

20150122_ccwg_IG

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. This is the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance Weekly Conference Call, we are at the 22nd of January, 2015, and the time is 10:09 UTC. Let's start with the roll call, please, Renate.

Renate De Wulf: Okay, Olivier. On the call we have Alain Bidron, Olivier Crepin Leblond, Nigel Hickson, Alexandra Dans, Anne-Rachel Inne, Sally Costerton; and myself, Renate DeWulf.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Renate. Do we have anybody else on the call who we haven't just listed now? No one else? Okay. Well, that's a very reduced group today due to various factors, perhaps the call being a bit early, and at the same time, also being a very busy day for most people. There are a lot of other calls following this one.

Now, today we are just going to look at the finalization of the two agendas we have for Singapore, the public session first, and the face-to-face working group session. The agendas have been published and sent over to the mailing list, and I would imagine that this is going to be quite a fast -- well, a pretty short discussion. It looks like with the number of people who have joined us today, we are not going to have that much -- that many changes made to the agendas.

Now, first, the agenda number one is the action items from the last call; they are all complete that was for a need to send an email to the mailing list, toward the suggestion on speakers, and also to share the proposed face-to-face topics. So we have those two parts, agenda item number two is the finalization of the public session. We've now been told that this takes place from 11:15 to 12:30, so that's 75 minutes on Thursday the 12th of February, which means that the public session will take place after the working group face-to-face session.

Just as a summary; there are two proposed topics, with an allocation of time of 30 minutes for the first topic, and 45 minutes for the second topic. The first topic being, effectively, a discussion on the network -- the NETMundial Initiative, and other Internet Governance updates; and the second topic being a discussion on the relations between staff and the community regarding the matters of the Internet Governance ecosystem topics; so on the first topic, the panel discussion; there were three -- sorry, four suggested people for the Panel; Wolfgang Kleinwächter being the Special Ambassador to the NETMundial Initiative. Janis Karklins, Kathy Brown, from the Internet Society, and Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca.

The idea was to have quite a small Panel and a very much -- well, lots of interaction between the panel and the audience. And the idea also, here, was to have the room in a U-shape fashion, set up in some kind of U-shape so as to facilitate the interaction between the audience and the panelists, and facilitate discussion, and stimulate the discussion going on. We have a couple of open questions at the moment. First, who should be the moderator, or moderators, or facilitators, and then perhaps fleshing out a detailed agenda, but I think with a few number of people we have here, we'll try and go as far as we can on that.

So let's start the discussion on the NETMundial Initiative, and other Internet Governance topics. And Sally Costerton has just asked the first question which was; whether the invitation should be sent from the Co-Chairs of the Working Group, or from Staff. I would personally think it's probably easier for Staff just to send the invites out.

Sally Costerton: Yes. Okay. Sally Costerton for the record. Olivier, we can do that. We probably should wait until we've got -- I mean, at the moment we could send them a hold-the-diary (ph) kind of invite, and make sure that they are actually available, because I think this will be probably the biggest issue, if his (inaudible) to could join us. But obviously I think they want to have an agenda, a more detailed agenda as soon as possible, because they want to know, you know, what they are expected to talk about. I don't think we are ready to give them that brief at the moment. The best we can do at the moment is say; we'd like you to be on this Panel, can you just hold this time.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Thank you very much, Sally, for this. It's Olivier speaking. I think that's probably, indeed, that's the right to go forward. If we don't manage to get a much more detailed agenda now, what I suggest is that I can probably work with the other two Co-Chairs, and we can sort of put something together, share it with the mailing list and within a week or so then have a more fleshed-out agenda. Certainly what you mean by sending and asking for their availability at the time itself, I think that's very important.

The call -- sorry -- the face-to-face -- The meeting will take place on Thursday, and I'm looking at the agenda at the moment. That clashes with the CWG Stewardship questions and answers. I also see the -- our SSAC Advisory update, At-Large (inaudible) monthly meeting, Registrar's Across-Field Address Validation Working Group, that's going to be a small meeting. So there are a few things, and it also clashes with parts of the GAC sessions, so -- Again, we might not be able to get everyone there, and certainly I couldn't -- I'm not sure whether Janis Karklins will be in the GAC sessions or not, but we have to keep that in mind.

