

20150129\_ccwgIG

- Renate De Wulf: And we have the following people; we have, Avri Doria, Bill Drake, Lynn St Amour, Marilia Maciel, Rafik Dammak. And from Staff we have Nigel Hickson, Alexandra Dans, Anne-Rachel Inne; and myself, Renate De Wulf.
- Becky Burr: Hello. It's Becky.
- Renate De Wulf: Oh. Hello, Becky.
- Becky Burr: Hello.
- Renate De Wulf: Did I miss anybody else who is just on the OJO (ph) and not in the room? Okay, Rafik. You have the floor.
- Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Renate. And thanks to everyone for joining this call. So it's basically the last -- I mean the chance for us to prepare for the session in Singapore, and so basically we'll try for today to finalize -- I mean, preparation for the Internet Governance public session, and also the Cross Community Working Group Face-To-Face Session in Singapore. And also we are planning to get an update about what happened in Davos last week. So, I think one of the urgent things that we need to finalize is regarding, if everybody is agreeing about the panelists, and so we can send invitation as soon as possible to get them -- to get confirmation, otherwise we need to find -- I mean kind of a replacement or a solution there. So any comments here, or any suggestions?
- Nigel Hickson: Rafik, good afternoon. Nigel Hickson. Could I -- could I just say something very briefly?
- Rafik Dammak: Yes. Go ahead.
- Rafik Dammak: Thank you. On the -- in terms of the Internet Governance Public Session which we've obviously discussed on the previous calls; I just wanted to confirm that I've had acceptances for the first item, if you -- as you know there are two items on the IG session, the first item is on NETMundial Initiative, and other IG issues. And we reached out to Wolfgang Kleinwächter, and he has accepted, and we reached out to Janis Karklins, who is the Chair of the MAG, and he's accepted. And we reached to Kathy Brown. Unfortunately, she has come back and apologized, she thanks us for the invitation, but she has a conflict that day, and she's asked if Sally Wentworth who is her Vice President for Public Policy issues can take part instead. So I, provisionally, said that we would welcome Sally Wentworth, but obviously it's up to the -- up to the group. Thank you.
- Rafik Dammak: Yes. Thanks, Nigel. Thanks for the update. But I think there is a main meeting here, Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca, I mean, did you reach him, or?
- Nigel Hickson: Yeah. I still well, I've reached out to him, but have not had a response yet, but I will actually -- will actually be seeing him later today at the ITU, or I hope to, so I will -- I will try and confirm with him. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Nigel. Okay. So, regarding the replacement for Kathy, (inaudible) asking comments from the participants here; and I see Marilia wants to comment. Yes, Marilia?

Marilia Maciel: Thank you very much, Rafik. First of all, just an update, I've heard from CGI.br (inaudible) that, in principle, Ambassador Benedicto was not on the list of participants, so I am supposing that either they have not been speaking about it, which is strange, because it's really close, or he's not going, and if he's going it's (inaudible) who was on the list. So I know Nigel said he's meeting with him today, he can confirm that, but just for us to have the heads-up, and maybe to extend the invitation to whosoever is representing the foreign ministry. I don't know if you agree with that. Another point I would like to make is, like, few minutes in the first topics, people that are a part of the Council, the first Council Committee of the NETMundial Initiative. So I would like to stress again, the suggestion that we have a moderator this is part of the Committee and I suggested Bill's name.

I think that he has been following the discussion since the beginning, so he would be able to make a very good moderator for the session, and to bring topics that are currently being discussed on the sup (inaudible) group, that he's talking about COR (ph) of the NETMundial Initiative. And Rafik has not raised this topic before, but it seems to me that, of course, ICANN continues to play an important role in the NETMundial Initiative, so maybe it would be interesting to have someone from ICANN as well on the Panel. I don't know if Fadi himself or someone else. But maybe this is something you can consider. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Marilia, but we had real difficulty to hear you well, but just want to confirm. Who are you suggesting as the moderator?

Marilia Maciel: I suggested Bill for a moderator, as I've said before on the list, and maybe to invite someone from ICANN to talk on the Panel. I don't know if Fadi himself, or Nora who is facilitating the work of NETMundial Initiative. I hope you could hear me now.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Marilia. I see Bill wants to comment. Yes, Bill.

