

20141218_ccwg_IG_ID936788

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. I think we can get going then. It's Olivier speaking. So if we can start the recording and everything. Can you hear me?

Renate De Wulf: Yes, Olivier. We can hear you and the recording has started.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Oh, perfect. Okay. If you can start the call, please?

Renate De Wulf: Okay. Would you like me to do the roll call?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Let's start with this. So, good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone, this is the meeting of the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance. Today is the 18th of December, 2014, and we'll start with the roll call. Please, Renate?

Renate De Wulf: Okay. We have Bill Drake, David Maher, Evan Leibovitch, Greg Shatan, Joerg Schweiger, Keith Drazek, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Pablo Hinojosa, Rafik Dammak; and from Staff we have Nora Abusitta, Nigel Hickson, Alexandra Dans, Ergys Ramaj; and myself ,Renate De Wulf.

Did I miss anybody on the call who is not in the AC room? All right. You can go ahead, Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much, Renate. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And the first thing I need to let you know about is that we have new Co-Chairs. So one, as you know, is Rafik Dammak. The other Co-Chair at the moment, the newly-appointed one, is Jordan Carter from the ccNSO. Unfortunately Jordan was not able to join us today. Rafik is on the line, but he's not able to speak, so I guess you already know Rafik, and then Jordan is also well-known to the community. I don't think there needs to be any further introductions than this.

With regards to our agenda today, it's quite long, and we'll try and go through it quite efficiently. We first have an update from Nora Abusitta, about the NETMundial Initiative. We'll have, then Nigel Hickson who will be speaking to us about the CSCD response from ICANN. And then afterwards a number of procedural items, like the discussion of the themes about work -- about working groups, update on the events calendar, and then planning for the CCWG and Internet Governance Meeting at ICANN 52 in Singapore.

Is there any other business that anybody would like to add to this agenda? I don't see any hands up, or anyone shout their name out, so the agenda is approved. And let's go to the first of our items, and that's the -- an explanation and an update about the NETMundial Initiative from Nora Abusitta. Nora, we are listening to you. You have the floor.

Nora Abusitta: Thank you. Thank you, Olivier. Thanks very much. First of all I have to apologize for the background noise, I am at an airport, and I will be boarding my flight very soon. Thank you, for inviting me to update you all on the NETMundial Initiative. In case I don't have enough time to

tackle your concerns or answer any questions, I will make sure to go back to the recordings or speak to my colleagues and answer any of these questions via email.

So as many of you are aware the initiative was launched on November 6, and the purpose of it was to -- is to create an Open Source platform to make it easier for multiple stakeholders, experts, resource providers to collaborate on analytical capacity building resource mobilization and other projects that can advance the practice of distributed Internet Governance. This is very much in line with NETMundial's principles at Sao Paulo. During this period, so since November 6th, we've seen a strong community interest and participation, and activities, and in the organization of the NETMundial Initiative.

There was an open call for nominations for the 25-member council -- Coordination Council, and those were answered actually quite well from all sectors and all geographies. The call for nomination was actually -- the deadline for this call of nomination was extended per community feedback, and we closed those nominations a few days ago. Currently we have 43 confirmed nominations, by confirmed I mean we've checked on who these people are, and we make sure that they are indeed who they claim to be. We have a very impressive roster of names, and the final announcements of the Coordination Council names will be made by -- before the end of this year.

So, a lot of great progress achieved for several reasons; one, because the process since the very beginning has been extremely assertive and adaptive. We have been communicating with community members on their thoughts and their concerns regarding the initiative, and we have been adapting it to make sure that these concerns are tackled. And so as I mentioned earlier, one of the things that was done was that the deadline for submissions was extended. There has been suggestion earlier that some of the seats would be permanent on the Coordination Council that has been reversed due to community feedback, and so on.

Currently we have a living blog on the NETMundial Initiative website that we update weekly, almost, to make sure that any answers -- and questions that come up from the community are answered as quickly as possible. Again, I have to underline the fact that this is a very iterative process, community feedback and community participation is what's going to shape it. And there have been some concerns that are expressed by several groups. Those were taken into consideration, changes were made to reflect them, and so where we are right now is that as soon as the Coordination Council Members are announced, there will be an announcement on next steps, and the work of the NETMundial Initiative.

I think I'm going to stop here and take your questions. This way, you know, I have about 10 minutes to answer any questions.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much for this, Nora. It's Olivier Crepin Leblond speaking. So, the queue is now open for questions regarding the NETMundial Initiative. And we have a hand up from Evan Leibovitch. Evan, you have the floor.

Evan Leibovitch: Hi there. Sorry, just as a matter of disclosure, I've been involved with the Internet Society, and I've been following the response to NMI, and I haven't been very pleased with the NETMundial Initiative response to it. But my first question, for it was like the second word out of our mouth. What do you mean by Open Source, and why are you using that to describe NETMundial Initiative that way? I've worked in Open Source for 15 years, and there's nothing about NETMundial Initiative that comes close to what my awareness of the term "open source" means. So could you please elaborate on that, because right off the start, that comes across as a gratuitous marketing term. And when you talk to people that know what open source means, and that they see what NETMundial Initiative is, and they know what Open Source is, it immediately starts the conversation with -- believing that this is being used as a marketing term. So could you please elaborate by exactly what you mean by Open Source? Thank you.