Nigel, I just heard your voice, Nigel Hickson.

Nigel Hickson: Yes, sorry. Nigel Hickson for the records. Good morning. Yes, so we had a choice of basically two sessions, for the public sessions for the meeting team, and this session on the Thursday was the least-clashing session I -- you know, clearly one can't avoid some clashes, and the GAC is meeting all the time. But at least the GAC is meeting on sessions where some of them might be able to attend this session as well. In terms of alerting potential, you know, panel members, also we can do that, as Sally has said, and it's quite possible that some of the people might not be there the whole time so we ought to give them notification as early as possible if we want them. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Nigel. Olivier speaking. Speaking of the room actually, it's going to take place in the Sofia (ph) Room. Do you have any indication as to whether we will be able to have that U-shape setup?

Nigel Hickson: I mean if we requested the U-shaped setup, as we discussed -- this is Nigel -- on a previous call, and I'm (inaudible) meeting stage, but we've got no reason to think that shouldn't be possible, they'll all say, we'll do what we can to facilitate that.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks very much, Nigel. Olivier speaking. And I do note, actually, from the schedule at the moment, the time before the break appears to not be allocated; so that room seems to be vacant, which might point to the fact that it could be quickly set up, if it was not, in this U-shaped fashion.

Are there any questions or comments from anyone on the call regarding the -- just the actual logistics? I'm not seeing anyone put their hand up, so now we have to think of the moderators or facilitators, and just on the side, I have just noticed -- I've received a small note from Rafik Dammak, who is actually in the subway at the moment, so he's unable to join the call,

unfortunately. Yes, moderators and facilitators, are there any suggestions? In the past the public session was moderated by someone chosen by -- was it a staff member? I actually can't remember -- Who was the moderator for the previous session? Was it --?

- Nigel Hickson: What we did in the past, Olivier -- Nigel Hickson speaking -- is typically, a Board Member who was kind enough do the moderation in the past, but (inaudible). Yeah. Thank you.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Nigel. So the question mark, perhaps a Board Member. That's a good point. I see Marilia Maciel has put her hand up, Marilia, you will have the floor.
- Marilia Maciel: Thank you so much, Olivier. Can you hear me?
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, Marilia. I can hear you, and maybe slightly louder, you are a little bit faint.
- Marilia Maciel: Okay. Thank you. I'm on my mobile (ph) now. This is Marilia for the records. I just would like to point out --
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Marilia, it's too loud now.
- Marilia Maciel: Yeah?
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: It's too loud now.
- Marilia Maciel: Sorry. Sorry, Olivier. I just would like to point out that we had the first meeting of the Coordination Council of the NETMundial Initiative last week -- the beginning of this week -- and I think that we haven't (ph) taken into account very much in the programming of the session, the Coordination Council that has been put in place. So maybe when we think about moderators, maybe we should go through the list of people that are in the Council. I know that there are some people that have expertise and experience in moderating sessions there, and maybe it's an option for us to choose as moderators. Even for the (inaudible) people to be able to update us on what is going on, and ask the right questions from the panelist, because they know how the discussions are being skewed.
- And just to point out as well that we do not have an official Chair, but the facilitation of the first meeting was made by Nora; so I don't know if we should invite her as a speaker or not, but it would be interesting to have her there, so we should make sure that at least she participates in the session two (ph), and make an invitation for her to be there. Thank you.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much for this, Marilia. By Nora, do you mean Nora Abusitta?
- Marilia Maciel: Yes. Exactly, Olivier.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you. So we have Board Member or someone from the Coordination Council, or Nora Abusitta. Let's also, indeed, have Nora listed so that she -- we can make sure that she's going to be in that session A quick question for you, Marilia. Ambassador Fonseca is likely to be in Singapore, is he?
- Marilia Maciel: Yes. As far as I know he's going to be there, but I have not spoken to him in a while, so we should better confirm that.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks very much. All right, so as I said, Board Member, Coordination Council -- someone from the Coordination Council, or from the NETMundial Coordination Council or Nora Abusitta. Do you envisage, or does anyone here envisage that we could maybe have two different sets of moderators for topic one and for topic two, since these -- the topics are very different from each other?