Bill Drake: Hello, everybody. I'm -- a couple things, one is a general matter. I'm a little procedurally puzzled, so I just -- I want to make sure we are not reinstating the Panel structure; I thought we had agreed not to have panels, per se. When we talked on previous calls, and emails, back and forth the discussions was that we would have people make very brief kind of comments, like two minutes max, to start conversations. And I thought that was agreed. So, if we are doing that, I don't really see the point of listing panelists, per se, because then you are sort of creating the impression that we are all going to be sitting there, doing the talking heads thing again, and that, I think, is not what we wanted to do, especially if we are spending a limited amount of time on this topic.

I will also note, as Marilia just said, the people that are listed are not involved. So it's kind of -- except Wolfgang. That makes for kind of an odd discussion of what's going on in NETMundial when you've got people who are not involved in NETMundial Initiative. So, I hope that if we are going to do this, that we will stick with the idea of having a more open and interactive discussion, with not really canned presentations of any length. We had talked about having a U-shaped room; I hope that that's happening. I've not heard anything about the room configuration. Maybe Nigel can remind us. I've been concerned about some other meetings that we often do, such as NCSG Board Meeting, I really that's kind of -- a traditional kind of seating arrangements that's a real problem.

So, can we just clarify what we are doing; are we sticking with the -- looking at Olivier's January 15<sup>th</sup> message, and various others on the list. Are we sticking with what we agreed before or are we revising it? Thanks.

- Rafik Dammak: Okay. I think it's -- as what Marilia says, it's kind of -- we are supposed to be, kind of, I mean to give (inaudible) -- intervention, I mean it's not finally, per se, here and so I think that's what we did last time. So I don't see that we -- that we (inaudible) being here. About the shape, I think that was supposed to be confirmed by Nigel. Nigel, can you confirm that we will get U-shaped outline for the meeting room for the session?
- Nigel Hickson: Yeah. Thank you. Nigel Hickson. Yes, we've put the request in; they've said there's no reason why we shouldn't have the U-shaped room. I mean, do we actually get to the location, sometimes there's complications, but certainly we haven't been told we can't have it, so I'm comfortable we can for the time available, and there will -- so some other suggestions on the way the seats should be laid out and we can look into that as well. Thank you.
- Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Nigel. Okay. So we think -- if you are confident, I think we can be confident that we can get this done in Singapore. Okay. So we just maybe need to call -- I mean, I think we -- I didn't see any objection for the -- what was the proposal as the replacement for Kathy.
- Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)
- Rafik Dammak: Yes, Sally can be -- I mean Sally from ISOC, I think, can do a good replacement. I'm just trying to check also what was on the chat from last time, and we are waiting for a decision. Okay. So I think that maybe we are set here. Just maybe we confirm for the moderation. I think, Bill, you volunteered last time for this topic?
- Bill Drake: I'm sorry, Rafik. Could you say that again?
- Rafik Dammak: Okay. I'm just trying here to -- I mean to confirm for the moderators for topic one.
- Bill Drake: I have. No. No. I mean, a couple of people said on the list, you know, that they suggested me, and I'm totally happy to do that.
- Rafik Dammak: Okay. That sounds good. I mean just to confirm, I mean, to put names. Okay. Thanks, Bill.
- Bill Drake: But can I just -- I don't mean to interrupt Rafik, but the only challenge is, again, in booting up the conversation, I would want to make it clear that they are making -- they are giving initial comments on the general aspects, but then I would like to turn to people who are actually involved in the process, like Marilia and (Inaudible), and others who can speak to what's happening and according to the Council, and so on and so on. I wouldn't want to restrict the initial discussion to just the speakers. That's all. Just a (inaudible) --
- Rafik Dammak: Yes, I think as moderator you -- I mean, you can handle that.
- Bill Drake: All right.
- Rafik Dammak: And understanding your comments I see in the chat, and to avoid any confusion I think, that we can have to avoid -- and I have to say in the agenda to be public -- published online, so we we'd just like to kind of -- to see, say, not just the panelists, something similar involved (inaudible) in any misunderstanding, so we will be careful there.
- Okay. So, any further comments for this topic? Okay, so what is remaining is just to confirm. Nigel, will confirm with the Ambassador, and also I need to confirm for the replacement. And I think we are set for topic one. For topic two, it's just so, I mean, we will avoid to say a panel, and just to confirm who will be coming from ICANN, and who from -- or who else from the community. So nobody wants to comment or suggest something?
- Bill Drake: Dead silence, probably not helping us, move forward. Let me try this extemporaneous. I guess one of the topics that actually, I think it was a couple of the business community people who are not on