- Nora Abusitta: Thank you, for this question, and I apologize if the terminology is inaccurate or, perhaps, confusing. By Open Source we really mean that this is going to be crowd sourced or a lot of -- all the -- everything that goes into the platform will be contributed by community. Whether it's projects that need to go on there; whether it's funding for projects, and so this is really the intention behind the term. If the term is seen as problematic, we are definitely -- we can definitely take that back to the Transitional Committee and review it like we have been reviewing a lot of the terminologies. But essentially the platform is a place where people submit ideas, they submit intentions for funding certain ideas, and that's it in a nutshell.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Nora. Any follow up, Evan?
- Evan Leibovitch: Okay. I will just leave it as a matter of advisement. Please take back to whoever coined the term Open Source for this, it has absolutely no relationship to what you just described. Open Source has to do with how things are created, how things are distributed. They have to do with copyright, they have to do with intellectual property, and so the way you are using it, is an absolute misuse. So when you talk about this to anyone who actually understands the term, you are starting on the wrong foot, as you are coming across as using it as a marketing term, as opposed to actually something with substance. I mean, I have other comments, but that -- it was the second word out of your mouth as you described this, and so it seems to be a very prime way to describe it, and I really think that needs to be rethought. Thanks.
- Nora Abusitta: This is noted and I -- and as I have mentioned before, many of the terms used, or a lot of the things that -- you know, we listen to the community, we listen to comments like the one you just made and we make changes, and we adapt as we go along. So, this is very appreciated. So thank you.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Nora. Sorry, I managed to un-mute. Any other questions? We have a hand up from Greg Shatan. Greg, you have the floor.
- Greg Shatan: Olivier, thank you very much. The question is that, as noted, or kind of implied in Evan's question that ISOC and a number of organizations have reacted quite negatively. I haven't seen NETMundial's or ICANN's response to that, but I'm wondering how, you know, what the kind of current state of play and reaction to the -- to the reaction is? And also that the pairing of this with World Economic Forum, which is -- it's actually a crowd that you are crowd sourcing with, that's a -- that's a pretty high-end crowd.
- I'm not sure how that matches up with kind of the -- you know, any attempts to overcome the digital divide. So, just wondering kind of where the current state of play as your -- your roundup sounded pretty positive, but if you read third party descriptions of what's going on, not so positive. You know, including the fact that the time of the extension for the panel was, because there were only 16 nominations for 25 seats, and even now, you know, it's hardly a big horse race for those seats, and a lot of people, I think, have been kind of staying away, for fear of being seen as, indoor thing, that's a NETMundial Initiative. I'm just wondering if you care to comment on that.
- Nora Abusitta: Yes. Thank you. The extension of the deadline for nominations was really not because we only had 16 submissions. The 16 submissions were actually around the week ahead of us as the previous deadline. And with those 16 submissions we had some of them that were pending. And so the extension of the deadline was really as a result of requests and community feedback. The World Economic Forum is one partner of the three partners that are enabling this platform, they do bring a different community to this, than the community that has been historically active, and that is very much noted. But they don't in any way exclude the current community. The current roster, in my view, is quite a substantial roster.
- If there are seats that are currently held for technical organizations as well as (inaudible) should be -- choose to fill them. We have had extensive conversations with ISOC and others, since ISOC's placement, and so again, I go back to saying what I said earlier. We will be in constant contact with everybody. We will adapt to make sure that the concerns are met, and this is where we are.

Sorry, I'm going to mute because there is a lot of noise, but I'll listen for the next question.

Greg Shatan: Thank you,.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you for this, Nora. Any follow up, Greg?

Greg Shatan: No. That's very helpful. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you. Nora, I have a question as well. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. With regards to the relationship between NETMundial Initiative and ICANN, is ICANN still the driver of this initiative? And furthermore, when one speaks about ICANN, obviously there's ICANN the Board, ICANN the organization, ICANN the community. How does the NETMundial Initiative relates to the ICANN community? How do you see that happening?

Nora Abusitta: Thank you, Olivier. So ICANN's role in this has been just a partner, and one of the enablers. Now we were seeing at some point as being more active than the other members, because we were talking to our community, but the other members or the other enablers were also talking to their own communities. What is ICANN contributing currently to this? They are contributing part of the Secretariat, and so 20% of my time, and 50% of another ICANN employee's time, as well as some initial funds to get the Secretariat started. I can assure you that the other two players, so the West and CGI, they have been equally active in their own circles in promoting the NETMundial Initiative. The Board of ICANN is adequately updated, they are onboard with this, and so this is just another place where ICANN is collaborating but definitely not the principal driver.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. It's Olivier, again. How do you see them, this relating to the ICANN community? How is the ICANN community involved, or how would it be involved in this?

Nora Abusitta: Well, at first -- I mean, from a personal level, as part of the activities that I am involved in, I will be updating the community regularly during ICANN meetings; this, however, will not be the central focal point of, you know, ICANN's work. There are many more important things that ICANN is embarking on right now that -- you know, that this partnership or this project that we are doing with West and CGI.BR. But from my personal capacity, I will be updating the community during ICANN meetings and making sure that, you know, they are fully informed in case some community members would like to participate, and as we've seen, many of the community members have chosen to participate in the process.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you. It's Olivier speaking. I mean, the gist of my question was whether there was any process within ICANN for the ICANN community to participate, or whether they would participate as individual in NMI, and if it appears that what you are saying is people participate as individuals in NMI.

Nora Abusitta: Absolutely.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you. Any other questions or comments following on this? I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so thank you very much for joining us, Nora, and if you do have further questions, I hope that you'll be able to brief us on future calls of this Committee, and of course we are going to be discussing the way forward as far as this Cross Community Working Group is concerned. And we'll get back -- we'll get back to you with some feedback. So, thank you.

Nora Abusitta: Olivier, thank you so much. I hope next time I update you I'll have better circumstances around me to be able to speak more freely. Like I said, I boarded the plane as I was talking to you all, but I'll be more than happy to answer any questions, either via email or if you'd like me to get on one of your calls again.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Nora. And now we have the next part of our agenda, the CSCD response from ICANN with Nigel Hickson, who has joined us, to provide us with some feedback on the proposed response from ICANN with regards to this. Nigel Hickson, you have the floor.

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Nigel Hickson. Good afternoon. Thank you very much, and Nigel Hickson talking from the Geneva Office, and good afternoon, good morning, et cetera, to everyone, and thanks for asking us along. I think it's worth putting this in context, this particular document, because otherwise it might be seen as a -- this mapping document might be seen as rather odd. You know, why has it suddenly emerged? What's this all about?

So I think it's worth noting that the Commission on Science and Technology for Development, this is for CSCD, it's a U.N. Commission that reports through UNCTAD which is part of the United Nations. And the CSCD, which ICANN is an observer on, for a number of -- for the last couple of years, has embarked upon an exercise, one of its working groups has looked the whole concept of enhanced cooperation. Enhanced cooperation is this term of art coming out of the GNS agenda, which effectively means, for many people, how governments can interact in the public policy process. And during this exercise on enhanced cooperation, a number of individuals, mainly in civil society, got together and thought it would be a good idea to do a map of where issues are being tackled. And not just technical issues, so improved technical issues, such as naming and numbering et cetera, but also the -- if you like, the Internet Governance issues, the issues on the Internet, such as child protection, privacy, surveillance, cyber security, et cetera, et cetera.

And the idea of this map would show where these issues are being tackled and if these are issues of being tackled by governments, or are they being tackled by business, or whatever. And that was the origin of the mapping exercise. When this particular working group on the enhanced cooperation was dissolved or partly dissolved last year, so then earlier this year, in June, CSCD contracted out this mapping exercise to Diplo (ph), which is the -- one of the networks on Internet Governance that is based in Geneva. And Diplo took it forward and produced this current document that you can see in the link.

And essentially this document was presented to a meeting of CSCD, an intercessional meeting of the CSCD in November, and there were lots of comments on this document. I mean, a lot of people said, ah, well, you know, this map will play in this area, but it's updating in this area, so there was a lot of backwards and forwards by the technical community, and by business and by governments. Some governments didn't like it because it showed that actually in some areas governments were involved in issues, and some governments don't like that perception. Other governments didn't like it because they didn't feel that some of the detail was correct.

So it was decided that there should be a window of opportunity to update this map, and then this map will be presented again to the CSCD session in next May, so that's what's going on at the moment, the opportunity to update this document, and we are sort of consulting on -- amongst staff and various other people on updates to this document. I mean, the idea is simply to get it factually correct so, you know, if there is an activity going on that the mapping exercise doesn't fully capture, then we ought to make sure it's factually correct. So in our area of names and numbers we are trying to update it, some of it hasn't got the latest figures in it, for instance on IDNs or on gTLD (inaudible), and so we are updating it in effect.