Sally Costerton: Sally Costerton, for the records. Yes. I think so. I would suggest that, because they are completely different.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks for this, Sally. Olivier speaking. So, I think we've got -- Okay, so two moderators would be okay. So then, I guess we can then look at the second topic. I just can't imagine that a more detailed agenda than what we currently have at the moment, on the first topic, the idea, and the way I've listed it here, is for each speaker to be speaking for a maximum time of about two minutes, which usually translates to three minutes, which makes 10 to 15 minutes for the panelists, and then we'll have about 50 (ph) minutes for a discussion with the audience and no doubt there will be lots of questions coming from the audience. I don't think we'll have any trouble with filling that 30 minutes slot at all.

I think that's a pretty loose agenda, but I guess each person could be -- each panelist could be asked to provide their perspective on NETMundial primarily. If you wish to discuss other Internet Governance initiatives that relate somehow to NETMundial, or perhaps updating us as to what discussions have taken place at the World Economic Forum, that will probably be of help as well. But beyond that, I can't imagine having some agenda that's even more structured than this. -- I mean are there any suggestions as to -- points that we should, perhaps, specifically ask of the panelists?

Sally Costerton: Olivier, it's Sally, again. Sorry, I'll put my hand up.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Go ahead.

Sally Costerton: Okay. I would suggest that we just need to give them guidance as to whether -- you know, the degrees to which they want to be talking about the NETMundial Initiative, and which other Internet Governance subjects do they want to raise, because this is a surprisingly short session in my view. I think -- I'm very surprised that we are balancing the time like this, particularly as we have the face-to-face CCWG Meeting. My sense is that this topic one will probably take almost all the time, and you know, that will -- it will be helpful to think about the other Internet Governance topics that we want to see raised in this session, and to be clear about whether or not we'd like any of these individual panelists to comment specifically on those.

But it's two different points I'm making, sorry. One is about I don't see how we can see how we can do this session in half-an-hour with speakers and response. I just don't think it will happen. And the second one is, you know, we should probably give them a share on which other Internet Governance topics the CCWG thinks it wants to have had. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Sally. And I'll -- I'm taking notes at the moment, I think what we'll have to do is to share these points with the working group on the mailing list. I entirely agree with you, 30 minutes is a very short amount of time. I was hoping we would have had more than 75 minutes during our slot for that. I understand that this is the new way the slots are being shortened a little bit, to allow for people to change rooms, and sort of not have back-to-back sessions where the room is taken up by a previous group. So this is very short indeed.

Okay, are there any other points regarding the first topic? And Alain Bidron is also adding in the chat, that 30 minutes is short for NMI, and especially if we deal with NETMundial Initiative and other Internet Governance topics; that sounds like really not even touching the top layer at that point we are barely touching it.

So, okay, let's then look at topic two. Now, it might well be that we change the order around, or we make both topics 50% of the time. When the most we could get, perhaps, would be 45 minutes for NETMundial and 30 minutes for the relation between staff and community. Now, this is -- the second topic is effectively -- and I don't know why we've got -- regarding IG ecosystem topics, I guess, yeah, Internet Governance topics, or ecosystem topics at least makes it a bit wider than just Internet Governance topics.

We need to think of invitations for the people to be on the Panel. I think that on the ICANN side, so ICANN Staff Members put a whole list here. So Nigel, Anne-Rachel, Sally, perhaps Tarek, I was going to mention, perhaps, Nora as well. But again, this is such a short amount of time, we might have to see if -- and we are lucky to have many of these people on the call today; see if there's going to be a delegation of tasks here, as to how to best cover the various -- the various IG Governance topics, as far as the Staff perspective is concerned.

