20150115_ccwgIG

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everybody. This is the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance weekly conference call today, the 15th of January, 2015 at about 18:06 UTC. We have an agenda, which we'll just have two main items, one being the elaboration of the topics of the internet governance public session at ICANN 52 in Singapore, and the second one being the preparation of the face-to-face internet governance session that this working group will have, also in Singapore at ICANN 52.

But before we proceed with the agenda, I'd like to ask if there's any additional items which anybody wishes to add. And I don't hear anyone shouting any additional items, so that's fine and then we can start with the roll call, please.

Renate Dewulf: Okay, Olivier. On the call we have Jordan Carter, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Lynn St. Amour. And from staff we have Nigel Hickson, Alexandra Dans, Anne-Rachel Inne, Ergys Ramaj and myself, Renate Dewulf.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Renate. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Do we have anybody on the call who hasn't been listed in our roll call?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up so let's move on then with our next point in the agenda. And the agenda has disappeared off my screen. I'm not quite sure whether that's supposed to be like this. Renate?

Renate Dewulf: No, it's still on the screen.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. So that's really helpful. I've got network problems on my end.

Alright, I think the first part of the agenda was to look at the action items. And since I haven't got the action items in front of me, let's have a -- no, I do have. The two action items were for Nigel and Renate to submit the request for the internet governance public session. That's been done. And for Renate to create a page in our community wiki for the CSTD ICANN contribution and that I believe was done and shared, etc., etc. Are there any comments on the action items? Seeing no one put their hand up, those are therefore okay with everyone.

Let's move to agenda item number three and that's the topics for the internet governance public session in Singapore. We had a lengthy discussion last week about the different -- the various topics and I sent a follow-up e-mail to the working group with four topics that had been suggested. The first one was to have an update on the NETMundial Initiative; second, strengthening the IGF; third, cybersecurity; and fourth, coordinating between ICANN the corporation and ICANN the community. Now, with the -- the follow-up

discussion that took place on the mailing list showed that there appeared to be little support for the cybersecurity topic and so we reduced it to the NETMundial Initiative and strengthening the IGF and then coordinating between ICANN the corporation and ICANN the community.

So that's the -- that was one round, if you want. And then we went a little bit further. I think that some also mentioned that strengthening the IGF was not something that we could work on right away and, therefore, we reduced the overall list of topics, I think, to the NETMundial Initiative and then the coordination between staff and the community as far as internet governance is concerned.

So that's where we are now and I wanted to sort of reopen the discussion on this and see if we can flesh out maybe a little bit further than this and see if we can be properly aligned on where we're going for this. The suggestion that I made, because we had to file the request for a room and so on late last week, so we've basically gone with the NMI updates, a NETMundial update, with some time spent for a question-and-answer session, Q&A, and then the majority of the hour or the time spent would be the discussion on coordinating between ICANN the corporation and ICANN the community and that would be a full -- that was suggested to be a full discussion.

Now I see Nigel Hickson has put his hand up, so Nigel, you have the floor.

Nigel Hickson: Olivier, good evening; Nigel Hickson. And good evening to everyone. I didn't want to spoil the flow of the dialogue. I just wondered if it would be helpful if I read out what we've submitted at the moment. And this, you rightly say, is a placeholder, but we had to provide the meetings team with something. We could have said we're going to discuss the weather or cricket, but we thought it better to stick to the conversation.

So we've said this internet governance session organized with the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance issues will feature a community-wide discussion on the topic of the NETMundial Initiative, and other current IG initiatives, and an exploration of the framework in which ICANN engages the ICANN community on IG issues. As I said, that's just a placeholder and after the discussion today or whatever, we can amend that. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Nigel.

And so I now open the floor for any feedback; first on the NETMundial issue, whether we should have some -- what kind of interaction we should have, whether we should have -- if you want a lengthy update on this. What exactly are we trying to get out of that session, effectively?

And I seem to have stupid connectivity problems again.

Renate Dewulf: Olivier, Lynn St. Amour has raised her hand.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you for this because I can't see the screen. It's all frozen for some reason.

Lynn, you have the floor; Lynn St. Amour.

Lynn St. Amour: Thank you, Renate and Olivier.