So I think it's important, you know, to say it in that context, but happy to answer questions about it, and also, perhaps Olivier, after I've answered questions, because it's relevant to your next item, you ought to say something about the other exercise that CSCD is doing in terms of the more important WSIS+10 Report. But I'll stop there. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much for this, Nigel. And so, well, we have the floor open now for questions on this topic. Whilst people gather their thoughts; I've looked at the mapping exercise, I think it's helpful. Certainly a helpful document, and it certainly shows that there are less orphan issues that one would say, I think, was reported at some point, with the Internet being filled with orphan

issues. The question is; where does one go from here? I mean, this is a helpful tool, what's the plan as to what to do next with this?

Nigel Hickson:

Well, that's a very good point, Olivier, I mean -- and it depends on who you talk to, to an extent. I mean, it was an interesting discussion that we had at CSCD, because a number of us said, you know, a map is a living document, I'm not sure actually how correct that is, because you've got (inaudible) maps that aren't living, but the usefulness of a map in terms of a road map, or in terms of a street map, or any kind of map is that it's a living document, and that it reflects reality and current realities evolving in the past. So you are right, it did show that there aren't orphan issues, per se. In other words, most issues that we can think of on the Internet are being looked up by someone, and I don't think that's too surprising.

Now there are a lot of issues that are only being looked at by one region, or one part of multistakeholder community, or whatever but, you know, most issues have been addressed by someone in the past or in the current. In terms of what usefulness the map will serve is that it could be, for instance, submitted as-- to the WSIS Review, which we are coming on to, the WSIS+10 Review, as an indication of all the activities taking place on the Internet Governance issues. So for instance, this WSIS Review is all about, well what has happened since 2005? Has anything happened? You know, are we discussing things now that we didn't discuss in 2005? Are we making progress in terms of develop new policy, or guidelines on issues that we hadn't done in 2005.

And I think what this mapping does show; it shows some evidence in terms of the progress that's being made. So it does have that purpose but, you know, whether governments agree that it should be submitted as part of the evidence to the U.N. General Assembly is obviously up to governments. I mean, it seems to be my own personal opinion, a good idea, but others more knowledgeable would be deciding on this.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:

Yes. Thank you for this, Nigel. Any other questions on this topic? Now, in the agenda it mentions the staff response, and are you able to share that staff response with us? You know, what stage are you at basically? What do you need from the community on this?

Nigel Hickson:

Well I'm not -- I'd be delighted to share anything with you. In fact we are still as I'm -- I've only had responses from a number of staff so far. I mean we are not -- I'm not -- well, you know, we are already looking at the bits that affect ICANN. I mean I'm not -- we are not responding on issues, or like, you know, the broader issues on cyber security, and privacy, or child protection, or trade issues, or economic issues, we are responding on the bits that affect us. And I'll be delighted to, once I've got an input, and I'm proposing to work on this next week because I've asked for comments by this weekend.

So I will circulate to you, once I've got something coherent, I'll circulate to the group exactly what I've got, and then if the group -- you know, if any of you think, well, golly, you've forgotten a fact here or, you know, we ought to reflect that we've done this, or someone has done this, well I'll be delighted to. I mean this is an exercise that I think many people can contribute to. And I see Marilyn is on the list, and of course Marilyn made a major contribution to this already in many respects, and so I'm sure, I'm sure she will have views. But it's not just ICANN that's looking at this, the CSCD Secretariat had sent it out to the outside -- the secretariat has sent it out to the RELs (ph); they sent it out to, I think -- all sorts of places so, you know, we are just one of them, if you like. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:

Thanks very much for this Nigel. And Marilyn, have you managed to make it on the call yet? No. I haven't found the dial-in information. In the meantime, I open the floor for any contribution from Working Group members; thoughts and points of view on this. So if there's anything that can help Nigel in formulating any directions, perhaps, that might be important for our community. I've noticed a question from Bill Drake in the Chat. "ICANN staff are responding to ICANN, but can the community respond in parallel?" Nigel, you might be muted.

- Nigel Hickson: Well, no. I'm sure they can, I mean I think -- you know, CSCD have -- I mean, if you like, they haven't gone out to public consultation on this, but they've gone out to consultation with all the people that were present at the meeting, and others, indeed not. I mean, I personally wouldn't see any harm in anyone contributing on any part of this. I mean, it's the -- you know, the people that are going to produce the final document, I think are looking for factual information. I mean that's what it's -- that's what it's essentially about. So I mean -- we don't -- we don't have the monopoly on any knowledge of this area at all.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you. Did Marilyn Cade manage to make it on the call yet? Are there any other questions or comments from anyone else in the group, in the meantime?
- Marilyn Cade: Hi.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Marilyn, I think that your phone is on. Yes. Welcome, and you have the floor. Marilyn Cade.
- Marilyn Cade: Thanks. I'm hoping that I will (inaudible) -- this sounds like there's going to be an echo, let me see if (inaudible). Okay. That's better, I think, right?
- Unidentified Participant: It's all right now.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. It sounds like it, hopefully.
- Marilyn Cade: Okay. Thanks. So, very quickly, just to go back. I was a member of the Cross Community -- I'm sorry, too many terms here, of the CSCD Working Group on Enhanced Corporation, and I think Nigel may have mentioned that already. ICANN was a member of the -- on the technical community there were five civil societies, five business, five technical community. The technical - - the five technical -- sorry -- the five business representatives are working on a short letter that we will have finalized probably coming up very soon. I did do quite a bit of work within that group, as Nigel mentioned. I was also very active on making comments. I would just say, that about the mapping exercise, just had two parts, and I think it's really important to keep the mapping part of the exercise, the database, perhaps I'll call it, protect that and continue to enhance it.
- But the part of the report that I think is causing concern to the business participants, and to some governmental folk, and to perhaps others, is the subjective nature of the cover report, and that is what most of the comments were -- are offered about. In addition, the way that the consultants wrote some of the descriptions, they were so concise that they actually did not fully convey factual information, and The Secretariat was asked to go back out to such parties and ask them to fill in, in certain areas. And so I would say, for instance, you know, even the description of the ITU on one of the pages, is incomplete. A description about what ICANN does is incomplete; UNESCO, many, many others, but that is work that's being researched, and it's being fixed. (Audio echo/audio skip)--
- Sorry guys, I don't know how to get rid of that.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. (Inaudible) need for these comments on (inaudible/choppy /audio/gap) -- Well I don't think that a new (inaudible) extra, so I think that's (inaudible) --
- Keith Drazek: Excuse me. This is Keith Drazek, we are getting some real bad audio right now, it's like very choppy, not just an echo, but there's something wrong.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: If that's true, Keith. Since the (Inaudible/audio skips) --
- Renate De Wulf: Olivier, you broke up completely.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. (Inaudible/audio skips)

Renate De Wulf: Yes. Please dial back in, Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Yes.