Sally Costerton?

Sally Costerton:

Sally, for the record. To answer that, I think it would need -- I am very unclear as to which topics the community group wants to cover, and that will drive (inaudible) topics. The Internet Governance -- this is an Internet Governance Working Group, therefore, obviously we are limiting our discussion to Internet Governance issues, and the lead executive for that at ICANN, as you know, is Tarek. So I think, you know, this is something that, you know, we can discuss in the staff group, but it really depends what the -- I'm still unclear as to why -- what the group wants to achieve in this discussion with the open session, and which tells me (inaudible), I'm not disagreeing with it; I'm just genuinely unclearly; and I think depending on the topics you want to cover, that would drive who is on the Panel.

But I take your point, that you need a -- that would be far too many people for a panel because we would not have time. So any (inaudible) that you can give us on that will be extremely helpful because I'm very, very unclear.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:

Thank you very much for this. Now I'm just trying to think, myself, of the exact wordings that Marilyn Cade came up with in suggesting this, and I think several people have suggested that we also had Bill Drake who has also spoken about this. I think that essentially the question is, today, how is Internet Governance -- how are Internet Governance topics or decisions by ICANN driven? What is the place of the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance in the overall ICANN landscape, and what are the needs of the community with regards to that working group?

I imagine this is quite a wide set of questions that are being asked, but these are questions that I have heard of by many people, some have asked as to whether Internet Governance topics are Board-driven, Staff-driven, community-driven, and I think that part of the discussion here, stems from historical matters where, for example, the NETMundial Initiative started out as more a top-down, Fadi, Board, initiative, with the community being informed afterwards, and there were concerns at the time that this was, in theory, not the way that ICANN was working. Now, that said, this could have just been a glitch on the horizon, and things have, since, very much improved, and I think that session could indeed provide the ability to explain how the initiatives are driven, and perhaps find some consensus as to how things actually work.

I do recall that Marilyn, in Los Angeles, I think it was, did say something during the public forum, that was not taken very well, and that of course just had Marilyn speaking in her own sense, in her own capacity, that everything should be absolutely community-driven, and so effectively ICANN shouldn't do anything -- and I'm just paraphrasing here by the way -- ICANN shouldn't do anything without the consent or the drive from the community. I'm not quite sure that on topics of Internet Governance which evolved very quickly indeed, and which are mostly external to ICANN, this is the right way to proceed, and I would imagine there are -- there's probably a way to enhance communication between the community, the Board and staff on these topics. And perhaps this session could be the right time to explore this, especially with regards to the needs of the community, the ICANN community.

So that doesn't just focus on the working group members interacting with staff, I think there's a good interaction, very good interaction between staff and working group members, but it would be interesting to hear from the community what needs there are out there, with regards to Internet

Governance and how the community can influence ICANN, as far as Internet Governance is concerned; so outside of the ICANN sphere.

I might have rambled a little bit here, I'm afraid I'm just making this up as I go along, but that's my understanding of it. Sally Costerton, you have the floor. And I note that, in the meantime Bill Drake has joined us. And Ergys Ramaj as well, has joined us. So, Sally, you have the floor. And you might be muted at the moment.

Sally Costerton: Sorry. I was. Can you hear me now?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, we can.

Sally Costerton: Thank you. Sally Costerton, for the record. Yes. Thank you. This is why I wanted to try and bottom this out on this call. I wonder whether, and I'm just sort of brainstorming here; it sounds to me, based on what you've said now, and what I've heard on previous calls and generally in the community, that there are probably two issues that we need to address here. One is the one that you just talked about; well you talked about both of them.

The first one being, what kind of mechanisms can we put in place? And whether they go through this working group, or whether it's a communications questions, or through the SO/AC Leadership structure, or whatever it might be, to make sure that there is a heightened level of awareness about what Internet Governance activities are anticipated into the future if you like, from either the Board, Fadi, Tarek, you know, whoever else is handling it from the Staff perspective and the Board perspective, so that you don't get the kind of perceived gap that has been commented on with NETMundial. So that's one thing.

