20150106_ccwgIG_ID938820

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Renate. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance Monthly Conference Call -- Weekly Conference Call, I would hope, sorry. Welcome back after this holiday break that we've had. Today we have a discussion specifically targeted at the preparations for the Internet Governance Public Session at ICANN 52 in Singapore.
	We'll be looking at the proposal which was made a few weeks ago by Jordan Carter, one of the Co-Chairs of the Working Group -- And for some reason I'm getting another call -- Okay. One of the Co-Chairs of the Working Group on this, and we'll be then having a quick -- at the end of this call, a quick update on the CSCD ICANN contribution, which was sent, I believe, just in time for it to be considered.
	Let's go to the -- First, adoption of the agenda. Does anybody wish to add any additional points to the agenda? I don't see anyone putting their hand up or speaking out. I hope I'm still on the call. Am I on the call?
Renate De Wulf:	Yes, Olivier. We can hear you perfectly well.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	All right. I am. Okay. No, it's just I think the other call, they are trying to call me back, so I'm just getting confused now. I did tell them that I was switching from one to the other. Anyway, so let's have a look at the action items we had in our last call. Here we go, they keep on going. Action items from the 18th of December, we have three action items. And Nigel Hickson has shown us the CSCD response to the -- sorry -- the ICANN response to the CSCD process and we'll be looking at that at the end of this call, Alexandra Dans has indeed worked with Marilyn Cade to build this calendar of Internet Governance events. The link is in the Pod (ph), the Note 6 Pod, you can do a cut and paste, link to events calendar.
	There's been a point raised during the -- I'm sorry -- on the mailing list that the NSRC calendar has also got an enormous amount of information on it, but as someone rightly pointed out, it is very technically-minded, and it might be a bit overbearing on the -- for us, since we are looking specifically at the Internet Governance, and perhaps less at some of the more technically-minded conferences out there. That said, it would be good to have a link to that NSRC calendar, and perhaps to keep an eye on it, so as to transfer some of the less technical points to the -- to our own events calendar. Feedback is appreciated, please, on this.
	Then finally, I was to consult with the CCWG on Internet Governance on the content of the IG session at ICANN 52. I did ask and there was no response on the mailing list, and this is why we are having the call today. Now, let's go to the next point in our agenda, and that's number three. And we are going to look at the actual public session there. Now, I don't know -- well, I don't think that Jordan is on the call. No. He's still away. And neither is my other Co-Chair, or Coordinator, Rafik Dammak -- Oh, no, Rafik is there. Okay.

So, the proposal which was sent to the mailing list was to have a session that was to be divided into two bits. The first part was going to be a discussion around the NETMundial Initiative with a proposal that we would have two, maybe two or three, I don't know, a couple of people who would be able to debate this initiative to start the discussion in the room. Obviously, not all agreeing so as to be able to have the different points of view; and dialogue where people don't agree but remain friends is always better than having a dialogue where everyone just says, me too. Certainly, in order to stimulate discussion in the room.

So that was the first -- the first part. The second part was to have an update on the WSIS+10, and to get a responsible ICANN staffer, or someone from the CCWG, so a community member to provide us with main highlights of -- and points about WSIS+10.

Bill Drake came back during the last call, and provided his feedback. I wonder if I can ask upon Bill to explain his feedback. I have shared it in the mailing list. Bill, do you have -- Would you like to speak?

Bill Drake: Hi. Okay.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Oh. I didn't hear you.

Bill Drake: How are you, everybody? I'm trying to find the email; that would be in (inaudible) transcripts that Olivier kindly sent along. I think this was on the -- on the point of the procedural aspect, right; of the --?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That's correct. Yeah. I mean, we are looking at -- It's Olivier speaking. We are looking at how we are going to structure this. You mentioned the possibility of having a U-type environment, a U-shaped room --

Bill Drake: Yes. Okay. Good, I get the message now.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: -- or a U-shaped table that (inaudible) --

Bill Drake: Right. And I think I'd like -- Thank you, Olivier. Yes. I mean I, for quite some time have -- I've been feeling, having attended these sessions for years now, and having talked to many other people in the room that, you know, we have a sort of tradition of the big Panel talking to an audience full of people, many of whom are fairly savvy about the issues, and well informed, and this sometimes leads to people feeling, well, a little bit disconnected from the enterprise. So I definitely think it would be much more useful if we could move towards a more dynamic and interactive format and certainly moving us to a large U-type configuration I think would serve the purpose and get people engaged more and make it feel less like, you know, just "an audience" (quote/unquote).

So that's simply a logistical question, I thought that people had expressed interest in that idea when we talked about it. I don't know whether the staff can put a room together like that, but that's what I definitely would like to see. The other point, I'm looking at the email that you forwarded there's a transcript. Did you want to also talk about the sensitive points I feel about NETMundial and WSIS+10, or do you just want to take one at a time right now?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Bill. I think we'll start just -- let's start first with the format itself, and I'm saying; that's a pretty straightforward thing. Does anyone else have a view on the format? You know, the U-shaped room, or classroom shape, or whatever. And I wonder -- I was going to call upon maybe others. I can see plenty of other people on the call today who have experience in those -- in this form -- in these different types of format, and in the kind of interactivity that we would be getting. I'll just remind you all that in Turkey the format was a more classical format with a small number of -- not even panelists, people that came up to the mic, and then a queue that had people come to the mic to speak as well.