this call, suggested it. I think Marilyn, Greg Shatan, and a few other folks had raised this point in particular. And insofar as it was their suggestion, and they had specific ideas about it, why not ask them to kick off the discussion, because we are all kind of sitting her going, okay, what are we doing?

So why not look to parties who raised the issue, ask the parties who raised the issue to raise it here. They could pose an initial framing and then get feedback. We will not turn it into -- I think we don't want to have it look like there's some sort of binary though. I mean, I don't want to set up a discussion where some people from the community are complaining, and then staff are responding, you know, justifying or something like that, that's not the feeling we want to have for this discussion. I guess the idea would be to try to reach a shared understanding of this without dwelling too much on perceptions of past particulars. That would be my problem. I don't want to spend too much time looking backwards, personally; kind of been done a lot already.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Bill. I think, you know, for people just really maybe to -- kind of to -- I mean to work for the future, it's one of going back to the best, and going on again about the issue which had the community, and how the staff may be acting on behalf of ICANN, but maybe it's kind of to be more constructive here, but I understand your concern, and then, yes, (inaudible) you would have people at discussions, we need some balance. Yes. Lynn, I see that you've raised your hand. Please go ahead.

Lynn St. Amour: Yeah. Thank you. Just sometimes depending on how they are set up, it seems as though not sort of many people don't necessarily see it. I just wondered, I just joined this group at the last ICANN meeting, and joined a couple of calls since then, but I don't know what the discussion was previous to that. But are there some specific things this group would like to get, either -- you know, get out a different sort of -- I mean, specifics; a different sort of engagement, different sort of processes, you know, building on what Bill said which is -- and lack of interest in terms of looking forward -- and I assume that means just -- I mean looking backward. I assume that means no interest in looking backwards, and just banging on about things we were unhappy with previously.

Do we have a straw man or some specific behaviors or process changers, or something that we might suggest to actually kick off the discussion and in a way they would advance the relationship?

Rafik Dammak: (Inaudible) ; so, let's go to Marilia and see if others, (inaudible) would want to respond to this. Yes, Marilia.

Marilia Maciel: Thanks so much, Rafik. First of all, regarding topic two, it would be nice if the people that propose the topic to stick around to develop the proposal, because I believe that it was proposed in a very strong manner, (inaudible) on the call, but it's a session that is very hard to shape, as you pointed out, because the tendency after discussing NETMundial is that we look backwards on what happened, and I don't think that it is very useful. I think that as Lynn mentioned and asked in the chat, the important thing to discuss is the challenges that we have ahead in 2015, and how to make sure that the community and ICANN staff are in tune to form the participation and the involvement of ICANN in the meeting to come.

I think that that should be our main goal for session two, and just to clarify because we asked if you -- the mandate of the CWG is brought, and usually in our Face-To-Face Meeting, we discuss all of the issues that are now a part of the Internet Governance scenario. All of the meetings, how this impacts on ICANN, how it would get involved, so it's really a moment for us to get updated in the different processes that we need to follow, and we did put together an agenda, a mapping of all the meetings that are taking place this year, and it would be nice to follow up on that. Just on the public session, we pick up two different topics to discuss with the community, but now face-to-face, we dig down more in Internet Governance spaces and what is being discussed there. Thank you, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Marilia. Just, I want to observe here that regarding the relation with ICANN staff, I think we are collaborating well now. I mean we have Nigel and Anne-Rachel, and even Sally attended our calls, and I think we are cooperating and trying to find how we can work together. So I think in that front it's best for (inaudible), in comparison to what happened before, and so if you want, I guess, the next session, well this topic among -- and more for (inaudible) I guess, we can probably (inaudible) -- I mean, kind of milestone, or what we want for the Cross Community Working Group to focus on in the next month. I'm not sure if, for example, I feel like (inaudible) was talking about ITU, I don't know, the Council. I'm not sure about with Jacqueline, if she's coming - - if she's here, and may there are ways to (inaudible) review and so and so. I think it talks to the community and to view that, and for that topic to propose concrete action for the working group, and to work with the ICANN and the ICANN staff on that. Yes, Bill.