And how do we make sure that, you know, we don't have that gap, that there's a more immediate flow of information moving around the community about anticipated programs and projects, that's one issue. And the other issue is this question about how do you -- how would the staff, make sure that they are aware of the needs of the community around Internet Governance issues on an ongoing basis, which is related but different.

And that's really an engagement and coordination question, in my view. And within that, is this the environment where we do that; because that might, you know, a very obvious conclusion, that we say that we agree as a broad community, but if the community members, even if they are not members of this working group, if they want to communicate, reach out and engage with staff on issues of Internet Governance, they come to this forum to do it, that could be one solution.

I'm not saying it's necessarily the right one. But it gives everybody a clear kind of way of knowing that there's a place they can go where that discussion will always be happening. The staff will always be present, and the community will always be represented, and it's operating within a very clear charter. So, the advantage of doing -- there are many advantages doing that, not least of which is that, this group runs within that charter therefore it would be very difficult for it to not work within the rules of the policy development rules and the advisory rules that the ICANN community has developed for itself.

It's just predetermined framework, if you like. And if we wanted to tackle those -- if I'm right and the group agrees that these are the two kind of key topics, then I wonder whether it might be better to have a -- instead of a panel structure, perhaps set up almost a sort of head to head with a moderator. So, for example, we could have the three Co-Chairs, or one of the Co-Chairs, or however you wanted to organize it and, say, Tarek and Anne-Rachel, or something like that, to have a structured sort of question and answer with a moderator. More like a TV type of thing, you know, where we make those issues get put on the table by the facilitator, the moderator, and then we go to a Q&A with the community, so they make a contribution, and so make sure that we come out with something actionable; rather than have a more traditional panel structure where everybody says something. Do you want I'm -- Am I being clear? I'm not sure I am.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Thank you, Sally. Olivier speaking. You are absolutely clear, and I think that actually works very well with the requirements that we've made for having the U-shaped room. That certainly looks more like a head-to-head discussion than a panel, where, as you very rightly said, every person will just launch in one direction and will reach -- I would actually add to what you've said, that if everyone launches in a different direction, we just won't reach any kind of solution or consensus at the end, it would be just a wasted 30 minutes, each one talking in their own corner.

Are there any thoughts from anyone else? I note that Rafik Dammak has also joined the Adobe Connect Room. Bill, Rafik, Marilia, Anne (ph), any thoughts on this. We are currently speaking about -- discussing topic two, the relationship between staff and the community relating -- regarding Internet Governance ecosystem topics. Trying to flesh out how the session should be structured, we are looking at perhaps having -- this is a shorter session with NETMundial Initiative taking the initial 45 minutes, and this being 30 minutes, for the second part of the public session.

Are there any comments or reactions? A note from Bill Drake, "Head-to-head or open group is okay." And Bill Drake, yeah, also mentioned, "Prefer a non-panel formulation as indicated some time ago." Head-to-head, face-to-face, they are sort of facing each other, effectively, I'd imagine. Sally, is that correct?

Sally Costerton: Yes. Sally, for the record. We could brainstorm around that, but if you are (inaudible) you had, and it doesn't matter who, (a) a debate chairman, if you like, or a session chairman, who is sitting between, say, Anne-Rachel and Tarek on one side of them, and the Chairs and motion the group on the other side. Okay, these are the issues that we -- that the CCWG has raised, issue one, issue two, because (inaudible/audio skip) --

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: You are dropping off --

Sally Costerton: -- the Chairman is then asking -- the Chairman is then asking the participants to give their (inaudible/audio skip) specific questions. And as they would say -- so the Chairman might say to one of them, you know, say you are talking to Tarek, you might say, Tarek, there's been a lot of debates in the community about whether or not the NETMundial process was top-down, and the community got left behind. I think we all agree we wouldn't want to do that in the future. You know, how do you think we would be best -- we could best avoid that? What kind of communication should have been in place? That Tarek has his comments, that the working group Chair have their comments, and then open it to the floor, with a view that the -- the person chairing the debate actually tries to encourage some agreement about next steps and actions so that it doesn't just become a kind of airy-fairy discussion.