That worked quite well, but I would say, certainly, having the U-shaped; a U-shape would probably be more likely to raise more interactivity and certainly discussion, and so that -- if that could be technically possible, and I'll probably have to ask Nigel whether that is possible, indeed, then that would be a preferred way forward.

Rafik Dammak, you've put your hand up, so you have the floor. And we cannot hear Rafik, I'm not sure whether you are trying to use Adobe or by phone.

Renate De Wulf: Rafik, try again now.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I don't see him being able to speak, I'll let -- Yeah, it doesn't seem to work at the moment Rafik. Renate, I'll let you work out with Rafik the technical problems on that end.

Renate De Wulf: Yeah. Rafik, try again please. Now speak. No. It doesn't work; I'll try and sort it out. Please go on with the call, Olivier. Sorry.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Renate. All right. So, on the format I think we are okay with this, I don't see anyone speak against the format and wanting something that is not U-shaped. But Nigel Hickson, is there a possibility then, to have a room that would have this shape?

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. And good afternoon to all. I think we touched on this at the last call, and certainly we have the ability, and we have a narrow ability because we only have till the end of this week, to put in, you know, the requirements, and we've can of course ask for a U-shaped table, that should be possible, it's possible in other -- it's been possible in other formats. But we also have to consider other logistical issues, which include whether we want remote participation. For example, one assumes that we do, and we also want the session to be recorded; and issues like that.

And also, we have to take into account, that depending on the slot we get, and as I mentioned on the last call, there is competition for slots because of the -- all the different IANA transition requirements for this particular ICANN meeting that is taking our time, as Olivier has noted at the beginning of this call. So, depending on what slot we get, it looks we might get 75 minutes, we might not get the 90 minutes that would be ideal. But we might get 90 minutes but we should plan for the possibility that we might only have 75.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you for this, Nigel. So, are you going to be putting the request through at the -- before the end of this week? Will Staff be putting the request through for this then? That's the public session. I mean that's the session that's been there in the past as well.

Nigel Hickson: That's right. We ought to clarify, and Renate is the expert here, but given her customary efficiency, she has already submitted the request for the CCWG slot, so to speak, for your -- if you like -- your own committee discussions. But we have to do the public IG session, the one we are talking about at the moment. We have to put that in, and we certainly, as Staff, will be happy to do that, you know, after this call, and you've had the requisite information. And I'm hoping Renate will help me on that, because she is much more proficient than I am.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you for this, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. I think, U-shaped room, recording of course, remote participation, of course, all of the other bells and whistles that one has for a public, you know, a public session at an ICANN meeting. But just, I guess, the difference is to see the shape of the room itself, and it's a little bit, perhaps more like -- for those who were around back in those days the -- a few years ago there used to be SO/AC-led topics with a U-shaped room in the middle, and people sitting around the room, and a couple of roaming mics as well, that kind of helped, and it seemed to work quite well. I wonder if anyone has any comment about that type of format, negative or positive. Well, okay. So, I think that's enough. With regards to the format that appears to be what we need.

	Sally, you had briefly put your hand up, I'm not sure whether you wanted to add to this.
Sally Costerton:	Yes. Hello, everybody. Yeah --
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Go ahead. Sally Costerton.
Sally Costerton:	Happy New Year. Sally Costerton, for the record. I just wanted to suggest that when we -- what we should do in terms of requesting that (inaudible) meeting suite, that's sort for the first thing. The degree to which we can have flexibility about the room now, will depend on what the setup times are for the big rooms, so typically by, say, Wednesday it gets a bit easier, because the rooms where we have the most space (inaudible/audio skip). And the toughest day is Monday. And we are not planning to have this session on Monday, or are we? I can't remember. If this (inaudible/audio skip) --
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	You are breaking up, but I understood --
Sally Costerton:	Can you hear me?
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Yeah. We can hear you. Sometimes you were dropping out a little bit.
Sally Costerton:	Yeah. Yeah. Sorry. What I suggest that we do, is we kind of share the problem with the meeting team and say; okay, this is what we ideally want. We ideally want a roundtable type approach for the maximum amount of people with translation and remote station-- roaming mics, and so forth. You know, what is the best slot you can give us that would provide that, because we may well have to trade off between the timing of the slots, and the quality of the room? And I think it's important that this group is aware of those possible tradeoffs and can pick; because we probably won't get every single thing we want. You know, the perfect time slot with the perfect room availability; if that makes sense.

So, I'm happy to try and sort of oversee that discussion on the Staff side; I just wanted to share that, as a likely set of circumstances, but we'll know that in the next kind of -- a fairly short period of time, I would think, so we can bring that back to this group and say; okay, these are the realistic options that we've got and, kind of, priorities do we have. |
| Olivier Crepin-Leblond: | Okay. Thanks for this, Sally. And I note, not a roundtable, it would be a U-shaped table, says bill, in the chat. |
| Sally Costerton: | Yes. Sorry. I forgot (inaudible). |
| Olivier Crepin-Leblond: | And also with regards to the requirements, of course not clashing with any of the GAC main sessions, obviously, because we do wish to have some real good multistakeholder participation in that room, and it would be a real pity if GAC members could not be a part of the discussion on there. Or at least could not be attending this. There is more in the chat with Bill Drank. But now we've dealt with the setup. And, Sally, I agree with you. I think that's a good way forward for you to see with the meeting's theme, how our needs would be accommodated.