Bill Drake: This is making me a little bit uncomfortable. And by the way, for the some reason, I have kind of laryngitis so apologies if I'm hard to understand. When we -- the problem is we are having varying participation in this group from call to call, and for people who expressed very strong interest in something at Time T1, and they are not here at Time T2, and it makes it a little bit hard for the other ones to figure out exactly how we proceed.

When I'm looking again at the discussion online, when we talked about these things previously Olivier had suggested that we would spend 40% of the 35 minutes on NETMundial Initiative, and 50%, however you want to divide that up, on this topic, and if we are doing that, then I would think we really need to have some more clarity on exactly what we are doing. We are -- the meeting is in a little more than a week, and we've got a very broad subject line here that doesn't have -- we are trying to envision the really productive and focused conversation that includes. So, I'm wondering if we should take this back to the list, and ask the people who raised the issue, exactly how they want to scope the discussion, what they have in mind that we would talk about, or how should be proceed.

I mean, we are all kind of groping here, because it wasn't -- it wasn't the first suggestion of, you know, the people who are speaking right now, and words -- we have to put on a show for 100-plus people, we don't want to go in there and just playing around. So, I think we really need to get some directions from the folks who wanted to do this. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, Bill. Thank you. (Inaudible)--

Renate De Wulf: Rafik, we cannot hear you.

Rafik Dammak: Can you hear me?

Renate De Wulf: You are very faint.

Rafik Dammak: Now, is it okay?

Renate De Wulf: Much better. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. As I was trying to say -- No, Bill, I'm not under water -- What I was trying to say is that I really hope that we can finalize this topic for today, but it sounds that it's the topic number two need to revisited, and to check, again, the list on how we should be -- shape it. So, Renate can you please put this as an action item, for me to get more input in the list and to see how -- how we can make if for this part, so --

Renate De Wulf: Yes. Okay.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. So, just trying to figure out if -- So, Bill, did you suggest -- it's a specific question, maybe it can be helpful, in terms that we can get a fair input, otherwise maybe we are going in

cycles and get the same -- the same explanations. Do you have a specific, I mean, any question or -  
- so that we can share on the list. Lynn? Waiting for your warning (ph), maybe --

Lynn St Amour: (Inaudible). I'm just using Bill's opportunity before another time. Maybe we can ask those that were the most adamant about having this topic. Specifically what they'd like to see as outcomes; are they looking at a set of agreement, a set of principles between the community and ICANN staff? Are there specific behavioral process changes you are looking for? To the extent we had even just two bullets that we could talk to, or begin talking to, we could then use the session to flesh that out a little bit. But to Bill's point, I mean, it doesn't aid anybody to look back and continue beating the same horses, but really to apply everything we've all seen, for this is what we think would be most helpful, to enhance Internet Governance going forward; just two or three specific areas, or specific topics, behaviors.

(Pause)

Bill Drake: Well, radio, silence. I'm going to try and break it again. This is Bill. I agree completely with what Lynne is saying, I think we should go right back to -- we should send a message to -- You should send, Rafik, as Co-Chair, I nominate you, a message to Greg and Marilyn, and CC the group, and ask what exactly did they want to talk about, and would they like to be lead-offs on the discussion, to see if that's okay with you. And then the other thing I would ask is, maybe we should consider tweaking the time allocation that we have suggested when Olivier is at 46, I think with NETMundial Initiative at least people know what it is they don't know, or at least there are known unknowns and unknown unknowns I suppose too, but at least there's a focus, a topic for people to go around circles on.