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

Sally Costerton: I hope, Rafik, has that a bit clearer.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah, Rafik, is that clearer? In the meantime whilst Rafik answers, I believe he probably is just able to type in his follow-up on this. I note also, Bill Drake's -- mentions, we are moving away from panels, and he was puzzled by the reversions (ph). We don't really have a panel as such, the setup we've asked for is a U-shape, and so both topic one and topic two will be discussed face-to-face, and I guess I might have misused the words for the first topic, saying, panel discussion with the audience. Well, we have four people that are listed here, and the idea is for each to just open up with a few remarks but then have more of a -- because of the shape of the room -- have an actual discussion between people.

I gather if we cannot get the shape of the room, and cannot get a U-shape, what I would suggest at that point is for people not to be sitting on a head table, but rather to bring the chairs forward and have them sitting around in a circle, so as to be able to have them speak to each other, and have

the moderator walking -- in the audience, rather than having -- or in the middle of the circle, perhaps, rather than having a panel and the stage at one end, and people sitting scattered around the room at the other end.

So, Sally, then, you are suggesting -- I personally think I like very much what you suggested; we have to think of a moderator or a facilitator for this who would be good at simulating questions, and stimulating the discussion. Are there any suggestions from anyone on the call for a suitable facilitator? What we discussed earlier for those who just arrived, what we discussed earlier was that, because topic one and topic two were so different from each other, we could have different facilitators. It probably would be a better idea to have different facilitators for topic one and for topic two. I don't see anyone put their hand up, or type answers at the moment. I believe I am -- Yes, I thought I was muted for a moment, which was a bit troubling.

Bill Drake, you've your hand up. And we appear to have lost Bill Drake. Okay? These things do happen; let's wait until he manages to get back in the room. Are there any other thoughts or feedback on topic two in the way that it's built? Sally Costerton?

Sally Costerton: Thank you, Olivier. Bill is saying you can't hear him. I was going to suggest a couple of options about facilitators, (inaudible) as you've said, it's somebody who has -- will be able to get the group to ask questions. Firstly, I wondered if it should be somebody from this group, because this is the focal point of the discussion from -- as the community as a whole; and this is the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance, so it would make sense to me. But it would be logical to have somebody from this group. And (inaudible) for me to, you know, make a suggestion, but that would be very undiplomatic, but I do think that that would be the most logical way forward; perhaps one of the Chairs.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you for this. So session Chair, perhaps--

Sally Costerton: Because there are three Co-Chairs, you see, this is just what I'm thinking, so I can envisage having maybe two Co-Chairs on one side of this debate with the -- sort of say, Tarek and Anne-Rachel, say, or Tarek and Nigel and Anne-Rachel on the other side. And then one of the -- whichever is the third Co-Chair, who is kind of, you know, actually running the session. But I don't know whether that would work. Oh, Bill could facilitate, he's volunteering. Yeah!

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Thank you for this, Sally. Olivier speaking. I'm just asking on the chat, "If the first bit is topic one, or whether it's the first bit of -- Well, I'd imagine it would be topic one since Bill is very well clued up on NETMundial Initiative, and I believe being closely associated with developments." So that would be a good point, a good suggestion. Thank you, Bill. Well, we'll ask the working group, by email, to suggest chairs for topic two, I take your point Sally, that perhaps one of the working group Chairs, the Cross Community Working Group Chair would be a suitable moderator. And as far as the agenda is concerned I think that -- the detailed agenda is concerned, I'm pretty happy with the two points that you've suggested. So what kind of communication can we put in place to make sure there is a heightened level of awareness about where Internet Governance activities are anticipated, from the Board and Staff.