With the NETMundial discussion, I'd just sort of remind everybody the World Economic Forum takes place next week, of which there's meant to be I think quite a number of significant discussions. I'm also on the IGF MAG. And Janis Karklins, who is the Chair

of the MAG, is in fact -- he's been invited to a meeting there next week to discuss the NETMundial Initiative. So I think it would certainly be helpful to get a good debriefing, maybe even going back to the meeting between ICANN and ISOC in late December, as well as a report out of the WEF. And I actually think our purpose with respect to that ought to be to determine -- and maybe some sources at an ICANN meeting in that context, what the ICANN community at large would like to see happen or would perhaps do to support the NETMundial Initiatives (inaudible) support for.

But I think it would be quite helpful to have a fairly thoughtful discussion around that. And I don't think that's been had yet within the ICANN community or within the ICANN circle. That may be wrong. I missed last week's call and I'm just coming back to this group just a few weeks ago as well. So if I'm out of the loop, just appreciate hearing that. But I think a thoughtful substantive discussion on that should help us to at least all sort of be working off the same sheet of music, I guess. I really have no sense as to whether or not there would be consensus or support from the ICANN community, but I think a more substantive discussion is called for.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. Thank you very much for this, Lynn. It's Olivier speaking.

So I think that we've got that pretty much canoed up. It was what was mentioned last week. So having Janis, for example, invited and having a couple of experts, people who follow the NETMundial Initiative closely or who are actually involved in the NETMundial Initiative, we will be able to get a fuller picture of the progress that's been achieved at the WEF. And I'm -- the ICANN meeting comes, I would believe, immediately after the WEF, doesn't it? It's just like a couple of weeks later, or a week later. And therefore, do we have presenters or speakers? I would say that we don't have any yet and we have to send the invitations out. That's the next step forward. So if we can decide on the suggestion for speakers, then the earlier we can send the invites over, the best it is. Yeah. WEF is end of next week so, yeah, that will be two weeks, two or three weeks before the ICANN meeting, which I think is just right for the timing.

Lynn St. Amour: So I mean I think having somebody from the IGF, Janis is he's going to be there, would be good. He could represent the discussions from WEF, but also from the IGF's perspective.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah.

Lynn St. Amour: (Inaudible) about the overlap between the two. And then, yeah, I mean I think the other speakers are probably fairly obvious, but it'll be good if we could get somebody from the NETMundial Initiative leadership. I don't know if that's somebody from Brazil or if that's Fadi himself. And then I think somebody else from the rest of the internet community or technical community at a minimum. And again, I don't know if that's somebody from ISOC or if it's somebody from one of the other organizations. (Inaudible) where the differing views seem to be seated at the moment and I think any representatives from both of them would be appropriate.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Lynn. There was -- the initial idea was to get Janis and to also get -- let's see, who else -- Kathy, also, from ISOC to be on that and perhaps a couple more people as far as NMI is concerned. Perhaps members of the first committee that has been created could be on the panel. But we just don't want to have too many people on there. One of the things that we've asked for in asking for the room is for it to be not a classroom style, but more of a U-shape or a face-to-face type format. And we did not want to have too many presenters and speakers so as to have more of a sense of interaction with the community rather than having a lecture and just a panel of people that just talk to each other and with a very bored audience was the idea.

So just a small number of presenters or speakers would be good. Certainly the name that stuck a couple of times was definitely Janis. And I would see that Kathy Brown also would be great. Who else? And he's not on the call today, but certainly Bill Drake would probably be someone who would be suitable for there. And we also touched -- yes, we also said Wolfgang Kleinwachter was a good point, yes, as he is indeed in the coordinating committee.

So what I suggest, then, is to -- after this call we'll make a list -- well, let's take notes then of the different people. We've got Wolfgang -- Renate, as you taking notes on this?

Renate Dewulf: Sorry, I was on mute. Alex is taking notes.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Alex is taking notes. Okay, excellent. So Wolfgang Kleinwachter is a definite, I think. I haven't seen anyone speak against him being on that panel. Perhaps Janis Karklins. Trying to think of (inaudible) that we've had here. Well, we'll start with these two and we'll also add -- yeah, Kathy from ISOC and perhaps three people -- four people. Let's have a fourth person. Any suggestions? I can't hear anyone.