Unidentified Participant: And in the meantime--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I'm not sure whether you can hear me there.

Keith Drazek: That's better

Renate De Wulf: That's much better, Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: It's much better, but unfortunately it's a temporary thing. I don't have a microphone with us, I'm using hands-free with my laptop at the moment on the Adigo, so. But anyway let's move on in the meantime, and then please dial back to me, and then I'll switch again. Hopefully the line will be better on the mobile phone.

So, thanks for this, Nigel, and the action item that I mentioned just earlier, it's for Nigel Hickson to come back to this working group with the proposed response, before it is sent of course, and if you could give this working group a few days for us to come back to you on this, Nigel, that would be much appreciated.

Nigel Hickson: Well, yes. Absolutely, Olivier. It will be a real pleasure, as I've said. So then -- unfortunately it will be a few days, probably, and it will probably be, you know, just between Christmas and New Year and, you know, and I apologize for this but, you know, I could only sort of do what I can do in terms of the information I receive. But I'll start drafting something, you know, as soon as I get information, and I'll let you have whatever I've got. Thank you very much for the opportunity.

Renate De Wulf: I think Adigo is trying to dial Olivier back in the call.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So I was back in the call, and for some reason the operator dropped it. Okay, fine. So I'll wait for the next call again. Thanks for this, Nigel. Let's move on then, and let's go to the next part, which is the discussion of the themes of work for the CCWG on Internet Governance -- And I just received the call again. Now I can't hear the operator. And now I wonder whether I'm back on.

Renate De Wulf: You are back on.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Excellent!

Renate De Wulf: That's the echo.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: No. That's fine, that's because I'm swapping this in the computer and the other -- and the phone.

Renate De Wulf: Okay. It's perfect now.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So now there shouldn't be any echo, and let's move on then. Discussion of the themes of work for the Cross Community Working Group; we have several topics that are listed on the agenda; WSIS+10 and CSCD, IGF, ITU Plenipot, NETMundial Initiative. It really is down to a case of whether we are going to have everyone involved in all of those discussions, or whether we will go into parallel tracks, smaller tracks. I've had some discussion with my colleagues, Rafik Dammak, and with Jordon Carter on this, and we are not quite sure at the moment. Probably looking at the list, we think that cutting it up in too many different sub-groups is probably not going to be helpful.

I note, David Maher mentioning, "Is none of the above an option?" Well, then if it's none of the above, then let's see what else we could have in there, and the floor is open for everyone here to contribute to this, and to say whether you should think that they are in, out, whether there are other topics that we would like to have in this working group. This really is now down to us organizing our work. David Maher, you have the floor.

David Maher: My concern is that we might be perceived as limiting our options if we organize our work around any one of those particular platforms. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for this, David. It's Olivier speaking. Very fair point, and I actually agree, we shouldn't be just limiting ourselves, but I think these are probability just points of reference, and of the issues we've identified so far as being the issues that we need follow up with and to contribute to, obviously the list is open-ended, and we can always add more to these, bear in mind though, that we are not such a huge group of people as you can see on the call, and I know that there are quite a few who are following on the mailing list that we also need to start thinking about where we want to go on each one of these and actually, what amount of time we want to spend on these issues.

Marilyn Cade: Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, Marilyn. You have the floor.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry. I think there may be an echo. Let me step away and see if that makes it any better. My suggestion is -- I think it's so bad --

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: I think the theme is Internet Governance, and these are just subtopics and could be, perhaps, the preliminary subtopics.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Thank you, Marilyn for this. I think you might be having your computer on, your computer sound on at the same time as your mobile, and this is why your phone is in this way, you are getting the -- you know, the few technical issues. With regards to this, yes, there are subtopics, there are threads, I don't think they are anymore than threads, and we have an unlimited number of threads, I just wanted some tap on the people who are present here today; which ones should we really focus on as outstanding items and -- or if anyone wishes to take on the responsibility of taking one of these themes, and saying, well, you know, you know, I will be following up on this. And before a call, and we have our regular calls, I'll be able to follow up on this specific topic, and be able to ask the group for its input, so that we actually are not taken by surprise when these consultations come up, but we would actually be able to discuss those vocally, but also be able to formulate a response, if a response is required in these threads.

Marilyn has disconnected. Any other comments on this; any thoughts or--? Really, this group is -- you know, Internet Governance is a very, very big topic and we really have to make a choice, I guess, to start with as what we are going to concentrate on as the first step, and then how we are going to take this forward. Evan Leibovitch, you have the floor.

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks, Olivier. I guess my concern is, when I look at -- when I look at the four items, I look at tactics as opposed to strategy or as opposed to even higher-level objectives. I mean, if I had my druthers right now I would have us making sure that we have a very clear definition of ICANN's place in the world of Internet Governance. Because when we look at things like NETMundial, when we look at thing at ITU, we look at things -- or the world of IGF, we are looking at a lot of issues, many of which are outside the purview of ICANN directly, in terms of its mandate on names and numbers.

So, personally I would love to entertain a discussion of where -- you know, is ICANN self-aware of its role? Is it aware of the limitations of its mandate, and is it possible through either financial

resources; through the nature of its multistakeholder structure, that it can contribute to other components? But I'm very aware right now of, shall I call it, you know, mission creep within ICANN. It has a role to play within the world of Internet Governance, while at the same time has - - you know, needs to have a focus. A part of me, you know, in the back of my mind thinks it needs to do its own mission right before it starts bleeding into the missions that go beyond its own mandate.

So, when I look at list of meetings that becomes the work of this group, I'm thinking that we are drilling down far deeper before the preliminary discussion is happening, and that is -- what is ICANN's role in the IGF? ICANN, you know what -- ICANN obviously is one of the main players in NETMundial Initiative, but I'm still trying to connect the dots between the NETMundial Meeting that happened and the NETMundial Initiative. I don't see that -- even that being a clear path. So, personally, if I had my preference for this group, I would like to have a clear idea of ICANN's role in the world of Internet Governance, and the extent to which it has influenced whether that's moral or financial, or other; and to figure out the best way forward to use that. The meetings are all important things, but those are sort of like symptoms and tactics as opposed to things at the high level that I don't think we've totally resolved it. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Evan. Is there any response from anyone on this call? I'm looking at Marilyn, and maybe Bill, you are also very much involved with many of these Internet Governance initiatives on the (inaudible) of ICANN; Bill Drake maybe? I see it's a very silent call.

Marilyn mentioned the -- having some subject experts on this, and perhaps we could follow this path forward which would be a case of saying, well, as far as WSIS+10 and CSCD are concerned, Marilyn is a good expert on this and could lead on that, and certainly follow up. For NETMundial Initiative I think Bill might be a person, or even Marilia. I see, Marilia, you've put your hand up in fact, so let's hear from you.