How do we make sure we don't have that gap between what's going in the Board and Staff, and the Community? And secondly, how are staff aware of the needs of the ICANN community, and the environment in which we do that? I think that can definitely stimulate some good discussion there. Bill Drake's mentions his connection is terrible. I believe, Bill -- are you in Davos, or something? That's of course is speaking about cases with very bad communication.

"Strongly prefer facilitated open conversations to talking head panels?" Yes. Absolutely, Bill. I don't think we are suggesting in any way that we would have talking-head panels as such. Marilia Maciel, you have raised your hand. You have the floor.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you very much, Olivier. Just to make a suggestion. I know that our time is very short, but I think that probably it would be useful for the community to have some very -- in a nutshell, quick updates on what ICANN has done in terms of Internet Governance related topics, that we have participated in. In ITU there was a very good (inaudible/audio skip) because the comments made on CICD (ph) might be, Internet Governance policy issues exercise (inaudible/audio skip) --

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: You're breaking up.

Marilia Maciel: -- of this discussion very closely, to know that these contributions were made and where they can find it. So, maybe at the beginning of the session, we could have a five-minute, very short update on what happened since the last (inaudible) in L.A. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Marilia. Olivier speaking. I'd imagine that in the opening statements, or at some point in the conversation, this could definitely -- this type of update could definitely be given by some of the staff members that will present in that head-to-head discussion. Even if it just means, as an example, of what's been happening since the last time the working group has met; or since Los Angeles. What I would be concerned about is to actually set some time, 10 minutes, for example, on an update from Staff about what's been happening. And then we -- I know what happened then, people start getting up and asking questions on the topics that are there, and we very quickly run out of time without any kind of face-to-face discussion actually taking place, or debate taking place.

So, I'm a little concerned about having so much time spent on updates, because that then brings us to the panel part in some way. So the updates could be done in writing, indeed, yeah, that's a possibility. Maybe Tarek could do a blog, and maybe -- That's a very good point, Sally mentions in there in the chat, "Maybe Tarek could do a blog, and if Tarek does a blog, then he could point to that blog or to elements of that blog during the discussion in topic two, taking it as examples."

Any reactions to this? "And we can certainly make sure the blog is promoting on the social network (ph)." That's sounds like a good idea.

Nigel Hickson: Yeah. This is Nigel Hickson, and I'm sure that I can't speak for Tarek, but I'll speak to him in a minute. And I'm sure we can facilitate something.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Fantastic. Thanks very much for this, Nigel. Okay. Realizing we still have 10 minutes until the end of this call. We then also have to look at the face-to-face working session, that's our agenda item number three. I think we've got a pretty clear idea of the public session now. Now, with regards to the face-to-face session, there were five topics that were suggested, and we, again, here only have 75 minutes for the whole session, so that's going to be very, very tight indeed. We might have to drop some topics there, and I wondered whether anybody on the call has a suggestion as to what topics might be less important or perhaps we could put them in order of importance. But I realize, often, one topic that is very important for one person, is completely unimportant for someone else.

The five topics are as follows: firstly, address the relationship between the community and ICANN Staff on Internet Governance ecosystem in this session as well. That was -- effectively that would be, maybe even a first step to the discussion that could take -- that will then take place face-to-face in the public meetings.

Secondly, understanding how the Cross Community Working Group and Internet Governance membership is organized according to the Charter. And this is more of an internal housekeeping matter. We have a Charter at the moment. We have this very tight very definition of members and observers, that type of Charter was drafted before the more open Cross Community Working Group on accountability and on IANA Stewardship transition, and so we might wish to find out if we should revise this to allow observers who haven't been nominated by their SO/AC or SG.

Thirdly, look at the calendar of the forthcoming activities, and perhaps put together a plan of our activities and the topics that we are going to be focusing on in the months leading to the June ICANN meeting. Then we can, already, spend time in planning the June ICANN meeting in Buenos Aires. I guess three and four can probably come together, and I personally think that requesting staff in specific slots for the face-to-face Cross Community Working Group Meeting is going to be a tough one, since this usually takes place just a month before the actual face-to-face meetings. And then finally, preparing the Internet Governance public session; I think that probably goes hand-in-hand with number one, and these two could probably be brought together.