Patrick Faltstrom, you are next. |
| Patrick Faltstrom: | Thank you very much. I hope that you can hear me. Otherwise, I'll just type in the chat. We in the ICG, I think there's quite some overlap of interest in what this group is doing, and what we are doing in the ICG, given that maybe we actually have got some proposals, when we come to the Singapore Meeting. We have requested a session where the operation communities are presenting whatever they are doing, and I just hope, Sally, that you can -- that is also if that, and for (inaudible) session, which we hope, I haven't heard anything back, but that we should not have any clash in the scheduling between the two. I'd suggest that. |

Sally Costerton:	Thank you, Patrick. Yes. We'll take that into consideration. I can foresee this producing all sorts of scheduling problems, but we'll cross that bridge when we come to it.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Okay. Thank you for the suggestion, Patrick; and thank you, Sally, for the response. Now we've dealt with the logistics, let's have a look at the content, and so we had, first, the NETMundial Initiative, as a suggestion, and with having this debate going on with just a couple of experts with different points of view. Experts or representatives, or whatever, and it was mentioned that, perhaps Kathy Brown from ISOC could mention what the ISOC perspective was and is, or perhaps is going to be then, since we all know that perspectives do change with time. And we could also have someone from NETMundial, maybe, I would say, no more than two or three people, obviously because we don't want to end up with a massive panel of people that will just talk to themselves, and between themselves, and leave the audience as an audience, rather than a full participating -- a full set of participants.

Are there any objections to this? Or is there any support for this? Because if there is support, then I guess we would have to send out the invitations as soon as possible, for that. Bill Drake? |
| Bill Drake: | Thank you. One thing that strikes me, I think that there are people in the community who do want to talk about this, but I also think that at the same time it could be a little -- now that we've seen the schedule, it could actually be a little premature, in the sense that the process will still be not very far along, in terms of the NETMundial Initiative taking shape. There is supposed to be a meeting of the Coordination Committee scheduled, but it's not clear how firm everything will be by the time we got to Singapore, in which case we could end up just rehashing the problems that people had with the way the things queued (ph) up. And I don't know if that will necessarily be the most useful activity. As I understand it, the Coordination Committee will meet 31 March.

After that time we would have, I would hope, we would have more clarity as to what we are doing; before that time, I think it could just be a lot of hand-waving, and I'm wondering -- I mean, I support this in principle, the idea of having this conversation the last time we talked, but now that they've announced the schedule, I'm wondering whether it's sensible, and whether this might not be a topic that would be better held until Buenos Ares, by which point the Coordination Committee of the NETMundial Initiative will have met and hopefully started to put some processes in place, and we'll have some idea what the thing is actually going to be doing or not doing, that people could then respond to, so I'm expressing, I guess, a second though, as to whether this is meaningful, at this juncture. Thanks. |
| Olivier Crepin-Leblond: | Thanks very much for this, Bill. And I note from the chat that Robin Gross also does not support the discussion on the NMI, and Nigel has indeed confirmed that the 31st March is the first meeting of the Coordination Committee.

