere. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks very much, Michele. Olivier speaking. So we can add this to our shopping list, and so that's ICANN funding, I guess, just to give it an overall umbrella theme. ICANN funding of initiatives, how's that?

Michele Neylon: Expenditure funding. I mean, the thing is this, I mean, we know that there's a big question mark over where a lot of this money from the New TLD Program ends up, as in all the excess.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. The question being -- It's Olivier speaking -- The question being, is this already going to be treated in Los Angeles? I understand there might be one of the topics for the public session, the high-interest sessions on the Monday might be related to this. But if we have it in our shopping list, and of course we share this list with everyone on the mailing list before L.A. then that will give us the ability to work on a subset of these issues.

Michele?

Michele Neylon: Olivier, I'm just being -- trying to keep this brief -- let me be kind of semi blunt, and actually being quite blunt. Do you honestly expect this issue to be resolved in a single session in L.A.?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: It's Olivier speaking. I'll be quite frank, and speaking on my own sake, but we'll probably have a lot of questions, I don't think that will have any answers.

Michele Neylon: But that's what I mean. I think, you know, the thing with some of -- some things sure are time-sensitive in respect that, let's say, for the comment period open on a particular issue, if this group were to take on a responsibility within its remit to weigh in on something, hypothetically, then you have a -- there might be time constraints on doing so. But when you are looking at something, like say, the funds from these auctions and how that -- how those funds are used, or the bigger picture with respect to ICANN's expenditure on various things, which may or may not be considered to be part of its core mission. That's something which isn't going to be resolved in one, two, or even three meetings. I mean, various people have asked, quite point questions of ICANN senior staff with respect to certain expenditure items, and maybe, two, three meeting go by before actually an answer is actually provided. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Michele. So we've got the second topic here. So that's ICANN expenditure. Is that correct? Any other potential topics for Los Angeles? I don't see anyone put their -- no one is putting their hand up? Okay. Now that's just two topics. What I'll be doing is to send an email to the list and ask for some topics for L.A. Meeting. I must say I'm a little concerned that we haven't got any new ideas as to how to spend this time which we have face-to-face in a positive way, and

actually move forward on things and expand, or expand our operations. By expanding, sorry, I'm saying rolling our operations, starting to actually doing things.

Greg, I briefly saw you put your hand up.

Greg Shatan: Yes. I guess I was just thinking it would be helpful, although it may be elementary to some to some, if not to many, or even all of us to -- you know, as part of its take here, a review of the various Internet Governance hotspots, that are occurring, and whether we -- and to what extent this group should be involved in those. There are things other than the NETMundial Initiative going on, and I think it would at least be helpful to, kind of, run through what they are and what, if anything, our group should be doing about them. So that we are -- you know, do not continue to be overtaken by that. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you for this, Greg. I notice a plus-one from Michele on the chat. Yeah. I mean, this year, obviously, has also got the ITU Plenipot. Is this in the remit of this group? I guess that as long as the ITU Plenipot starts having things on the Internet, and about the running of the domain name space, and other things, then of course that would sit within our remit, I guess. I know there has not been very much done within ICANN on this forthcoming Plenipotentiary Conference in Busan.

But, that said, there are -- the feedback that I have from other sources, is there are some very, let's say, sarcastically interesting proposals on the table from the world's usual suspects, so it could be worth something of this working group to also look at that, and obviously you mentioned many other fora as well. So a review of the various Internet Governance hotspots is what I'll put on the agenda as a potential thing that covers everything.

Any other suggestions? Okay. I think we've got a little bit to start with. I'm hoping that we can develop this over the next few weeks on the email list, and that those people who are missing from this call will be able to participate and add their points, so that that -- we actually have a good, helpful, and certainly fruitful meeting in Los Angeles.

I have a concern that I'll share with all of you, and that's that today, whether ICANN wants to be part of the international Internet Governance debate or not, it hasn't got any choice. It is part of the international Internet Governance debate, whether it has to do with its own accountability, or its contracts with the U.S. Government, or the IANA transition, or the running of the domain name space, and many, many different -- in many different ways. And we've seen that at the IGF a great number of sessions were somehow related to ICANN one way or another.

Whether this was by design, or this was just because they magnified it so, or just coincidental, that's another story, and I'm not going to venture into this. But it's obviously clear that ICANN is involved with all of this global Internet Governance because it has to be involved. The concern that I've had so far though is that the communities that make up ICANN and that should be the ones really responsible and responsive to these processes, has been pretty quiet, and so staff has had to lead the way on this, and much to the disapproval of our communities, because of the fact that many believe that this totally breaks the bottom-up model, but somehow I have a feeling that staff has more filled the vacuum than -- and has to fill that vacuum because otherwise the alternative was that ICANN would not even be involved in any of the stuff that is likely to affect ICANN.

So I'm hoping that we are really going to start seeing the importance, we as a community, see the importance of these issues, and actually spend more time, you know, more time on this than what we've done so far. I know that Bill isn't quite happy with this interpretation. That's just my own feeling on the thing. You are, of course, very welcome, to all share your points on this call.

Michele Neylon?

Michele Neylon:

Thanks, Olivier. Michele for the records. I understand what you are saying, and I appreciate what you're saying, Olivier. However, this is -- I mean, the general issue that has been voiced by several of us, well actually quite a few of us, to ICANN staff, in particular the senior management, is that ICANN needs to both slow down and also do a better job of communicating stuff effectively to the community. So I wouldn't -- I wouldn't -- well I understand what you are saying, ICANN is not -- it should not be trying to operate in the same kind of agile fashion that a small business might be able to operate in.