Any other thoughts on this? And the chat is still going on about topic one, so the previous agenda, that will be recorded as well. Sally mentions, "Even if we do request specific slots earlier the clashes are pretty consistent from meeting to meeting." Indeed one of the problems, I think, is the fact that the ICANN meeting was shortened by an amount of time, and that shortening of the week has made things very busy. And of course, on the one hand we've shortened the week; on the other hand, we've had more topics land on the table, somehow sometimes pushed on the table.

Any feedback on this agenda? So, what I'm proposing is to put one and five together, and to perhaps drop -- well, and three and four somehow together with an emphasis more on three, so we would have addressed the relationship between community and ICANN Staff on Internet Governance ecosystem, which would be effectively just a preparation of the points that could be discussed in that face-to-face -- in the public session. Secondly, understanding how -- well the work on the Charter that we have to do; and thirdly, just planning for our activities until Buenos Aires.

Any comments or feedback on this? I don't see anyone put their hand up so it looks like there is agreement here. I'll take it that silence is consent on the call. I'll be sending these suggestions to the working group mailing list, and try to collect some feedback on there, although I'm a little concerned also that the mailing doesn't appear to be very much focused on at the moment, understandably with all of the other things that are taking place at ICANN.

Now seeing we have three minutes left on the call; I ask whether there is any other business. Or, Bill, I know you lost your connection in mid-sentence, and we lost you there. Do you wish to add a few things? Or are you actually able to speak now?

Bill Drake: (No response heard)

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Apparently not. Okay. All right; well, thanks for the heads-up, Bill, on the thing you just mentioned in the chat. There may be a pre-conference in Buenos Aires on the Friday, from the non -- I believe NCPH, is Non-Commercial (ph) Parties House, that could get into Internet Governance issues. So that's a good point, and maybe that's something that you should be able to share with the working group when we meet face-to-face in Singapore. So we could even plan on having involvement -- a wider involvement of ICANN -- the ICANN community in those issues.

And with this -- so any other business? Going once, going twice. I guess the only business I should ask, is whether we should have a call next week, and I believe it would be a good idea indeed. This time it doesn't appear to be possibly good for people, certainly in the Americas, this looks like a very early time, and then in other parts of the world, it's also a little bit difficult. I think we are doing rotation. Renate, is that correct?

Renate De Wulf: Yes. That was the suggestion that came up which seemed to please most people. Hello?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Yes. Yes, Renate. So, when would be next week's call, where would rotation be at that point?

Renate De Wulf: It would be -- we could either do it at mid-afternoon UTC, or early evening UTC; what would suit you best.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. For me, personally, early evening UTC, would probably be better for me. I'll be in Prague -- not in Prague, sorry; in Budapest for the week. So, that probably is the best. I don't know for others. Rafik, you are on the call, when would it suit you best? That's middle of the night for Rafik. Okay, then suggest when. Typical, this darn problem, the earth is round. I can't believe whoever thought of that stupidity; anyway. I'll wait for Rafik to say -- 1300 UTC is Rafik's preferred time, so let's try it around that time. Renate?

Renate De Wulf: Yeah. Okay, for me.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: And I think that 1300 UTC is probably also going to be okay for Jordan Carter who is also in the same part of -- not the same part of the world, but we are looking at the same time zone, or similar time zones.

Renate De Wulf: Okay. Okay, I'll settle it for 13 UTC.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, for this Renate. And with this, I'd like to thank everyone who are on the call, and we all have -- What day will that be? I think, Renate, is it the same day as today? Or will it be --?

Renate De Wulf: Well, let's keep the same day so that maybe people get used to -- that this call is always on a Thursday.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. We can do that. Thursday is fine. Thanks very much, everyone. And this call is now adjourned.

Unidentified Participant: Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Bye-bye