No, we can't hear you at the moment Marilyn. And in the queue at the moment we have Sally Costerton, and then Marilia Maciel. Sally, you have the floor. |
Sally Costerton:	Thank you, Olivier. Sally Costerton for the record.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	And if I could ask -- Sorry Sally. If I could ask Renate to work out with Marilyn, why Marilyn can't be heard, and we'll put Marilyn in the queue as well. Sally, sorry for this.
Sally Costerton:	I was just going to suggest, and it's just a suggestion. Exactly to Bill's point, the process has moved forward since this group last met, and specifically Wolfgang Kleinwächter has been appointed as an ambassador to the NMI, and if there is a desire for this group to have an update on, you know, the whys and wherefores, and what's happening, and who is involved and things like that. So, confidently we could ask Wolfgang to come to the session and to provide that. (Inaudible/audio skip) suggestion if we didn't want to go ahead with the full debate, this might provide at least an update if that was still required.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Okay. Thanks for this, Sally. Next we have Marilia Maciel.
Marilia Maciel:	Thanks, Olivier. And this is Marilia speaking, for the record. I'd like to reinforce the point that was just made. I think that is true what you said, that the first of the meeting of the Coordination Group will take place on the 31st March. But as far as I understand from here until then, we will be discussing the terms right after the NETMundial Initiative, and I think that it will be very useful for us, that are part of the Coordination Group, to understand what are the concerns and what has moved forward in terms of discussion between ICANN, and specifically regarding the organizations that express concerns or points regarding a NETMundial Initiative. So I think it would be really a good opportunity for us to discuss with our community how the terms of reference are evolving. What are the discussions inside the Coordination Group, and also to hear the concerns of others that have expressed (inaudible) statements; and what is the status quo.
	So maybe I would not agree that we give so much time to that, maybe 15 (ph) minutes, if so much, and we could make this discussion a little bit shorter, and another topic could be added to the agenda. So I think that this is important, but more like informative to keep -- to make sure that we are all on track and on the same page regarding the initiative, because I think we cannot deny the important role, political -- practical, that ICANN has had to do that. But I think the community should express itself in that too, and this is a very good opportunity for it. Thank you.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Thank you very much for this, Marilia. It's Olivier speaking. Are there any other comments on this? So far, I hear many voices saying we should not have a debate on NETMundial Initiative, but rather an update, an update perhaps from Wolfgang Kleinwächter, an update that would include the terms of reference, that would include perhaps a progress report, or some progress update, because not everyone is aware of what is currently happening at NMI, the NETMundial Initiative, which means we would not be taking a full 50 minutes for this, we would probably have a shorter amount of time devoted to this, perhaps 15, 20 minutes maximum so far.
	Sally, your hand is up. Is that a new hand?
Sally Costerton:	Sorry. Old hand.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Okay. Thank you. Marilyn Cade, are you able to speak now?
Marilyn Cade:	We'll see. Can you hear me?
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Ooh, you sound very, very far away, Marilyn, very faint.
Marilyn Cade:	Let's see. Are you able to hear me? (Inaudible) --
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	I think we'll probably have to dial out to you again, because I can't hear you well at all.
Marilyn Cade:	Okay.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Could you do a test? Okay. We'll get back to Marilyn in a moment. I can probably hear my echo as well as I can hear Marilyn's. So, any other comments on this then? Now rather than having the NMI as the main topic of discussion, so if we have a 15-minute progress report which includes Wolfgang, what would then be a main topic of discussion? I note from the chat that Robin Gross suggested a discussion on -- let me see here, "Strengthening the IGF, that's one suggestion that we make." Is there any support for this, or are there any other suggestions. Nigel Hickson?
Nigel Hickson:	Yes. Olivier, thank you. Nigel Hickson. I mean, just to note, the IGF, we did briefly raise it, so it was briefly raised at the last call, it's -- I mean rather than supporting or not, but it is going through an interesting phase, and at that time there will be quite a lot of information to possibly impart and also dialogue to have. The IGF is going to be very interactive this year, in terms of the themes and

sub-themes. A call is going out in the couple of days, whereby, you know, the overall community, the wider community, not just ICANN, of course is being asked to look at themes and sub-themes and intercessional work. So I think, you know, there will be quite a lot -- quite a lot going on, and then of course the future of the IGF is also bound to the WSIS+10 topic, at first of what will be happening to the (inaudible/audio skip) --

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Nigel, I think we lost you in the last couple of seconds, because of -- some kind of echo that came up.

Nigel Hickson: Yeah. Sorry. All I was saying is as well as the substance of the IGF what's going to happen in the Brazil conference in November, and before that. There's also the mandate of the IGF of course, which is going to be discussed at the U.N. General Assembly in December next year, or just before December next year. So I think the IGF is possibly relevant from that perspective as well. But of course, that's up to you. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Nigel. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. So, strengthening the IGF is on the table. Nigel Hickson, perhaps a few updates that might be of interest.

Marilyn Cade: Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: And maybe rather than having just updates, there could be a discussion around this. I hear Marilyn Cade now. So Marilyn, you have the floor.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. I'm going to say a few things very quickly because I'll probably get disconnected due to the complications on my end. We need to make a decision on whether we are treating ourselves as merely an update environment, and I think that's okay, and appropriate in our -- in the Cross Community Working Group and IG itself. And updates are important, and we need to be sharing information, but we need to distinguish between, we are just a mechanism to spout updates; versus we are actually, as the CCWG/IG, providing guidance and input to the ICANN Staff and Board about the role of ICANN and Internet Governance, and I hear us blurring that over and over and over.

                           Now, more than anybody, I'm happy to spend my time bringing others onboard and briefing them, and bringing them up to date, but I think we need to think about this seriously. What are we doing this for? Is it just to show we know what is going on? Or are we trying to, as a community, from a bottom-up, consensus-based approach, guide the decisions and actions that are taken by an organization that we are responsible for? And so I'm happy for us to spend a certain amount of time briefing the broader community about the risks, challenges and opportunities that we see. But I think we need to do that seriously, take that work on seriously, and then be putting that information out to the community and taking community input so that there is a guidance aspect to the world of the Cross Community Working Group.

                           I fully agree that there's a lot going on, on the IGF, and a relevant update (inaudible) typically would be useful, because the broader community engaged in ICANN should also be engaging and supporting the IGF. To do that I think we would need to invite the Secretariat, (Inaudible); and the Chair of the MAG, Janis Karklins, and think seriously about how we make sure that those key participants are there with us, are able to contribute. We also have a number of working groups, but we need to be careful that we are not just using this, as we have in the past for, here's an update on the landscape. The CCWG was created to provide guidance, so how are we going to do that? And I think in our last few conversations, we agreed and understood that we expect to be listened to, but I hear us going back to, we are just going to give information, put it out in the wild, and see what happens, and I'm not comfortable with that.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you for this, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. And we have next, Marilia Maciel.