Marilia Maciel: Hello? Can you hear me?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Marilia Maciel, you have the floor.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you very much, Olivier. This is Marilia speaking for the records. I just would like to react to what Evan has mentioned. I think that's a very important involvement. We do need to make his reflection on the high-level importance of the role of ICANN and how ICANN should place itself in the broader ecosystem. But on the other hand, I think that when we discuss themes on theoretical terms, and on very broad terms, sometimes it's hard for us to move forward, and I think that, this agenda here in front of us, of communities and phases (ph), give us something concrete for us to reflect upon. If I would -- if I could, maybe, point out some priorities for us, I think that the idea, it is always a priority because many of us, ICANN as an organization participates in the IGF process, and I think that we all agree that, for different reasons, the IGF should be reinforced.

But it's a meeting that, already it's scheduled and has its own dynamics and many of us are participating on our personal capacity in MAG, and in the open consultations and other stages. But I think that the upcoming WSIS+10 is something that has set the ground for the different organizations to operate, including ICANN, including the technical organizations, and the recognition that the technical aspects of the Internet, they work well. They should continue to work as they were. They should be lenient and led by the technical community, so I think that when we put WSIS+10 into the picture, this is something that really could, or not, have an impact in the ecosystem.

And I think that all of us should be involved in a way that the impact that it has is a positive one, that must only try to hunt for things that we don't want to see happening, such as the some more Internet Governance oriented process, but also to try to propose things that we do think should happen, because to me it would be like a very modest outcome for WSIS for us to just -- for us just to say what we don't want. And I think that we do have things that have advanced and moved

forward after WSIS in 2005, and maybe it could be an opportunity departing from the role of ICANN and what ICANN works with, and to make a contribution, a real contribution to the discussions in WSIS to make it a meaningful moment, to reassess Information Society that we are (inaudible) and if it is indeed the -- everything we had promised that these people (inaudible) and develop more oriented, and so on.

So I would say that in terms of focus, we have our normal meetings that we are engaged on, and so on, but maybe this is a process that we could continue more, because it touches upon how the different organization in the ecosystem interact, including the technical ones. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for this Marilia. It's Olivier speaking. Are there any response to Marilia's suggestions, and what's the temperature in the room? I know that Marilyn has -- Oh. You're back on the call. Marilyn Cade? And I can't hear Marilyn at the moment. No. Your mike does not seem to be working.

Unidentified Participant: Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: We are faced with issues at the moment. Yes, go ahead. Who--?

Unidentified Participant: Hi?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Rafik, is that --?

Unidentified Participant: I'm sorry, I was -- I'm sorry, I was (inaudible) lost track of where we were in the conversation. I don't know if this would be of any interest to people, but let me just float the question out there. On the accountability call the other day, I think it's really a kind of (inaudible). The question of the nature of the global public interest came up again, and the fact that ICANN has no ability or no definition or no clarity, on exactly what that standard is, and so on, and it doesn't seem that anybody is really working on it. And I don't know if that Accountability Group will come to any kind of clear thinking about it, that we would be drawing on discussions from the larger IG environment and how they might influence the bounded space of what ICANN is responsible for.

And I don't know. Would it be possible that this group would be one place within the ICANN sphere where we could take something like that on as a topic to think about? If not, okay, no problem, but I am struck by the fact that people are still stuck on the very fundamental issue, and there is no group anywhere that's really dedicated, thinking about it still, after all these years; or studying in any meaningful way. And this is part of that -- and that's arrived at a very clean, clear work agenda of a near-term nature. So I just thought, maybe I'll throw that out there as something that we might consider. If it's a terrible idea then I take it all back immediately.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, for this.

Marilyn Cade: Hello?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Any other -- Yes, Marilyn. Welcome back.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. So let me see if I can try again. I think I'm in agreement with -- So I think what we need to be doing, we are supposed to be the subject matter experts with the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance. We've come together. I think we need to -- we seem to have taken a bit of a holiday, and I think that was, perhaps, because people were diverted and working on other Cross Community Working Groups also with some urgency, but I think it's important we get ourselves back to a regularized discussion, and sharing information and digesting that information, and what is ICANN's role in the larger ecosystem, I think was why we originally created this group, and it seems to me we need to get back to that. So we do need to understand what is going on in WSIS+10, or at CSCD, or at IGF, or went on -- I use the past tense on purpose -- at the Plenipot that is relevant to ICANN.

I think all of that understanding is important, but I'm not sure that, you know, we need to be launching input into all of those initiatives. I think that has to be done on a case-by-case basis. We launched input into NETMundial using a town hall that we organized and facilitated. But I think we probably ought to discuss, first of all, what's going on in the ecosystem, what is ICANN's role, and what do we think the ICANN community' role is. That seems to me to be the productive use of our time.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Thank you for this, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. I think I'm seeing a pattern where we can have subject matter experts, and I'm saying experts, we don't need just one per topic, that's certainly anyone who has been involved with those topics is able to monitor those things. When it comes down to this working group actually, producing inputs to these processes that would then be discussed with the working group; and I guess based on the information brought in by the subject matter experts, the Working Group could then make up its mind and certainly would be -- would have the time to be able to make up its mind and decide on whether it wishes to proceed forward with presenting an input from the ICANN community. Or whether it's something that it leaves and it doesn't see as being part of its mandate. Would this encompass the way forward somehow?

And certainly defining the boundaries is a useful thing, but I know David Maher mentioning earlier that, you know, we also have to keep our mind open as these are the hot topics of the day, obviously there would be other topics that we would following into that. But certainly as we can see, the ITU Plenipot is something that is tasked, and when we originally started this group the ITU Plenipot was going to be a huge hurdle ahead of us, so that definitely changes the nature of the kind of feedback we need regarding the activities of the ITU Plenipot follow up.

I noted a couple here who I can identify as subject matter experts. I'm not sure we have the time for people to put their hands up on the different topics, but I would certainly say that WSIS+10 and CSCD, Marilyn Cade should be a topic -- subject matter expert, and others who wish to volunteer, please make it known. The same for the IGF I think that -- was it Marilia, you mentioned the IGF specifically. It would be good if you could be one of the subject matter experts on this, and certainly there's a lot going on now in the IGF, and with the IGF Support Association, that's another branch that has opened up. The ITU Plenipot, I don't know who was involved with this, but with regards to the --

Marilyn Cade: Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah, Marilyn?

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I put in the Chat; it seems to me on the ITU Plenipot, what we want to focus on now, are the relevant outputs that are resolutions that are specifically relevant to ICANN and ICANN's role, and there's a couple. And I do follow the ITU work there, with volunteer -- perhaps Nigel as well, or somebody else who is engaged there, but I would volunteer to contribute also on the tracking of the ITU, WSIS -- the Council WSIS Working Group, the ITU Council Working Group on Internet Public Policy, and then I think there may be some other initiatives coming where someone from ISOC or someone from ICANN might be better positioned, or someone else from Industry who might be a Sector member, because I'm not, might be a better -- But the output that are relevant to ICANN, I do think we ought to follow.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you for this, Marilyn. So, I have you down as subject matter expert for ITU, and also for the WSIS and CSCD. Obviously others are welcome to volunteer for this as well. And then finally on the NETMundial Initiative, and Bill Drank, I think you probably were very close to knowing what's the ins and outs of this, and so you might be a good topic matter expert on this, and obviously getting more people involved as well on this. And if you -- if any of you can think of other topics they need to closely pursue, or would like to volunteer to be the subject matter

expert on any other topics that is not on there, on this list yet, please make it known in the Chat, and then we'll be able to add this, and mark you down as that. Bill, I think I heard you. Bill Drake?