Lynn St. Amour: Should we have -- Olivier, should we have somebody from the NETMundial Initiative, either Fadi or somebody from Brazil?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I guess, yeah, that probably would be a good idea. It's just that I don't want to -- yeah. Okay, let's have someone from the NETMundial Initiative itself, although I'm not quite sure how the whole thing works because there were these new committees that were announced, but I'm not quite sure how the committees relate to the organizational part.

Lynn St. Amour: Yeah. I'm not sure, either, but it would seem to be at least a little awkward for us to have a session on this without having somebody who can sort of speak--.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah.

Lynn St. Amour: Officially what the current state of the initiative is.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That's a good point, Lynn. So let's do that, then. Let's have -- is it Javier from (inaudible)? Ambassador from (inaudible), I believe on this.

Lynn St. Amour: He is.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: And that brings it up to four people. And then the rest is just going to have to be a good interaction with the audience and have people in the audience ask questions and these questions being answered, both by maybe other people in the audience, but also by the people on the panel. And I see here from Ergys that -- Ergys Ramaj mentions in the chat Wolfgang is a special ambassador to the initiative, effectively serving as the spokesperson. So that would be absolutely perfect to get answer from him.

And so that's the first question. The second thing being how much time are we going to get on that session. I know that, Nigel, you've filed the request for the room and I'm not quite sure how much time you asked for. Was that 60 minutes or 90 minutes?

Nigel Hickson: Yeah, thank you, Olivier. Nigel Hickson. We asked for -- well, we asked for a maximum of 90 minutes so it will be between 75 and 90 minutes. So between 75 minutes and 90 minutes, depending on when the slot occurs and we can come back to that later. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you for this. So let's not then talk minutes, let's just talk percent of the whole session, percentage of time for the whole session. Are we looking -- and this is an open question for everyone on the call today. Are we looking at having 50% on NMI and other internet governance and 50% of the allocated time on the topic of relations between staff and the community as for as internet governance topics are concerned, or should we put more time allocated to the second topic and less time for the NMI and internet governance topic? I guess I'll turn also to my colleague, John Carter, on this since he is a co-chair.

I guess there's -- everyone has their own thoughts on this one. Mistimed my question. Okay. The question is, with regards to the allocation of time, if we have two topics during the public session, the first topic is the NETMundial Initiative and internet -- and maybe other (inaudible) of internet governance. The second one is the relationship between the internet governance -- well, ICANN staff and ICANN the community on the topic of internet governance. Do we put more time -- well, do we divide our time equally between the two topics or do we emphasize one topic more than another, in which case I was going to suggest less time on the NETMundial Initiative, more time on the relationship between staff and community.

So there's agreement from John Carter, a slight emphasis on relationship, too. Any other thoughts here? I realize there's not that many people on there. NMI's a little slower than expected. Okay. So let's say that we can probably have 40% of the time -- let's put it for the time being 40% of the time will be on NMI and 60% of the allocated time will be on the relationship issue.

And certainly -- I mean the reason why I suggest more time on the relationship issue is because I feel that it is a source of -- certainly it has the potential to be a source of tension and that has been shown in the past to be a source of tension when things have happened and communication hasn't worked out too well and so there was a bit of a rift going on between one and the other and lack of coordination between the two. If we can certainly improve on that, that will probably help everybody, staff included and community included as well. We need to define the way forward on that.

Okay. So that's the -- as far as timing between those two are concerned. The next question is do we need to invite anyone for the second topic, the relationship between staff and community on internet governance topics. I would imagine that we would have -- well, obviously Nigel would be there and Rachelle as well. Perhaps should we invite Tarik to be there as the person in charge of internet governance on this? And perhaps a few vocal community members on there. I can certainly -- and they're not on this call, but I can definitely imagine that Marilyn Cade might be one of the people who would wish to spend some time explaining her point of view. Perhaps a couple more people. I'm open to suggestions.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so -- okay. We -- as far as that is concerned, because it is an internal thing, I think we probably have less problems inviting people closer to the time. Perhaps we can discuss this on the mailing list and we'll have some suggestions then. Perhaps Sally Costerton is a good idea. Yes, that's a good point as well, Nigel. Thank you.