So we might want to make it more 50/50, or something like that, because it would be very hard if we say, okay, fine, we move on now from NETMundial Initiative to this other thing, and then we all kind of, like stare and look at each other. That would not be -- since we asked the staff, we suggested to the staff strongly, that the community should play a role, a key role in shaping these sessions, going forward, it would be a pity, if it's the first we do that, we end up with half the show being kind of like, nothing. I would feel rather bad (ph) about that outcome.

Becky Burr: This is Becky. I'm not on the -- I'm not in the Adobe Room, and I agree with Bill.

Rafik Dammak: Can you hear me.

Renate De Wulf: Yes. We can hear you, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. I have a program with the Adobe in my phone, but I'm trying to -- okay, yes. Okay, Bill, we will send -- I mean this question (inaudible), so the purpose of this topic, and maybe we need to change the prime allocations between the two sessions, and probably we need, maybe, to spend more on the first topic, or also kind of maybe be more constructive, -- and to see what you can do on the top... two. I mean, kind of maybe do agreed on some day, what maybe the Cross Community Working Group should cover in the next month, and what we have -- what we have as maybe kind of minus fund that we can set for us, for ourselves.

Okay. So, understanding that we have to double check about topic two, I would just say, can we move to the other items? Okay. Well, for the Face-To-Face Meeting, I think we are almost set here, unless if you have -- Yes, Bill, I mean, this is one of the things -- I think that we can do it, really to talk more about what really matters in Internet Governance within this year, and to move forward. So for the Face-To-Face Meeting, I think we are set, I mean, unless if you have any additional comments or suggestion.

Bill Drake: I'm feeling, not set. I'm really wondering--

Rafik Dammak: The last thing there is now, and it looks to have been (inaudible).

Bill Drake: I mean I said -- You know, seriously, I mean, as I suggested in the chat -- sorry Becky is not in the chat. When we first talked about what we were going to do in the public session, the initial ideas was about part of what we would be doing, aside from NETMundial Initiative, was to talk about what was happening in some intergovernmental spaces, in which ICANN is represented, and have an interest, and we talked about the WSIS+10 process, and what's going on there, and looking forward to the December U.N. General Assembly Meeting, and we talked a little bit about the ITU which Nigel attends and represents ICANN, and so on. And I don't really remember from the conversation how that drifted off the agenda and into this, let's talk about staff and community thing.

Other than that, a couple of people suggested it and, you know, so on. So, I'm kind of wondering whether we should revert and -- because at least then we would have a concrete real thing that we know we are talking about. I don't know what anybody else thinks of that, but I mean there are people in our -- in this group who are not on the call now, and Marilyn and others who will be attending as well as Nigel, and Avri, and myself and others, at the ITU Council Working Group on Internet Public Policy, and the Council Working Group on WSIS, and so on and so forth, there are things happening there, some of them pertaining, in some manner, towards ICANN space. Maybe people would be interested to know about that, I don't know.

But right now I'm feeling like this discussion topic, looks like a big stinker. The conversation could either go nowhere or just descend into a lot of backward-looking complaining, which is utterly not interesting to me. I would welcome other's thoughts.

Becky Burr: This is Becky.

Rafik Dammak: (Inaudible). Sorry?

Becky Burr: Hi. It's Becky. I'd like to get in the queue.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes. Please.

Becky Burr: I'm sorry I wasn't on the other call; so I don't exactly understand. I could image a useful conversation about the community participating and sort of ICANN decision-making about, if Internet Governance activity, that seems to me to be, you know, potentially an interesting and positive discussion, it's clear that the -- you know, the advocate for that discussion, are not the people on the telephone. I wonder if it might be just -- makes sense to go back to Marylyn and then Greg, and anybody else and say, you know, we need a concrete, you know, outlying ideas list of participants, et cetera, or else we'll have to figure some other way to use the time. I mean I'm also interested in the things that, you know, in terms of an update on the things that are going on that Bill is talking about, but I could see some value in having an interactive and forward-looking and positive discussion. I'm happy to reach out to Greg this morning, and see if I can get his attention. I know he's very -- you know, engaged in the CWG stuff.