Marilia Maciel: Thanks, Olivier. This is Marilia, for the record. I would like to agree very much with what Marilyn has said. I think that we need to make a decision, and I think as a group, the role of the group is not only to keep the community informed, but also provide the Board an action -- item of activity. And that's the reason why the NETMundial Initiative should remain on the agenda, because this will be an important space to shape the evolution of the terms of reference as well, according to what the community thinks conveying this throughout. But I'm just not sure if the improvement of the IGF and the IGF itself is a topic in which we can agree, and contribute and shape from ICANN. I think that there very important spaces to do that.

And there are discussions taking place in the MAG. As far as I'm concerned, and I'm really concerned about that, maybe the MAG is not implementing the intercessional work so far that's necessary for the improvements to take place, but at least there are other spaces. This is important, maybe they can discuss it, but it's also kind of keeping the community informed about it. I don't think that the new ideas of how really to enhance the IGF are coming from our sessions.

Another topic that I have been concerned with; I don't know if we have enough bandwidth and capacity to discuss that, but I see more and more discussions in cyber security taking place, and being related to (inaudible) security. We have the conference on the Netherlands (phonetic) taking place, as soon as we have matched on our agenda. So I wonder, I think that one of the topics that are going to be discussed, is how we could preserve the infrastructure, the (inaudible) infrastructure in the context of cyber conflict. So maybe this is one of the topics that we could discuss. I know that Patrick is here, maybe will have views on that, but I do think that this year is being framed as a year of cyber security for several reasons. I don't agree with all of them, but I believe this will be an important topic. DNS will be an important piece of the puzzle in these discussions about cyber security, so what just came to my mind, and I wondered -- I wanted to share with you. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Marilia. And I wonder -- I know that Rafik was going to speak earlier, but I don't whether we've managed to get him on the call, or -- Is he able to speak? Renate?

Renate De Wulf: He should be able to because we -- Yeah, we dialed him in, so he should be able to speak.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Did you want to jump in, Rafik, at any point?

Rafik Dammak: No. It's okay. Yeah, it's okay.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks. Okay; Bill Drake next.

Bill Drake: Hi. Well, I understand the views being expressed on both sides, and we obviously don't want anybody to go away feeling like we are not reflecting fully the strongly-held views of the folks who volunteer, if we can avoid it. So perhaps we can split the difference and instead of making it simply a quick informational, maybe make it just a briefer discussion, instead of spending 50 minutes on it, spend 30 or something, and give people opportunity, hopefully, to provide input on a going forward, how might the thing be configured and made useful sort of orientation. Rather than reflecting backward, because that's the only thing I was thinking, but if we don't have -- in forward-looking orientations, if you look, you spend a lot of time arguing about the previous things that we've all cashed out already, online, about how the thing got set up. And I don't know that that would be terribly productive to me.

If others still want to have that conversation, fine we can have it, but it wouldn't be really providing guidance in any -- a very clear way, whereas if we could have a very focused discussion about things we believe of the community the NETMundial Initiative could probably do, and that would be great. The only problem is, I'm not sure whether everybody is really queued up yet to do that. But I'm open-minded if folks want to have a bit more discussion about it. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Thank you for this, Bill. It's Olivier speaking. So just for the avoidance of ambiguities here, were you specifically targeting what you just said, as the NETMundial Initiative, or as strengthening the IGF?
Bill Drake:	NETMundial.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	NETMundial. Okay. So, at the moment, just to remind you all, so we've got this progress report on NETMundial, and then the topic of strengthening the IGF. Marilia has suggested a couple of other topics -- Well, has suggested -- is suggesting cyber security as another topic, there appears a clear interest in having more of an interactive discussion that taps the input from everyone, rather than just having progress reports, although the first idea of having an actual debate on NETMundial Initiative was pushed back due to the fact there would be a lot more information about NETMundial Initiative once the Coordination Committee meets, after the ICANN meeting.

And hence the idea was a progress report we'd probably do, would be enough for that, but certainly strengthening the IGF might be a topic for discussion inviting Janis and -- Janis Karklins and (Inaudible), but there are other topics being suggested in the chat, and one of them is the one from Greg Shatan, and Greg, you have the floor. |
Marilyn Cade:	Olivier, it's Marilyn. I need to drop off; I just need to make a clarifying comment.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Okay.
Marilyn Cade:	An update on the -- an update on the IGF I would just say, I don't think strengthening the IGF is the right topic, and I'm sorry for dropping off. I am Chairing the working group on assessment of the IGF. Also what was proposed was an update on IGF, and the issues that are being addressed including improvements and strengthening the IGF, but an update is very different than just focusing on asking this community. So I apologize for dropping off, I do think an update on the IGF, and how this community relates to the IGF might be appropriate. And let me lend my support to Greg's topics and drop off with apologies. Thanks.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Marilyn, before you just drop off, you did mention earlier that we have to avoid ending up just giving progress reports, and what you are mentioning here, having an update on the IGF after an update from NMI, might just be a set of progress reports at that point, isn't it? Have we lost Marilyn?
Renate De Wulf:	I think she has left the call, Olivier.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Okay. Well, that was a quick one. Let's have Greg Shatan. Greg, sorry for this.
Greg Shatan:	Thank you, Olivier. No problem. I'll just restate what I stated in the chat, was that a possible subject for discussion could be coordinating between what I call ICANN the corporation, and ICANN the community on Internet Governance initiatives. I think we recognize that there often appears to be a disjunction between the efforts of the corporation and the community. And, you know, Fadi has said on more than one occasions that he has gotten ahead of the community, which might imply that we were heading the same place, he just got there more quickly. I don't think that's quite the case, but in any case, it certainly seems that if ICANN the community and ICANN the corporation were aligned in their efforts in the larger Internet Governance space, it could be a more powerful voice, than if it's not. And it seems to me that, kind of a prime subject for this group, as well as for this session to be how we close that gap. Thank you.
Olivier Crepin-Leblond:	Thank you for this, Greg. Olivier speaking. Any comments or thoughts on this? Whilst others collect their thoughts, that's an -- very interesting topic as well it -- I guess, Marilyn, before she dropped off, was in support of this. So you would suggest a discussion at that point, face-to-face discussion in the big room that would basically get people to express their opinion on the coordination between ICANN the corporation and ICANN the community. I gather we would