So, I think we've got that public session -- we have a good idea of what the public session is going to do. And of course we'll have a good idea of the people that we need to invite for it.

Are there any questions or comments regarding this? Because we might wish to then move on to the second of our main topics.

Robin Gross from the community. Yes, that's a good point.

What I'll do as a follow up -- that's an action item, perhaps, for me to send an e-mail to the mailing list and ask for suggestions for speakers for the topic of relationship between community and staff on internet governance topics.

Okay. So that's one thing. Alexandra, you're taking the notes off line are you, Alex? Yes. Okay, fine, because I can't see them up here on the action items box.

Alright, any other comments on the first topic here, elaborate the topics for the IG public session? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Nigel, since you've asked for the room and so on, do you think we have enough now to build this? Nigel Hickson?

Nigel Hickson: Yeah. Thank you very much, Olivier. And certainly we're in your hands, of course, in terms of content. I just wanted to mention the difficulty of finding the slot. Marilyn, and I think others on the call last week, rightly said that the objective should be to not interfere with any GAC sessions because, ideally, we would want government -- GAC representatives at this IG session. And also that it shouldn't conflict with any of the main IANA transition sessions, of which there are several as many of you will be aware. And so trying to find the exact timing for this session has proved difficult. And we have -- we will obviously have a time, but we haven't secured it yet and the meetings team are going to come back to me with some options. And if they do that, then I'll certainly share that with you, Olivier, and you can share it with the group as you see appropriate or whatever or take a decision. But I just wanted to note that we are aware that we don't want to clash with other sessions, but there are issues. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much for this--.

Marilyn Cade: Excuse me, can I--.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Nigel. And I can hear Marilyn Cade now. So Marilyn, you have the floor.

Marilyn Cade: Oh, actually I was just announcing myself. That was the only purpose of my intervening at this time.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Marilyn. I had already been told via other channels that you had arrived.

Marilyn Cade: Okay.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Just to bring you quickly up to date, we've looked at just agenda item number three, elaborating the topics for the internet governance public session at ICANN 52, retaining two topics; one, the NETMundial Initiatives and any other updates in internet governance, but probably just NETMundial and IGF. But it would be very NETMundial Initiative focused and we would have several people who would be invited to speak about this. Since the World Economic Forum is taking place at the end of this month, it seems like the right time to get a proper update and to get -- give the ability for the community to ask important questions regarding what this means for the ICANN community when we all meet face to face there.

So that's one. And the second one -- if you'll just let me finish, the second one is the topic about he relationship between the community and ICANN staff on internet governance matters. And so the whole session being either 90 minutes or 75 minutes, depending on what kind of slot we get. We looked at a percentage of time spent on each of those two topics, with a 40% time spent on the NMI and 60% spent on the relationship

between community and ICANN.

So that's the quick update on this. And there was a suggestion that you might wish -- or I suggested that you might wish to be in the -- specifically speaking in the second topic, the relationship with the community and ICANN staff on internet governance; along with other people, of course.

Marilyn Cade: Alright, thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Any response or comments on this?

Marilyn Cade: Just very, very quickly. I think I would just add one word to the second topic and that would be "internet governance ecosystem" rather than just "internet governance" because I think that's what we're actually talking about. And we have -- and then, secondly, yes, I am very interested in that topic.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you for this, Marilyn. Why would you add ecosystem to internet governance? Because I thought maybe that topic would be sort of wider if we just said on all matters of internet governance so -- or matters of internet governance which ICANN is involved with.

Marilyn Cade: Interesting. So let me respond. It's Marilyn Cade. I think that's exactly the reason I added that word, because I don't want this to be just about the -- and of course others should speak up on this, but I don't want this to be just about the internet governance policy issues that are addressed at the IGF, but also the broader issues and locations today where internet governance is being debated and, under that, where CIR and ICANN is being debated. And that, to me, would be more inclusive, but my goal was just to be more inclusive. So with those (inaudible) follow-ups, for instance, would be clearly in that broader term. And ICANN will be very -- the issues related to CIR, which include some of the functions that ICANN performs, are very much a topic there.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. So ecosystem -- if I understand, ecosystem is just there to broaden the term internet governance.