Unidentified Participant: Yeah. And this is what Lynn is saying, so I just wanted to concur with what Becky said, and what Anne-Rachel has said as well. And I think this could be a very useful discussion I just think in preparation -- so this proffers it for us.

Rafik Dammak: Yeah. Thanks, Becky. I see that Marilia wants to comment.

Marilia Maciel: Yes. Thank you very much, Rafik. This is Marilia speaking. I agree, in general terms, with what we said about the interest on reporting back on this mapping of what is going on. Actually in the last call I propose that we should start a session some 5 to 7 minutes of update of what her team produced, because some interesting things have been produced by ICANN, and staff on different processes, and I Nigel is here. ICANN did a comment on the TICD mapping of policy issues related to Internet Governance, so I think that there are things that are brought back to the

community would be interesting at least to know. The point I would like to make is that in our calls, not everybody participates all the time, and even though I don't think that topic two is very useful in this context, at least if we do not shape it with a forward-looking perspective, I don't think it's very right to take time out of it, or to remove it from the agenda altogether because we do not agree with it, because in other calls we were not present and people decided to put the topic in.

We are on the verge of the meeting, so I think we should stick to the two topics that we have decided, and then in our Face-To-Face Meeting have a serious conversation about engagement, and decisions, and maybe to work more on the list, because the people can make it to the call; and it's understandable. We have so many calls and so many processes going on. Then let's use the list more effectively to discuss, but I believe that we should stick to the topic that we have discussed before, maybe just adding a five to seven minutes of updating to the community, but that's all that I think we should change at this point. Otherwise we are just enhancing and increasing the governance problem and the decision-making process, it is not very good for lack of participation, not because of moderation of the Chairs, but because people are so busy they are not being able to participate as they should. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak:

Okay. Let me respond to that, Marilia. I mean, we don't make decisions during those calls, (inaudible) their proposal, and the question -- and we sent them to the list to get to get people feedback and comments. So we don't make any decisions. So some people, there you are proposing to revisit the topic number two, and topic question one. What we wanted -- I mean, what's the purpose and what we wanted to achieve here. And we are going to ask everybody, is going to be mindful of the decision for the time being. So I mean, the issue is, we need people to respond to the mailing list for issues. What's happening in the last weeks, we are not getting so much input or feedback, it's really few people who are responding to the follow up also of the call. So we are not making decision here, we are just trying to get input and make sure that -- and also the question with the rest of the group on the mailing list, so we will -- we are trying to improve that, but we need also, people to respond.

The last time I recall that Olivier sent, what was discussed on the last call. And as far we recall it was mostly Bill, Olivier and Marilyn responding to him; so Olivier responding to himself. Okay. So, we will ask those questions on the mailing list then, to really try to work out on this, hopefully, before Singapore, otherwise, it was suggested that it will be that we need to agree during the Face-To-Face Session. We are supposedly to prepare, but I mean if we cannot make it within the list, the last chance would be in Singapore, and Monday's session.

So we have 15 minutes left in this call, and we still have one agenda item. So I'm trying here to see if there is any comment or suggestion for action that we need to follow up, otherwise we can move to the next item. And yes, Avri, being in the center of the accountability is kind of -- meaning it's very -- seeing that we may have not what -- as what we want in attendance, but we have to live with that. Okay. So, any --

Okay, I see that Bill is commenting in the chat. Well, Bill, it's -- I mean, if we can agree, again, we could just in the Face-To-Face -- I mean we are working in the Face-To-Face Session, then we avoid to do it in the public session when defined, and we work in the topic number two, as it was suggested here in the call. So we need to check in the list. And yes, I have a suggestion, and I suppose if we are (inaudible) to be is to prepare for the Thursday, public (inaudible).

Okay. So let's move to the next item, and it's an update about the Davos, and we have the chance to have Bill who was there; he also maybe trying to get any -- I mean if he has any updates, or he wants to share, but let's talk with Bill. Bill?