Bill Drake: I just said, okay.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. Okay. Thank you. All right, let's move on to the next part of our agenda, I notice the clock is going faster than I was expecting it to do. It's an update on the events calendar, and it's got -- it's a follow up to our action items from the last call. Thank you very much, Marilyn, for having supplied this information. And thanks, Renate for having built this up -- Oh, no, it was Alexandra. Alexandra Dans as well, thank you for that. We've got the events on the left column, challenges in the middle and opportunities on the right-hand side.

This really is -- we don't really very much time to go through it, but you can see that if you scroll down, there are -- huge quantity of different things that -- events and so on happening around the world. And I guess what we have to do here, is to provide our preference as to which ones we need to follow closely, or whether -- I guess, Marilyn, you are probably following all of these, but I just wonder -- not all of them are going to be in line with what we do in ICANN, and I just wonder whether there's a way to perhaps focus on a few, rather than doing the thing of going after all of them. And Marilyn, if you just supplied that information, it would be very good if you could quickly take us through it, please. Marilyn Cade.

Marilyn Cade: Sure, sure. And I'm going to be quick because I've got to go on to a call I'm chairing in a few minutes. Why don't I work with Alex, separately, to fill a couple -- a little bit of narrative on these, and maybe Alex and I could actually do a call. I could talk her through a couple of points on narratives, and then the group can decide what's in the opportunity. I did also want to rename it, Alex, to issues and challenges, instead of threats; or issues and challenges and opportunities, instead of threats, I think threats is a negative -- it's too negative really. Some of the events, and I'm just going to -- I'm going to pick out UNESCO. UNESCO is on there because it is very, very important to the developing countries, particularly in the areas of access by the sea and the development of content, that it's probably less on ICANN's stakeholders' radar screen than it is on civil society and business who are external to ICANN.

So it's there for informational purposes. The cyberspace session that conference in April is also on there for informational purposes, but when we get to the CSCD -- sorry -- the IGF consultations, the ITU Council Working Group on WSIS and on IPP, both of those, I think, are very relevant to ICANN. The CSCD meeting itself, because there will be a day-long substantive session on the WSIS Review, which has lots of implications for ICANN, I think that's relevant. So maybe I could volunteer to spend a little time with Alex by phone, and then we could flesh this out for people. Would that be helpful?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Marilyn. That would be very helpful indeed.

Marilyn Cade: And then I'm going to -- fantastic, I see -- and Nigel says he can join the call. I'm going to drop off at 12:10, just an FYI, and then maybe we just get volunteers together. Alex can put the calls together we can do this on the phone, and Alex can put it together for us in written form.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That's sounds fine with me. It's Olivier speaking. Alex, are you okay wit this? You can remit -- I mean, deal directly with Marilyn, and I see Nigel also will be helping on this.

Nigel Hickson: Yes. I will be helping on it.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks very much for that Marilyn, and just before you go we have two more things; two more agenda items here; the plans for the CCWG Meeting, our next meeting at ICANN 52, face-to-face, also the plan for the public Internet Governance session at ICANN 52. Is there anything that you would like to contribute now before you go?

Marilyn Cade: Yes. On the public session, which I think is really important, and I'm going to stress the fact that the ICANN staff broadly, and I'm going to ask whoever is on here from the staff to take us back to a larger -- to Sally and to Fadi. This meeting needs to be scheduled at a time when the governments can attend and when it is not competing with another cross community working group, such as the one on IANA, or the one on accountability, point number one.

Point number two, the presentation on WSIS+10 Review, if we sent an invitation now to the Secretariat, upon the CSCD, I don't know if they would be able to attend, but it would be worth doing. Otherwise, I'm happy to work with someone else to put together the briefing on the WSIS+10. WSIS+10 has three aspects to it. It has what just happened, the high-level event which reviewed the action items; it has the WSIS Review document that is going on right now with CSCD. And then it has the events of the six-month period that will launch in June of next year, and I think what we want to do is overview for the community, how these things fit together and what they will want to be paying attention to.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Marilyn. Yeah.

Marilyn Cade: And I'm sure others may want to volunteer on this section as well, but I can volunteer to work on this, help put together the substance part on the WSIS+10 Review.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Also thank you for this, and we'll take note of this, and we'll -- obviously the public the Internet Governance session is worked on with (inaudible), so with Nigel being on the call I gather he's taking notes on this. And next in the queue we have Bill Drake.

Bill Drake: Hi. So it's a little bit dicey or maybe awkward, and I don't probably know how best to address this, the fact that we have a feeling amongst the community that it feels that we ought to be organizing this, and we know that's been something that Staff have been doing for a long time, and obviously the answer is to somehow find the collaboration way where we can do this together, so that it's not something that anybody is uncomfortable with. That said, I will say, personally, at the expense, at the risk of sounding a little difficult, that I was on the last panel, and I thought it was a disaster.

I thought that the -- I thought that it was entirely too formulaic, controlled and did not allow for open dialogue and all, and the insertion of the last chunk of speakers that nobody could understand why they were even there, or what the topics were about, and now they are related to the rest of the conversation, was just very awkward. And so what I'd really like to see us try to do, is work with Staff to arrive at an agreement, to do something that's a little bit more open and dynamic and formatted. That is less controlled. It almost feels like, you know, these things over the years, and I've been on it a number of times; I almost feel like it's -- like the dialogue is constipated, it's like we were all up here, given a very bounded amount of time to see party-line type things, rather than have an open exchange of views and topics. And a lot of the people I know were very unhappy with the last session, and were not enthralled with some of the previous sessions, and I'm talking about people who are pretty close to the Internet Governance world.

So I would like to see if we can't open this up, in different formats, maybe not -- maybe not the -- you know, the panel of experts, talking heads with big audience. Maybe a larger U-shaped room, maybe, you know, putting like the four topics that we've talked about here as possible subject areas for work in the community groups. I mean, if you just look at those four areas, and sort of put them up on a wall, and have somebody kick off a conversation about each of them, with some brief comments on the themes, and then all -- went to some broader integrated discussion immediately with the audience and drew people in. And then allocated, you know, 15 minutes of that, and then the next one, and the next one. That would be, I think, a big improvement, personally.