Marilyn Cade: That was my intention, to make sure we would be -- yes.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay, understood. Thank you. It's Olivier speaking for the transcript. I think we've got -- we've captured that. Are there any other comments that you or anyone else on the call might wish to make? And if there are none, then we can move to agenda item number four.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. So now we have agenda item number four and that's our face-to-face working group session at ICANN 52. And we have to really look now at the topics that we wish to discuss face to face and that is something we haven't really discussed yet, or even addressed on our previous call.

So I open the floor, I guess, for a quick brainstorm, if we can say there is a brainstorm with that few people on the call, but a quick brainstorm as to what we would wish to address when we meet face to face.

I hear some distant sound, but I'm not sure this is for this call. I would imagine it is not. Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. In our face-to-face meeting, and I apologize I was late, I think we actually need to also spend time on that second topic in our face-to-face meeting. Okay? We'll be hearing from the community in the face-to-face meeting, but we need to also hear from ourselves, I think.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay, thank you. So that's one potential topic. And let's make a list of them then. Any other suggestions for the face-to-face topics?

Lynn St. Amour: So Olivier, it's Lynn. I guess I would wonder -- and again, I'm still somewhat new to this particular forum. Would that not -- maybe the question's to Marilyn. Would that not be the same for the other topic as well, the major internet governance initiatives, whether that's IGF or NETMundial or--?

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn--.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: We could -- yeah, Marilyn, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Lynn, thank you for asking this. Marilyn speaking. I'd really like to limit the amount of time -- and I guess there's a tired tone in my voice. I'd really like to limit the amount of time that is spent saying the same thing or a different version of the same thing. And I do hear different versions of the same thing over and over and over. If the -- if we are hearing about it, because we are the CCWGIG, established to try to provide some guidance then, yes, I'd be open to that. But I haven't seen a lot of openness to actually listening to it. I regret that. But I guess the question is, what's the timing? Are we having our face-to-face meeting before or after our public meeting? If the face-to-face meeting is after the public meeting, then we should be trying to formulate guidance and advice. If we're -- if it's before, is the purpose just for us to hear it before everybody else does, which may be okay?

Lynn St. Amour: Yeah, I don't know. If I can respond, Olivier. And I appreciate I didn't put my hand up. It's (inaudible) not very many of us.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Sure. Go ahead, Lynn.

Lynn St. Amour: (Inaudible.) But I guess my question is do we see the work of this committee as either helping to, I don't know, charter, structure, energize, drive work from the rest of the community? Because I don't know.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: It's Olivier--.

Lynn St. Amour: I mean that's an honest question. If so, then I think that that would determine what we actually do with that agenda item, which is it shouldn't be the same peaceful thing, the same old things at that (inaudible).

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Lynn. It's Olivier speaking. And I think we can look back at our charter, which gives the aims of what would this cross-community working group does. My take from the charter and from our previous discussions is it really would act as a channel for coordinating the community inputs regarding internet governance and give a voice, if you want, to the community on all those matters of internet governance, something which hasn't been the case in ICANN. And so really, for the face-to-face meeting, I would hope would be more one of discussing issues and planification and perhaps taking stock of things than having updates, which we would be hearing at the same time also in the public forum.

Certainly the meeting we had in Los Angeles was a little bit different because we needed to have quite a few updates and we hadn't had those. There was so much going on simultaneously. Now we seem to have decided to go on specific topics and follow specific topics. Still many of them around, but there are a few things which I think will need to be done when we are face to face.

One of them is going to have to be the cleaning up of our -- well, not even cleaning up. I don't think it's cleaning up, but certainly the understanding what our charter says and how our membership is organized. That's a bit of an internal matter for the working group because we started out before a charter was drafted. A charter now exists, but we are still upgrading somehow without the -- any formal appointments and so on. And would you believe it, the charter which we have had all the SOs and ACs agree to, or the majority of SOs and ACs agreeing to, is actually maybe one that is more of a strict charter with regards to membership.

Then some of the more recent cross-community working groups. And of course I'm speaking here about the one on accountability and the one on IANA's stewardship transition. And those new charters have now got this membership which is open to all, with participants that are able to be on the calls and so on and where the actual membership only accounts if there is a vote or such, whilst the charter we have is a little bit more strict and provides X number of people per SO and AC. And then you might have -- you could have observers on the calls, but they also have to be appointed by the respected SOs and ACs. And that's a discussion I've had with the other two chairs on this and it's been a little bit of a question mark on that.