Bill Drake:

Yes. I'm sorry. I was reading. So I didn't realize that this has been put on the agenda, because I didn't get it. Anyway, just -- okay, so as to clarify, NETMundial Initiative did not do anything in Davos. Fadi was having, I think, a lot of private conversations with various political and corporate types of people in which I gather he was mentioning that the NETMundial Initiative was coming



into being, and was probably seeking support, and endorsement, or whatever for it. I don't know what else, because I don't -- I wasn't privy to those conversations, but there was nothing formerly on the agenda. Like no NETMundial Initiative announcement or something like that; that I know of, maybe.

One of the real things about Davos I have to say, is there's the public agenda, and then there is private meetings. And the private meetings who gets in -- who gets invited to the private meetings seem to be variable, so there was, I know, the whereabouts of at least 15 meetings about the Internet in various ways, with the different policy issues a lot of stuff, and security, and trust issues, and things like that, but there was not, that I know of, anything where NMI was formerly presented or discussed. I was at a session with Fadi, and the only other session that was like (inaudible) on Internet Governance, per se, really was not. It was Fadi, and me, and Kathy, and the Head of OECD, and the Head of WIPO and somebody else, I can't remember.

And we'd run into breakout groups, and basically the groups talked about the various random Internet-related issues that people in the audience had said, hey, this is an issue, and the only breakout group that did IG, per se, was mine, and we talked about things at a very high level of generality, to be quite honest, because people who come to WEP come from all kinds of backgrounds. I hear of people in the group who work in real estate so -- some of them didn't really know what ICANN was, to be honest. So you really, when I read these press reports from Karen McCarthy, and others, about the synergies, supposed, between Davos and NETMundial Initiative, I find it sometimes very perplexing having seen the absence thereof on earth, as opposed to what they are writing.

So I don't know what else I could tell you that would be of interest, other than to say that the World Economic Forum is launching its initiative that they call The Future of the Internet, which is really not about the future of the Internet, but that's what they are calling it. In the sense that it's not about the future of the Internet in a way that people would normally talk about that in terms of the technical evolution of the Net, over its institutional evolution, it's really much more focused on how the Internet is affecting business processes in the different industries, and raising a few policy issues, in particular privacy and security. And they intend to have that be a kind of ongoing part of various WEP.

Meetings, I think, all around the world, they are going forward, and basically they invite members to join the groupings which I think means plenty of money to be in the grouping, to carry on that conversation, and learn from the discussions, but it's really not specifically about IG, it's really not institutionally focused, there's nothing -- I don't imagine them talking about ICANN in any real way. When I talk to the staff about it, they seem to feel that that -- that the kind of stuff that we talk about, is just way too detailed for their community, way too into the weeds. They are trying to -- they are trying to speak to a much broader and more diverse range of participants, which was, of course, part of Fadi's thinking I think. In the meeting, (inaudible) that you should do in the first place, was that you would bring in new players from new, other industries and so on, not just gTLD businesses, et cetera.

So, I'm rambling on, and I will stop. I'm sorry I wasn't prepared, but I hope this addresses whatever questions.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Bill. (Inaudible) --

Renate De Wulf: Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Renate De Wulf: Rafik? Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: It's okay now?