probably have to have a good moderator that would have to steer the discussion so as to avoid any kind of overall bashing in one way or another, but certainly have something that would be generating a good discussion, and may be helpful to both ICANN the corporation and ICANN the community, and finding out how we can better work together.

Greg Shatan: I think so; exactly. A very good moderator and also a good, perhaps, framework for the session without trying to force it too much to make sure that it stays constructive, and not with just the -- either a venting session or one of -- or the alternative which is a -- you know, a declaration that -- of how things are so much better now, or whatever, you know, it might come from, the official statement. So I think it would need to be frank and candid, as they say, but while -- but at the same time, constructive. And I think a third group that would benefit from putting this in front and having this as a topic would be this group, because I think we need -- as Marilyn stated that, you know, we need to figure out exactly what our role is. Are we, you know, helping to drive the bus on ICANN's appearance to the world and the Internet Governance fora, and I think this would be -- that's what I think. I think it would be good if we could be in that -- in that role, and this would certainly advance that as well. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you for this, Greg. And I see support for your suggestion from Robin Gross on the chat. The question then comes as to how one would put this thing together. But I see Bill Drake with a hand up. So, Bill, you have the floor. We might have lost Bill Drake. You are perhaps mute.

Bill Drake: My apologies. I didn't un-mute. We are not in this process where we started out with two possible topics for the session in Singapore, and now it sounds like we have four, and so I don't know whether we are moving in a manner that's helping the agreement or not. But on this general point I -- it's a topic that obviously has broad resonance across the community, it has also been discussed for quite some time in a lot of different ways, at a lot of different levels. And so I guess my question to Greg would be, how can we do something that wouldn't be the same sort of -- I don't want to say complaining -- but airing the same concerns that have already been aired about strategy panels, or NETMundial, I mean, I don't know what the other examples would be if we are talking about things outside the ICANN environment.

But how could we see this stuff in a way that would be forward-looking, value-adding, and what kinds of initiatives would we -- would be the subject matter of this connect or disconnect between the corporation and the community? The Internet Governance initiatives, what are we talking about? Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks, Bill. Greg, would you like to respond?

Greg Shatan: Sure. I'll respond. My first suggestion was going to be to nominate Bill Drake as Moderator, and then that would answer all the other questions, but perhaps that slipped. But in any case, actually not the worse -- not a bad suggestion, but I'll put that aside. I think that in order to make it constructive, I think, you know, one of the reasons why it's a little bit different than it is in the past, is there have been new occurrences, such as the NETMundial Initiative. But I think that what might be helpful would be to have, first, I think we need to focus on external to ICANN Internet Governance initiative and not -- you know, the issue of what goes on kind of within ICANN is really not the subject. And I think looking at -- one of the things I think that might be helpful would be to look at how other groups or actors within ICANN, the community, are also involved in Internet Governance and trying to see if there can be coordination in that regard.

Perhaps to have representatives, and not only representatives from ICANN the corporation, but also from some of the more active actors, if you will, from various sectors of the community who are active in Internet Governance elsewhere, and see what sort of common ground there could be, and to try to come up with a framework by which ICANN the corporation engages the community and stays in step with -- more in step with the community with regard to its own efforts. So, looking to try to build something and design something out of the meeting, or at least, and that

would be, you know, a potential goal as well as to, you know, recognize where perhaps it's fallen short in the past. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you for this, Greg. It's Olivier speaking. I see Sally Costerton with her hand up. And I'm mindful of the time. We still need to reserve some time for Anne-Rachel to provide us with an update on the CSCD -- sorry on -- Yeah, on the CSCD. So, Sally Costerton, you have the floor. And you might be muted, Sally.

Sally Costerton: (No response heard)

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: We cannot hear Sally Costerton. Oh, just got cut off. Okay. Just coming back to you, Greg; would you think that the -- your suggestion for a topic here, the discussion of coordinating between ICANN the corporation and ICANN the community, should take place in the public session, or should this take place in the working group session that will take place; of course, a smaller room, and likely to have more working group members participating?