So I would say certainly having an internal discussion on the charter is the -- a quick one. Relationship between community and ICANN staff is another one that we need to discuss. But having updates like the NETMundial Initiative we can probably reserve to the wider audience.

Lynn, I don't know how you feel about this, so whether--.

Lynn St. Amour: No, I'm just--.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I was a little bit lengthy in my response now, but--.

Lynn St. Amour: Listening (inaudible).

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Apologies for being lengthy in my response but -- so are there other topics for the face-to-face meeting, other things we need to be working out for ourselves?

One thing I was going to suggest, perhaps, is to set -- well, look at our calendar of forthcoming activities and perhaps plan -- when we are face to face plan for the next set of sessions and topics until we reach the June ICANN meeting. It would be a good idea, perhaps, since we will be face to face to plan for these things.

Are there no -- these are just things I haven't discussed with Jordan, nor with Rafik yet, but absolutely open to being contradicted or told this is absolute rubbish or told that you're in agreement as well, who knows.

Marilyn Cade: Olivier?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, Marilyn Cade.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. I would support that we reserve sometime for planning for the BA meeting and that we enter a request, if agreed, during the face-to-face meeting to the ICANN staff at that time for a specific meeting spot. There will be significant turnout, at least from the Latin-American government and from the Latin-American broader community. And if we're able to publicize a date and a time and stick to it, I think that would be very helpful.

I took note of Nigel -- of someone saying there would be several IANA sessions. I hope there won't be several IANA session. There should be one major IANA session. I think sometimes there's a lot of enthusiasm about a lot of -- about multiple sessions, but the impact on the broader schedule and the exclusion then of timeslots that are suitable for community-wide topics also becomes a concern. So I would support yes, let's spend some time on planning toward BA, just a limited amount of time, but some time. And let's include with that a question to the membership of the working group about a specific timeslot.

I'll wrap up by saying that I think I would like to see us revise the charter to allow for observers without they're being nominated for participants or whatever we call them. I think it's a little unfair to treat this working group, which is we meant well, but this working group is a very, broad general interest working group and to be exclusive and exclusionary does not seem to me to be in the spirit of the working group.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah, thank you for this, Marilyn. I agree with you with regards to the discussion on the charter. With regards to planning the June ICANN meeting, could I ask Nigel to perhaps enlighten us with regards to planning for specific slots. If it's -- I mean my concern, having been involved with the planning of slots and so on in one of my previous jobs, supposedly, the slots were actually only given a few weeks ahead of the meeting and so it was impossible to actually set up a specific timeslot several months in advance.

Nigel, is this how this works?

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Yes, unfortunately it does. I mean I'm not suggesting things are impossible in any particular instance, but the way it usually works is that the, if you like, the broad time -- the broad agenda is initiated about a couple of months before the meeting by the meetings team, because they obviously have to decide the configuration of the rooms and how many rooms are going to be available, etc., etc., in Buenos Aires.

So although we can, if you like, flag to them in advance that we'd like to choose the afternoon or whatever, we can't definitively say we'll have a choose the afternoon. And again, if we -- as Marilyn said quite rightly at the last meeting, if we want to have a request that we don't class with the GAC, then obviously we can't determine that until we know the GAC agenda. The GAC agenda this -- the GAC timing for this particular meeting is way different from what it was for the previous meetings. I assume that they wouldn't be meeting on Tuesday because they didn't meet in -- on Tuesday in LA, but they are meeting on Tuesday and the only day they're not meeting is Monday. So sometimes these things are difficult.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks for this, Nigel.

So Marilyn, I mean would you insist to have -- to already discuss planning the June ICANN meeting in BA, or could we just maybe perhaps set the topics, but not actually look at the details for the slots and things? I guess Nigel being part of this working group is well aware of what our needs are and what we're looking for.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. I'll respond very quickly. It's Marilyn. We could work on topics. I think

staff need to remember Tuesday is constituency based, not an open day for meeting planning. And that doesn't change whether the GAC meets or not. So let's not lose track of the rest of the community and the commitments to the rest of the community. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Have we lost Marilyn or were you finished?