- Renate De Wulf: Yes. Now we can hear you.
- Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Sorry. I was saying, thanks Bill. It sounds really exciting, that I hope that you had a lot of fun. And I think Nigel wanted to add something. Yes, Nigel.
- Nigel Hickson: Yes. Thanks very much. And Nigel Hickson, for the record. We were asked to briefly report on this at the last meeting, but of course Bill Drake was much closer than certainly I was to Davos, I got as far as a (Inaudible) Lausanne in Geneva, I think. But as Bill said, I think the important distinction here is that the discussions at Davos, of course, are heavily influenced by the WEP (ph) agenda, and WEP of course can put what they like on the agenda, and I think generally, you know, ICANN was pleased Fadi Chehadé came back, fairly positive about Davos, and gave an indication that perhaps up to 20% to 25% of the discussions he went to touch on the Internet in some way or another. Not specifically as Bill has said, as on Internet Governance, but on Internet issues. And I suppose the most significant development was the future of the Internet initiative which is going to take place. This is a WEP initiative and people can join it or not, depending on the usual WESA Rules, et cetera.
- But potentially, yes, it could -- it could be quite interesting, and I think Fadi Chehadé will keep fairly close to it, and run through it, or ask other people to want to see it, and no doubt other people from ICANN, perhaps, will attend the regional meetings when they take place, but of course, separate from NETMundial. But in general a fairly positive session, I think, at the WEP including a number of bilateral meetings. I'm sorry we haven't got a detailed report, we will have something that we can share with this group in the next week or so, hopefully. Thank you.
- Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Nigel. Okay. So, any questions or comments? Okay, I see that --
- Lynn St Amour: (Inaudible), Rafik. Lynn St Amour, I was just going to comment to Bill's--
- Rafik Dammak: Go ahead.
- Lynn St Amour: It's Lynn St Amour, and I just want to comment to Bill's last comment in the chat room where he said, personally he'd like to hear about the bilateral. I think where we would be -- I'm sorry, maybe that goes back to the second kind of public session we are talking about earlier is, you know, what is ICANN working to achieve, through the WEP participation and through the bilateral and the meetings that were there, you know, what other -- what is he looking for in terms of endorsement or support, but maybe that's something we can talk about on the Monday, a Monday meeting, or find a way to couple that in the second topic as we look forward, and we talk about sort of engagements and the relationship between staff and the community, this being a example of work going forward and hopefully we have the opportunity to help shape what we think the community's participation should be in it, and what our expectations are on ICANN staff in terms of engaging the community.
- Rafik Dammak: Thanks for that, Becky (SIC). Yeah, I think that we can do that, and I mean to use efficiently our NETMundial session to talk about that, and so Janis can (inaudible) in that regards. So, we have just two minutes left on this call, so I'm just trying to see if you can have any comments or suggestions, or asking for action that we need to follow up.
- Becky Burr: This is Becky. I'd just like to second Lynn's suggestion, I think it would be very interesting to hear about that, about what the bilateral meetings were designed to produce, and what we think they did produce.
- Rafik Dammak: Yes. Sorry, Becky. Can you just please repeat that, had problem to hear -- to hear everybody, one, on this call, and can you just, please, repeat what you were saying?

- Becky Burr: I was just expressing my support for Lynn's idea, that we have a conversation about the bilateral meetings at Davos, and what the goal was, and how much, you know, what kind of progress. I think it's -- you know, Nigel said that there's going to be a more detailed report, but it's sort of that conversation would be very interesting for the rest of us.
- Nigel Hickson: Rafik, Nigel Hickson here. Just very -- just very briefly, Lynn, and I'm not trying to get away from a written report, but clearly at this juncture some of the bilaterals were, in terms of the IANA transition, in terms of talking to business and other governments about what was going on. So that obviously was element of the bilaterals. Another element was raising awareness on the WSIS+10 Process, and the engagement that would be required in New York in Q4. Thank you.
- Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Nigel. I think it's (inaudible) the whole engagement issue is kind of -- I mean, people want to get a better understanding on what's happening, so that you can report financing the Monday session, but all these bilaterals and (inaudible) that I think make -- I mean, you know, makes things more easy to understand what's happening, otherwise people will enterprise in the different ways. So I mean, just to be transparent about the bilaterals, it would make things more easy for everybody, and I think that's what we are trying to achieve here.
- So, other than that (inaudible/audio skip) -- Okay. So if there is no comment, or question, I will be happy to adjourn the call, what's actually the kind of question and discussion in the Adobe Connect Chat, and I don't want to stop it, but just wondering if you have any question or comments. Otherwise, I mean, we can -- we can continue the discussion within the list with all that we highlighted actually as an issue, and particularly as we consider the topic number two.
- Okay. So, thanks everyone. Hopefully I see you soon in Singapore, when we will call for you to continue the discussion in the mailing list, I gave all this finalizing; we leave this for the Singapore meeting. Anything else? Bye-bye.
- Renate De Wulf: Bye.
- Bill Drake: Bye-bye.
- Rafik Dammak: Bye-bye.