I mean, it's a -- there's a degree of accountability that it should have to the broader community, to stakeholders, to contracted parties, to the GNSO, to the Board, to everybody. I mean, it's not simply a question of ICANN execs come and go; oh, hey, this sounds like a good idea, let's go off and drop a few million euro on project X over here. So I don't know in what way Bill and other would characterize that, but I don't think that many people would be fully supportive of what you were saying. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:

Okay. Thank you for this, Michele. I might have misstated what I wanted to mean. But the concern that I've had is that so far any issues relating to Internet Governance have been a case of staff having to go to, or having to move forward or doing things without consulting the community, just maybe consulting the Board, and then afterwards explaining itself to the ICANN communities, and the concern being there, that it then, there was a disconnect between the community and the staff and the Board.

I'm just thinking that this working group here should be a bridge between the communities and the ICANN staff and the Board, on these issues, as a first-stop shop if you want. If there is an issue that needs to be dealt with quickly, then the Board, or ICANN staff could ask this committee to discuss those points to start with, before convening any big face-to-face meeting, or huge conference calls that the usual suspects attend.

A note from Bill in the chat, "There are numerous in the community with extensive experience in IG processes outside ICANN but there's been little effort to engage them in a community, staff process, the MTSG meetings with the Board over the years, I've pressed this point many times. Try to find out what the Board was doing, and I got little --" I gather "feedback" is the word after this.

Yeah, I mean, I don't think that we disagree on that, I'm pretty much in line with this. Okay, the time is ticking and I'm afraid we haven't really gotten very far today, partially because we have so few participants, but at the same time we do have a way forward for a Los Angeles, we'll have the NETMundial Initiative, ICANN expenditure, and a review of the various Internet Governance hotspots. I'll be asking the mailing list if we have all the topics to discuss face-to-face, and hopefully by L.A., we will have more of an idea of how many SOs and ACs have now chartered this working group.

I do feel a bit uneasy about, still, not being chartered, and therefore working in some kind of an ad hoc fashion. Perhaps if I could ask Renate, as an action item, that we go on a roundup of all the SOs and ACs and find out who has chartered, who hasn't chartered yet. Then at least we'll have a clear view of that.

And finally -- I noticed that some people have problems with Adobe, but that's a different story. Finally, I open the floor for any other business? There was a report from IGF, Istanbul, but there wasn't really very much to report on the issue of Internet Governance. I think the majority of us were in Istanbul, and we well know that there was the NETMundial Initiative on the one hand. the IGF funding, Funding Firm, or whatever it's called that -- Funding Fund, has been started on the other side, and the discussion on the future of the IGF which is an ongoing discussion and I expect that next year we'll be continuing that discussion on the future of the IGF.

Hearing no one speak, or put their -- seeing no one put their hand up. Any other business? No? Okay. So I thank you all for coming on this call, and the next call, I'm not sure, I don't think that we need a call until Los Angeles. If any of you think that we do need one please say so now. No? Okay. So no call until L.A., and we will be meeting -- so we will be meeting face-to-face over there. I don't have the exact date for it, I need the -- Renate, do you have the date of our meeting in L.A.?

Renate De Wulf: I requested the meeting for the Wednesday. I hope to have a confirmation for you soon, but I think it will be on the Wednesday.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: On the Wednesday. You've got a time for this, or you'll ask for a meeting any time on Wednesday?

Renate De Wulf: No. I have one at 8:30 in the morning, because then I thought that would be the less-clash possible with other meetings.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, for this.

Rafik Dammak: Sorry, Olivier--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: We are always clashing on that. Yes, go ahead. It's Rafik, yeah.

Rafik Dammak: Yeah, that will clash with a meeting I have to Chair at that time, so.

Renate De Wulf: Ah!

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Well, that's not a good start. Wednesday, 8:30 in the morning, let me just check quickly on my agenda. 8:30 -- Yes. Oh, dear. That will be working for me. That works for me. I'll just miss something that I can miss, so that's okay.

Renate De Wulf: Otherwise if you can suggest another time, I can try and move it. No guarantees.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. Thank you, Renate. The L.A. schedule looks to be very, very full for everyone. Perhaps could you just -- if you can just send a quick Doodle on the different spots -- what I do know is that today is the deadline for the agendas to be sent. So I think that the room allocations and all of this, is already closed, so if we've got that time, then they are not going to be able to change this to anything else.

Renate De Wulf: Well, with difficulty.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. You are being very kind. All right, fine. Let's just keep it at that, and if you can just remind everyone, once you've got confirmation of that time, and we'll see if we can juggle things around a little bit. Rafik, you can't make it for the whole length of the call -- of the meeting?

Rafik Dammak: Yeah. I have an Executive Committee Meeting, and I have to Chair it, so I mean.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: But the whole length, from 8:30 to 9:30, to is it 8:30 to 11:00 -- to 10:00?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, 8:30--

Renate De Wulf: It's 8:30 to 9:45.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. 8:30 to 9:45. Thank you, Renate.

Rafik Dammak: And I have the meeting from 8:30 to 10:00, so.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Oh, dear. Well, okay. We'll follow up after this call. I realize we are four minutes beyond the end of this call. So I thank everyone for having made an appearance here, and contributing to this, we'll follow up by email and we'll see you, I hope all of you, in Los Angeles. Of course as you know there will be remote participation possible as well. So there's no trouble if you are not able to make it to the face-to-face meeting in L.A.

Thanks very much, and goodbye. This call is now adjourned.