Marilyn Cade: I'm done.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Oh, okay; fine. Sorry. No, I just thought you had stopped in mid-sentence, but that's fine. It's Olivier speaking.

Okay. Let's then leave that in Nigel's hands. Obviously, I would imagine that there would be an internet governance session, a public internet governance session in Buenos Aires as well, wouldn't there be, Nigel?

Nigel Hickson: Well, yes. I mean I don't see any reason why not. As long as the one that we're planning in Singapore goes okay, then we could use the same format or whatever you think is appropriate. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. And one question then that Marilyn mentioned earlier. Are you aware with regards to the timings whether the public session would take place before the working group meets face to face, or whether the working group meets first and then the public session takes place?

Nigel?

Nigel Hickson: Sorry, Olivier. I was going to ask, actually, Renate, if she could confirm the Cross-Community Working Group slot. I thought that was on the -- I thought it was on a Monday, but I'm not sure, in which case it would be before the IG session, probably. But perhaps Renate can confirm.

Renate Dewulf: I can only confirm tentatively that the -- we may have this working group session face to face on Monday at 16:30. But until the schedule is published, it's not guaranteed 100%.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you, Renate. And when is the public session likely to be? Is that on Monday as well or--?

Renate Dewulf: Nigel?

Nigel Hickson: Well, we had highlighted Monday as a possibility because the GAC are not meeting on Monday and therefore it fulfills one of the objectives we've set out. But it's whether -- the difficulty was that the Monday is also set aside for some of the high-interest topics. And some of the high-interest topics occupied the larger rooms and we would need one of the larger rooms because we would, I think, probably attract roughly 150 people. That's what we've attracted before. And with an attractive agenda that you've outlined, you might attract even more. So that's one of the difficulties. So it could be in the -- on the Monday just after the CCWG meeting or something or it could be another day. And as I said, we're in the hands of the meeting teams to an extent.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks, Nigel. As soon as you know, then please let us know because I think -- it's Olivier speaking. I was going to suggest penciling in another possible topic, which is actually a follow up, taking stock of what was said in the public meeting. So if our face-to-face -- if the working group face-to-face meeting takes place after the public meeting, it would definitely be interesting to take stock of what was said. If on the other hand the working group face-to-face meeting takes place before the public meeting, then it might

be important to prepare a last small discussion about preparing the public meeting.

Nigel Hickson: (Inaudible.)

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: There we go, yeah. Excellent. Thank you for this. So that's another suggestion or another set of suggestions for this.

Any other comments or suggestions for topics for our face-to-face session in Singapore?

I don't hear anyone shout their name out or I don't see any hands up, so I think that's all we have for the time being. I can't think of any other things for the time being that we would wish to discuss face to face. What we'll do is to share this with our community -- with the mailing list in the moment. And really, I think that's it for today.

Any other business?

I don't see anyone else. No other business from anyone? Okay. So thanks to all of you for having attended this call. I'm sorry it was a little bit short, but at the same time I think we've got answers or potential answers for what we're going to do in Singapore and that was really the plan for it. So I thank you for your input.

And the next call we will have, I believe, next week. Renate, are we going to go through a rotation or what's the plan on this?

Renate Dewulf: If everybody agrees, I suggest we keep the Thursday and we rotate along three timeslots, morning UTC, mid-afternoon UTC and early evening UTC.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. And what timeslot are we likely to have next week then?

Renate Dewulf: Would the morning slot be okay, around 9 or 10 AM UTC?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: On Thursday, did you say?

Renate Dewulf: Yeah.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I think that might work for me, yes. That would work for me. I'm not sure--.

Marilyn Cade: I'm just -- sorry, I'm just doing the quick check. I -- at 11:00 -- Thursdays at 11:00 I'm booked, but I'm just doing a quick check.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: And Jordan, would that work for you?

It should be okay with you. Okay, fine.

Marilyn Cade: It should also allow Rafik to be able to join if we do it around 10 UTC.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: 10 UTC. Okay, that's fine then. That's great. So let's do that. The next call will be next week at about -- morning UTC on Thursday. And with this, thanks again to all of you and have a good morning, good afternoon and good evening. This call is now adjourned. Thank you. Bye-bye.