This is my own view. I feel like we have to -- we have to find a way to deemphasize the usual suspects serving as talking heads, giving canned presentations of safe points, and move towards

something that is a more dynamic interactive and fact-finding (phonetic) format. And I hope we can do that with the Staff, together. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Thank you very much for this, Bill. It's Olivier speaking. And just for those of you that have kind of lost the thread, we are on items 7, and now we've jumped number six, we are speaking about the public and Internet Governance sections. It's an interesting point of view that you have, Bill. You read the details that are in the agenda, of the proposed session there. One concern, you mentioned having 15-minute slots for each one of the topics, and the concern I have is regards to turning this into a lecture. If you have a 15-minute slot, you will have people on stage that will be speaking and the audience not having enough time to queue up, and ask questions. Is there (Inaudible) about that.

Unidentified Participant: I'm arguing exactly against that. I'm saying if somebody--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay.

Unidentified Participant: If somebody speaks for three minutes to key up the conversation and say, this is where this is, and then you've opened it up to interactive discussion.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah, Marilyn. Yeah, sure.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah. I'm going to speak and then I've got to drop off in a second for the call. I would prefer that we organize this. So I share the concern about how things went the last time, and I think that we should organize this session as we did at the town hall and we should run it. And the staff should support us and collaborate with us. And I would like us to keep it to two topics rather than having -- making it a briefing. And I think one of the things we do wrong, is we do -- we try to use these meetings as updates and briefings and maybe that would work sometimes, but for this meeting, I think this should be, assume people do their homework, and then let's have a robust conversation, and you know, that means we don't have to have a lot of speakers, we go out into the audience and we work with participants, right?

Bill Drake: That's what I had in mind.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Marilyn. Thanks Bill.

Marilyn Cade: And I am gone now. Good-bye

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you. We have Nigel Hickson in the queue. Nigel, you have the floor.

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. Nigel Hickson, Staff. What I was going to say is I think Bill Drake has reflected on what many people thought. Clearly, after the last session there were lessons to be learned, so to speak, and we'd be delighted, you know, to work with -- to work with you and do whatever you think is best. So I think, you know, there's a feeling that we -- we still have something to contribute as the sort of Global Stakeholder team and the Government Engagement team on this but, you know, happy to work with you.

And I think Bill's idea of having this interactive dialogue is excellent, some of us witnessed what the -- Diplo did here on the Geneva Internet platform for their conference in Geneva, last month, and that was very interactive where they have, you know, people just speak for a number of minutes, to introduce a subject and then you, essentially, have a dialogue. So I think that's a very positive way forward. All I would caution, and it's not for me to caution, you -- it's that we have a timeframe we have to fit in, in terms of fitting the ideas in. We have to submit by, I think, it's the 9th of January in terms of getting a slot. And of course this particular ICANN meeting is difficult to get slots because of the focus on the IANA accountability in the transition which is obviously

taking up some time. But anyway, very happy to work with you and do whatever is necessary, but would like -- yeah, would like an involvement. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, for this Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. And you did make a note with regards to the scheduling of the call, of that face-to-face meeting, you did make a note of the fact that it would be good if it didn't clash with any sessions of the GAC, so it's the governance to be able to also take part in this. Nigel? Have I lost again--?

Nigel Hickson: No, Olivier. No. No. I was on mute. No. Absolutely! I mean I think what we need to -- Well, it's not for me to tell you what you need to do, but you probably need either on this call or soon after it, what sort of -- who is going to, you know, do what in terms of putting in -- into something. I mean, obviously we can start putting something into the meeting's theme and ask for this session not to clash, and you know ask -- et cetera, and I'm happy to do that. But we'll need to decide what the broader topics are, and because obviously we don't need to know the speakers, but the (inaudible) topics absolutely. But whatever you think is appropriate.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you. It's Olivier speaking. And there is the proposal by the Co-Chairs of the group that is on the screen here, with regards to a potential format. Bill, I know you suggested having several topics, and here what we have just to explain it, is a starting discussion being the NETMundial Initiative, that we'd have a senior ICANN staffer on the other hand, and an external group with a different point of view. And we talk about Kathy Brown from ISOC as both being able to provide very different perspectives for -- and I mean, we have a total time here, allocation of 50 minutes so we could have each side -- each person bringing their perspective in about 5, 10 minutes. And then engage in an overall dialogue on the topic based on the points which were made there.

And then the second part was just a 30-minute update on WSIS+10 Review, having a responsible ICANN staffer or a member of the CCWG that follows those issues, to provide input, and perhaps ask questions from the audience in the way that you bring some more input into this. Is there any feedback on this? I mean, Bill, I know you have some thoughts, would you say that's something that could slide?

Bill Drake: Hi. As I've typed in the Chat, if you guys want to do two topics or four topics, that's fine, I don't care. I don't know, a 15-minute conversation about the NETMundial Initiative, I mean, maybe will be useful because maybe this is a pregnant thing that's been out there with an -- misunderstanding that by Singapore, once NETMundial Coordination Committee is up and running, maybe things will be a little bit clearer, and maybe we can actually have a productive conversation that will get people to a more shared understanding. So perhaps that will be good. Having different points of view I think are fine, obviously. It just won't turn into a debate, per se. I mean, if you're going to -- if you're going to tee it up like you've got, you know, one person on one side and one person on the other side, then I think then that's been kind of get us into a more contentious territory and I'm not sure that that's very good.

On the other parts of the WSIS+10, the only thing I'm wondering is, we were talking about not spending too much time on updating and sort of like people conveying information, and I would try to find some way because most people don't follow the ins and outs of WSIS+10 so carefully, and since a lot of it is anticipatory (ph) and we don't really know how some of these things will shape up, you could end up with just a few people who are following closely talking at length, which wouldn't be ideal either.

But what I would like to see, is whether we could instruct to mobilize people around providing some kind of joint statement inputs into that process, because I don't know if you've -- I mean, I talked about this at the last session the last time we did this thing, the stilted one, but there is supposed to be a mechanism for the WSIS+10 Geneva -- I'm sorry -- New York meeting for stakeholders to provide input. And if the ICANN community were to provide some sort of input into that process in the way it did for NETMundial, I would think that will be really, really useful,

personally. And so, if I were to talk about this topic, I would want to spin it more towards, you know, how will we, maybe, put together a process to begin sort of articulate the view, and what kinds of points would we want to put out there on the table for governments, or just consideration in the General Assembly.

And the last point I would make is, if we can somehow get a room that's not structured the same way. I've said this before and I'm going to say it again, the structure that room totally worked against us I think, so anything that we can do to try to get a more large U-type environment of something going on would really, really be good. So, basically, I'm supporting what you're saying, and just adding to it by saying, just be careful how we tee it up.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks, Bill. Nigel, is there any ability for you to specify the type of room you'd prefer when there's a need for it?

Nigel Hickson: Well, yeah. I mean, like in IGF we -- at IGF we did some U-shape rooms that had large numbers of seats along the side, so then you could still get, you know, 100 people into a room if you had to, but it doesn't feel like, you know, experts talking to audience, that's just so (inaudible), you know. But still it's an idea, if you (inaudible)--

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah -- No -- I agree -- The problem is, what's available then at the time. I think one of the concerns and that's from experience is that there is a limited amount of support staff and they are quite -- unlikely to be able to change rooms into different configurations depending on the meeting, and so we would need availability of a room that would have this U-shape. But Nigel, you might wish to add.