Greg Shatan: I think my answer to your question would be, yes. That it should take place in both places. I think that the -- I think that it's a good subject for a public discussion, and for, you know, a broad public input to this. By public, obviously, I'm referring to the ICANN public, but I think that the hard work of it -- moving the hard work of it into this community -- into this community would be a great -- would be a good thing. The alternative, of course, is to form another community -- another committee in the community to do that, and I think that would be redundant, and will also carve our mission even narrower. But I think we are in the right place for it to occur. But I think that kind of, if not rolling it out, at least kind of getting a broad public view on this. And then, you know, starting to deal with tackling it, will be, in this group, not just in the working group session, in Singapore, but in every session of this group. I think it is a valuable and important role that we should be playing. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Greg. I'm going to close the queue because we need to have this update on CSCD. We still have Bill Drake in the queue, and I know that Sally wanted to speak. I don't know whether Sally is back on the call. I can't hear Sally at the moment. So Bill Drake you have the floor.

Sally Costerton: Sorry. I just came back on.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. So let's have you first then, let's have you since you were on before. Sally Costerton, and then Bill Drake, and then we'll move on. Sally, you have the floor.

Sally Costerton: Thank you, Olivier. It's Sally Costerton. Just very quickly in response to the debate about -- the discussion between the community and the corporation; I very much understood that that is partly what this group is for; the CCWG that we are on now, that this should be the focal point of that engagement between the community and the corporation. So maybe we should be discussing in the other meetings how we -- if that isn't working as well as people would like, why not, and what do we do about this?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Sally. Yes, Greg actually did mention that this is something we probably need to be discussing in both meetings. So, absolutely, that's one of the discussions that will take place also in our working group face-to-face. Bill Drake?

Bill Drake: Thank you. My friend Robin and I are having a little backward and forward in the chat, as you can see, we obviously don't quite agree on this particular point. So I guess what I'm saying is, as far as I know Fadi has said publicly and repeatedly say, that having done the NETMundial and the NETMundial Initiative, the intention now is to get to focusing largely on ICANN's 'internal management, and stick to the meeting and all that kind of thing. If that is true, then discussions about whether or not -- how exactly the community and the organization interface with regard to external initiatives, is necessarily going to be on a fat-driven discussion, where we talk, once

again, about NETMundial and whether that as a good thing, and how it was done, and how it was funded, and who got travel grants. And we talk once again about the NETMundial Initiative, and whether that was a good thing, and how it was queued up, and I asked Robin in the chat for an example that wasn't NETMundial and NETMundial Initiative, and she said, Strategy Panels, which we also debated at some lengths last year as to how those were queued up and managed, and so on.

And so I guess I'm just wondering, I mean, if people really want to talk about the stuff, again we can, but I kind of feel like, wow, that's a conversation that's happened in so many ways, so many times, and so many context without yielding greater clarity, and as far as I know, there's the expressed intention that there won't be more of that kind of thing. So, I don't know what the -- I'm having trouble getting my head around what the forward-looking dimension of this would be, and whether we wouldn't simply be going back again, to previous discussions, to previous complaints, previous arguments. In which case, I'm not sure now tractable that will be in terms of yielding solutions, consensus or anything else, in the amount of time available in the public session.

So, I'm just expressing a little hesitation about it. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for this. It's Olivier speaking. So, we've run out of time for the discussion on the topics, what we have got though is a format, and what I will do as a follow up is to email our mailing list with the current four topics suggested, that is the NETMundial Initiative, as one; two, strengthening the idea; three cyber security; four, coordinating between ICANN the corporation and ICANN the community. And if you could all follow up on the mailing list then we can continue this discussion during our next call that will take place next week. Bearing in mind we are one minute away from the official end of this call. We actually did need another 15 minutes or so for Anne-Rachel to speak to us about the CSCD, toward the ICANN contribution to the CSCD. And since we have started about six, seven minutes late perhaps we could have about 10 minutes or so for Anne-Rachel to share this with us. Anne-Rachel Inne?

Anne-Rachel Inne: (Inaudible/audio skip) -- Nigel do the CSCD update. This is one that I think you all know we have been -- that ICANN participated in -- participating in since the beginning of the working group at the Commission of Science and Technology for Development at UN/DESA. So it is basically a working group that is looking at putting a report that we'll also tie in as Nigel would say, the next United Nations General Assembly review of the WSIS+10, plus IGF, and in there for course, part of the ICT and Internet Governance process, ICANN as a participant, has on this report, given a few, let's say, edits and updates on what our part is; some of the things that we are doing, and we hope to see, basically, in the process by next December.

So Nigel will -- I mean, I think Nigel has sent you the file that we submitted to CSCD?

Nigel Hickson: Yeah.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah, that's correct. Yes. It's Olivier speaking. That's right. Go ahead, Nigel.

Nigel Hickson: Good afternoon. Nigel Hickson, speaking here. Yes, so we discussed on our last call, I think, what was taking place in the CSCD, and of course it's not just ICANN staff that are represented there, and Marilyn goes along; Bill Drake and seeing to these meetings. So very intercessional, CSCD has one session every year, but they have an intercessional which was in November. And there were two documents discussed primarily that concerned us. One was the so-called mapping exercise, which was essentially an exercise that had been undertaken by the CSCD Secretariat with some help from consultants. And it was supposed to -- the idea was to map Internet Governance issues in terms of who is doing what, and where these issues were being considered. This was work that had been carried over from previous discussions.

