NOTES OF CCWG F2F MEETING ON 9TH FEBRUARY

1. Welcome from the co-chairs

<u>Olivier Crepin-Leblond</u> welcomed members and co-chairs (Jordan Carter was absent) and went over agenda; noting would also touch on <u>Agenda</u> for IG Public Session on Thursday. He introduced Rafik Dammak the other co-chair present.

2.CCWG Membership and Charter Discussion

Olivier noted intention to loosen Observer Criteria so could be appointed without nomination from SO/AC. Bart noted there was no absolute "standard" arrangements; varied across CCWG. So Olivier noted we could simply call attendees "participants"; they would then join mailing list etc.

<u>Bart Boswinkel</u> noted we could effect change without securing SO/AC changes to Charter; just by asking SO/AC if there were any objections.

<u>Tarek Kamel</u> just clarified that the Group scope did not touch on IANA / Accountability issues.

Action

- 1. Co-Chairs will write to chartered SO/AC to see a no-objection Reply to widening CCWG to participants.
- 2. Co-Chairs will seek additional co-chairs from the other AC/SO. GAC participation was noted as important.

3. Address the Relationship between ICANN Community and Staff on IG Issues

<u>Olivier</u> noted the IG Report (IG Report) was welcome and would be made available to all (agenda item for Thursday meeting).

<u>Marilyn Cade</u> welcomed Report but noted there was a wider issue to discuss; namely how the CCWG should work with staff on IG issues (in real time); not just to receive information. She gave example of WSIS and ITU work (for example on proposal for ITU CWG to discuss IANA).

<u>Tarek</u> noted Staff benefited from expertise in Community; noted how modus for enhanced dialogue would depend on nature of Events; noted enhanced relationship with ITU. He also noted differences between IG issues that fell within mandate of ICANN and those wider issues where we (as staff) generally coordinated with others (such as ISOC).

<u>Discussion</u> took place on how synergy could benefit ICANN as a whole in international fora; WSIS Forum (and what we do there) was an example as was a potential "ICANN" input to the WSIS+10 Review process. Was also noted need for more analytical discussion on wider politics of IG issues.

<u>Marilyn</u> noted genesis of group; mainly the lack of consultation on important issues (was NetMundial at time). We should be contributing *before* issues are discussed.

Action: Specifically on WSIS Forum; for staff to work with CCWG.

4. Calendar of forthcoming Activities and plans for future Sessions

Was noted that on Thursday there would be a wide ranging discussion on IG issues (Bill Drake moderating). <u>Bill Drake</u> noted that we have discussed staff / Community interaction today so would perhaps not have to discuss this issue on Thursday.

<u>Marilyn</u> asked for specific IG issues to be flagged on agenda (in addition to NMI); agreed (will amend ICANN52 site); said should include UNESCO;

There were calls for a similar IG Report to be written before each ICANN Session.

Action:

- **1.** Agenda for Thursday to be amended as per discussion; sole issue will be NMI and IG issues; with specific mention of IGF, WSIS and UNESCO
- 2. Regular IG Report to be circulated ahead of each ICANN Meeting.