Nigel Hickson: Thank you very much, Olivier. Nigel. Yes. I mean we can certainly specify, or we can certainly ask for a U-shaped room. I mean, I agree with Bill that it works well -- at IGF it's worked well and other occasions as well. It deemphasizes the sort of talking heads issue that was addressed earlier. So we can specify, you know, what we want and then we can refine it as we go along. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you for this, Nigel. Olivier speaking. So, what I'm getting from the discussion we are having here is that certainly a discussion on the topic like the NETMundial Initiative would be welcome. There appears to be some concern if we were to start this as being something confrontational by adding very different points of view, and Nigel mentioned in the Chat there be a bit of a difficulty to commit senior staff at this stage for this. So the discussion is on but maybe not with such a (inaudible) having two different points of view, that the presentation, the WSIS+10 Review which was proposed in the agenda, is not something that has gained traction here. At least I haven't heard anyone that has supported an actual presentation made to the audience. If anybody thinks otherwise, please correct me.

And Nigel, your hand is still up? Okay. Hearing no one contradict me, so that's where we are on this, and now I'll work with the Chairs then to think of a -- and of course, please, if you can think of expanding that format then, the discussion, as I mentioned earlier, I'm really concerned of having -- trying to cram too much in a face-to-face meeting. And having more than two topics for that 90 minutes is probably a recipe for just having the people on stage talk to each other and having the audience feel bored, and then we end up with a bit of catastrophe on those two topics that I see from this. Okay, fine.

And I think -- anything against the NETMundial Initiative? I mean it's likely to have moved a lot by then, and that could be one of the points of interest. Okay. Further up on the mailing list, and if we go back -- Oh, I see Nigel Hickson had put his hand up again. So, Nigel, you have the floor.

Nigel Hickson: Yeah. Sorry. Sorry, Olivier. Nigel Hickson. Just very briefly, I mean on WSIS, I mean, I think, yeah, I mean there's an issue that you don't want to be too boring so to speak, although there might be, you know, some important things just to touch on, but anyway. I suppose IGF could be something that's topical. I mean, obviously Marilyn has now left the call, but other people that are

in the IGF loop, and Marilia, of course. The IGF will be -- about around that time will be deciding, I think, or there will be a discussion on the themes for the Brazil Meeting. So that's just one suggestion. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you for this, Nigel. Most forward from the mailing list about this. Now I realize we have another -- only two minutes left until the end of this call. We have not covered one of the agenda items, and there was a plan for face-to-face meeting at ICANN 52. There are just four bullet points there. The suggestions that we had were very similar to the format that we had in L.A., a critical roundup of the discussion of the Internet Governance hotspots. Being able to confirm the themes and start drafting a working plan for our Working Group so that we don't lose things, and we continue with the momentum that we will be getting by then. And then an interface between the Cross Community Group and ICANN Staff, and I would imagine that, Nigel, you will be able to make it.

I wonder whether Nora will also be able to come to that meeting. This is just our own Working Group meeting. Probably that will be known for (inaudible) at a time, but it will be certainly be helpful for the community to interact with you and your colleagues, Nigel. And then a review of the actions from the -- the action items from the L.A. meeting, and just agreeing the actions that we are going to have in our next meeting.

Any feedback on this? Does anyone disagree with way forward for our face-to-face meeting?
Have I dropped off the call again?

Unidentified Participant: No. You are still on Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I'm still here. Okay. Well, I don't see any one putting their hand up or being unhappy about this. Nigel Hickson's hand is still up. Nigel?

Nigel Hickson: Olivier, sorry, I should have taken it down, I'm not very good at this Internet stuff. But I mean, just to answer your point of course, you know, whatever staff you need at that meeting, we'll do our best to facilitate their attendance, and I'll certainly -- I'll certainly be there so, yeah, I mean, we are in your hands. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you. So I think we've got a plan for our face-to-face meeting, and we can just build it from there. And with regards to the public meeting that we definitely need to do some work on that, to build it up, but we have just two topics at the moment, and one looks likely to be the NETMundial Initiative which, by then, will have started moving forward, and will certainly be of interest to everyone.

Just one last question before we go. Nigel, are you aware whether NETMundial Initiative will be discussed at any other session during the Singapore Meeting?

Nigel Hickson: I'm not aware. And it was a question I was asking, myself. I mean it's a bit early to look at it yet because that meeting requests something put it in. I don't think it's something that staff will have a particular session on, you know, so it's not something that we'll initiate a session on. I'm sure it might be included in some of the reports that are made by staff to the community or whatever, but I haven't seen a specific request for it.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, for this. That's the plan forward, and the second possible topic for this public session could be IGF. We can mark this as the second one to be suggested. We'll follow up on the mailing list. And is there any other business? I don't see anyone putting their hand up.

One last thing, of course, is to find out when our next call is going to be, and of course we are very close to the holiday period. I do not know what everyone's calendar looks like at the moment, but mine looks extremely busy, especially with the amount of activity that is taking place on the

IANA Stewardship, on the accountability. And I'm a little concerned we probably won't be able to meet again before the holiday period.

But what we can do is to meet again in January for our next call. Are you all okay with this? I don't see anyone objecting. So the next call would be in January. Now the question is, first week or second of January? I note in the Chat, maybe the week of January the 5th. Well just to check if people are back from holidays on the first week. And, well, the week starting the 5th is obviously the -- just turning to the calendar -- that would be the second week. Is that okay with everyone? And if that's okay, then let's have a Doodle then for the second week of January. A bunch of people are, oh, that's right. The next -- the third week, yes, there is a Non-Contracted Party meeting in -- exactly, Non-Contracted Parties House Meeting in D.C. Okay. So the second week of January, the week starting the 5th we will have a Doodle for the sprinkling of days.

Renate, I'll leave it over to you to choose the days, possibly Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, a number of times, including times that are a little different than this one, so that Rafik and so that Jordan are able to make it then.

Renate De Wulf: Okay.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Renate. And with this, I thank you all for having been on this call. Sorry, it was a little slow, and we've had a few technical problems, but hopefully next time we'll less of these, and certainly I'm happy, if we do have a bit of stepping forward, and we are back in business, and apologies again, for the amount of time it's taking to where we get back in business

Just one thing, to come back to your communities, please check your community on how things are doing with the appointments of Co-Chairs to this group. The CCs have one, the ALAC has one, I think it is the NCUC that would have one; I'm seeing Rafik. I'm not sure, I'll have to check that with him. But certainly there is a requirement for others to step forward as well. So please check with your constituency, and with regards to the actual makeup of your group. As you know it's now five members for SO and AC -- No, it is six members for SO and AC, and I think that needs to also be tuned up a little bit. But we didn't want to take the time on the call on too much procedural stuff. And I thank you for bearing with us.