And the second part was the CSCD report, the ICANN -- sorry -- the WSIS+10 report which, as I mentioned earlier, will be submitted into the ECOSOC Committee after the CSCD Meeting in

May this year, and the -- It was the first exercise, the mapping -- the mapping report which we consulted on just before Christmas, and as agreed, I circulated a version, I think on Christmas Eve, or just before that. And thankful for comments from Marilyn, and from Olivier, we then -- I then submitted it to the U.N., UNCTAD on New Year's Eve, on the 31st, just -- Olivier said just before the deadline. But we had quite a lot of input from start as well, but this on mapping, so it's mainly factual, the mapping exercise isn't supposed to be controversial. I mean, it's for some, because some countries obviously dispute that any progress is being made on issues. But it's supposed to be factual and we were trying to express, you know, what has been going on, on issues like IBB-6 (ph), on gTLDs, on IDNs, et cetera.

So that's how it stands. The discussion on these revised maps; that will be the CSCD Secretariat will come up with a revised document, and that will be discussed at the CSCD Meeting in May, and then there will be a decision whether that mapping as such will go forward with the CSCD report to ECOSOC. It might not, it might just be there, it might just stay on the record as a piece of information. Okay. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you for this, Nigel. Olivier, speaking. And Robin Gross asks in the chat, "Where can we see ICANN's contribution to the CSCD. Of course you've shared it with this working group, but is it published anywhere?"

Nigel Hickson: Well, yeah. I mean, I've shared it with the working group. I mean, it's not published yet, it will be published I'm sure, because all the contributions will be published by the -- by UNCTAD. That's normal practice. I mean, I haven't looked for them yet, I imagine they are not published yet because, you know, the 31st December was the deadline, and I expect, you know, they only went back to work this week, sort of thing. But what I'll do is monitor it, you know, on a weekly basis, and once it's published, I can send everyone the link of course.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Nigel, Olivier speaking. Would you be open to having a page -- if this working group, let's say, has a Wiki page that calls all of those types of documents, whatever ICANN sends to various Internet Governance fora, et cetera, that could be a storage of these, so that they would be one location, to be able to see all of these contributions.

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. Nigel here. Yes, I mean of course. I mean, from time to time we submit reports to U.N. bodies, you know, we are asked to give updates. I mean, often these are very factual issues, you know, how many gTLDs have been issued, et cetera. I'm not saying that's boring but, you know, they are of a factual nature, but of course, we can put links to these reports on a Wiki page. They are -- they probably are on a Wiki anyway in the ICANN community but we can put them some ways specific as this Committee wishes. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. I think it would definitely be of help for the ;members of this working group, and of course since this would be a public Wiki page, it could be used by others as well to see -- certainly as a one-stop shop for all of the inputs on the various fora. If I could ask Staff to -- as an action item to just create such a page on our -- in our hierarchy of pages, and then we can probably populate it ourselves and also ask you to populate whatever input it is that you've had most recently.

I realize we are beyond the end of the time, the official time of this call. Are there any questions or comments for Nigel? For Anne-Rachel, of course -- I don't see anyone putting their hand up, and I note that we have lost a number of people. So I would like to thank you all for this.

Any other business, actually, before we close off? No? Okay. Renate, I note in the action items that the one I just now is not recorded in there; is that a -- are you taking in notes offline?

Renate De Wulf: I recorded it on paper.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: On paper, that's why I'm not seeing it. Okay. Thank you.

Renate De Wulf:	You're welcome.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Well, I'd like to thank you all for this. Just as a reminder then, an action for all of us is to follow up on the discussions we've had today with regards to the four topics. Topic one, NMI; topic two, strengthening the IGF; topic three, cyber security; topic four, coordinating between ICANN the corporation and ICANN the community. Nigel Hickson?

Nigel Hickson: Olivier, I'm terribly sorry. Nigel, here. In the submission that we have to make by the end of the week, the one that Sally was talking about notes to the meeting scene, we really ought to give -- well we are asked to give topic headings. Now, of course we can add something, but we do need to give some examples of what's going to be discussed. Now, we can say IGF, we can say NETMundial Initiative, et cetera, and we can add something at a future time, but we do have to say something. So I -- I mean, can I just leave that with you for now? Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you for this, Nigel. And so we'll put a deadline for the discussions as, let's say, Friday the 9th of January, 1200 UTC. When you -- when is the deadline for submitting those forms?

Renate De Wulf: It's Friday.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So we could have Friday afternoon UTC, as being the time when the form will be filled -- or will be sent out?

Renate De Wulf: Yeah. We can try. I just don't want to wait till the last minute either.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Of course. Yeah. Okay. Well let's do Friday, 0100 UTC as being our own deadline for reaching consensus on what we want to discuss in that session; and I'll follow up immediately after this call with an email to the mailing list on this. Any other comments or questions? Being, no one put their hand up, and we are 10 minutes beyond the end of this call, I would like to thank you for being here and for your contribution and look forward to speaking to you next week. Next week we'll have a call -- let's have a Doodle sent out again, for us to find a suitable time for us. I note that Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday are usually the times which work best for people here. Is that correct?

I know, Bill you had mentioned that -- was it Thursday didn't work out? Let's have a Doodle, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday. And with this, I thank you all. And this call is now adjourned. Good-bye.