

**20150512\_CCWGInternetGovernance\_ID969556**

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. I'm Olivier Crepin-Leblond and this is the Cost Committee Working Group on Internet Governance conference call on the 12th of May. Today is Tuesday the 12th of May, 2015.

Let's start with a quick roll call, please.

Renate De Wulf: Okay. We have on this call and in the AC room Joerg Schweiger, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Peter Dengate Thrush, Mark Buell, Rafik Dammak, Vicky Scheckler, Judith Hellerstein, Marilia Maciel, Avrid Doria, Bill Drake, Lynn St Amour, and someone representing the Internet, Niana Ing.

And from staff, myself and Alexandra Dans.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Renate. Have we missed anyone on the roll call? Hearing no other -- okay, fine. So welcome, everybody to this call. For a quick link to the agenda on the chat on the Adobe Connect chat. It's a very lean agenda today. We're going to be primarily discussing our preparations for our two sessions during ICANN 63 in Buenos Aires.

For the first part we'll be looking at the public session and then afterwards we'll look at our face-to-face session.

There has been an interesting, if not extensive actually, discussion taking place already on the mailing list with regards to both sessions, which started with the recap of the last call that took place. And with first looking at the public session itself, the format, the agenda, the speakers and so on, so far we are looking at having a session that will use a similar format as the one that we had in Singapore. But which will incorporate a lot of updates. And the updates will be primarily on the forthcoming stakeholder consultations that are going to hit us over the summer and during the rest of the year. (Inaudible) work and others as well. And the feedback has been that, well we've had both feedback on the -- as far as presenters are concerned, but also on the topics themselves with perhaps also Net Mundial also being added to the list of topics to be discussed as such.

So where we start effectively is a -- so Monday is indeed, yes, thank you, Renate. Monday is going to be the public session and Wednesday will be the face-to-face. And that will be back to front when compared with Singapore, so we will not have any time when we meet face-to-face to prepare the public session, which is the reason why we have to prepare it now and perhaps someday these meetings that will take place until we meet in Buenos Aires.

Now as far as the public session is concerned, I think we have a number of -- yes, it will be winter down there. That's right. It is winter in much of the world too, yes.

As far as the public session is concerned, so I think that we've reached consensus on the format. The agenda itself, I know that we've had plenty of feedback both from, well from a number of

people. Peter Dengate Thrush has provided feedback. Bill Drake, also Marilyn Cade. And I just wondered if in the same order, they could summarize their points of view -- their points on the call so that we can take that as a starting point. And then move from there and (inaudible) parts of the agenda and certainly also look at the speakers list. If that's okay.

So first, and I'm sorry I haven't actually given anyone prior notice, I wonder if Peter, who is reaching winter in his part of the world, Peter Dengate Thrush, would you be able to summarize your views on the preparation of the public session? Public session only at this moment. Are you able to speak?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yes, thank you, Chairman. Can you hear me, everyone?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, very well. Thank you. Proceed.

Peter Dengate Thrush: My suggestion was -- had two parts. One sort of a philosophical one. And the second one was structural. The philosophical one is simply that it's important I think inside IM4 there to be a bottom up community development process for ICANN's position on international relations. And this is a longstanding issue for those of us who've been involved in ICANN for a long time.

For a long time this was hit very tightly as a preserve of staff and of particular the CEO. And on my time as a board member and otherwise that ICANN had to bring all of the ICANN crises that I could into the open and involve community participation.

And this topic is my difference and in the light of that I also formed the board committee. The board committee on global relationships to try and make sure that there was board oversight. And so this philosophically is an important part I think of the nature of ICANN, of the responsibilities of ICANN and the maturity of ICANN. So there's needs to be a community development process and the community taking positions on issues, effectively global relationships. And that's the first thing. I think that's probably why everyone's here is because they think the same way. This group should be doing that.

The second thing was the structural one. If there's going to be two sessions, it struck me that it would be possible to get as much of the presenting and informing that needs to be done because some people are keeping up with this very closely, others less so and some people will come out of interest with no idea whatsoever as to what's going on. But still be interested and able to be helpful.

So the first half of the first session I thought could be done with presentations and updates. And if that's backed up, a paper that's already available and gone out and is available as a handout. We can spend less time of the procedural reporting stuff and start developing and actual position paper on a couple of topics. If the timing is right and I see from the conversation we don't yet know this, it is possible with hard work to go away and have the community start discussing and come back at the second session and provide input into the actual draft.

So that was my suggestion. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Peter. Are there any feedback to Peter's suggestions on this? So we have the concept of having a background paper. I see Marilia Maciel in the chat completely agreeing with this. And the updates that would be primarily in the background paper and then that -- I presume that would be sent in advance or would be made available in advance to everyone coming to the session. And then we can speak on that. And I see there certainly is support also from Lynn St Amour for this. So we can do that.

The question of course is drafting this advanced position paper on the different points. I gather this would probably be just a -- I mean you mentioned a position paper, I think that probably just

summarizes what ICANN has been involved with so far and what the position of ICANN is so far, Peter?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yes, I was on mute. Yes, that's the idea. And just to make the comment I was typing into the staff, (inaudible) staff are very much across this. I don't think the paper would be a huge project. It would simply be a question of listing what they've been doing, collating and cutting and pasting from various other reports. Nigel and other staff are attending these meetings, know what's been going on and got a very good sense. So I think staff could certainly produce the first draft of the (inaudible) group. But this should not be a major burden for staff.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Peter. Olivier speaking. And as far as the topics are concerned, I was going to ask everyone here whether we're okay therefore with I think it was WSIS+10, CSTB and are we going to venture into the Net Mundial initiative as well?

That's an open question to the group. If anybody thinks there shouldn't be any such topics there, then I think we can -- if we could speak out. Ah, I see a couple of people. So let's start with Lynn St Amour. Lynn, you have the floor.

Lynn St Amour: Thank you. I think NMI is a more difficult discussion for the community as a whole. I note that Peter said in his group that while he's not clear I think what the ICANN position is. And I guess that means the ICANN community, means the ICANN board.

But that would probably need different preparation and frankly probably some coordination with the CEO as well. I suspect the board would probably have some difficulty coming to that conclusion without significantly engaging the CEO given how public and longstanding that engagement's been.

So I do think it would be helpful for the ICANN community to have a position on that. I'm not sure what the politics and logistics would be with respect to getting appropriate engagement in order to get to an ICANN position. Maybe Peter has some, or better maybe Bill, as a member of the initiative, had some insight in how that might be done across ICANN.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Lynn. Peter Dengate Thrush?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yes, thanks, Peter here. I agree with Lynn and that NMI is a contentious matter with issues involving for example budget. ICANN has somehow committed funding to there. As a matter of priorities, I think our priorities for this call and for this meeting is the WSIS plus team and stuff that we've been talking about primarily in that NMI should be dealt with, but has the potential to suck up a lot of time and energy away from what's probably a higher priority issue. So I'd put it that way. Let's make sure we cover the CD work and the WSIS+10 work and the preparations for the United Nations meeting in December as the priority. Thanks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you very much for this, Peter. Olivier speaking. And I also note in the prior email thread that there were reservations from Marilyn Cade with regards to the CCWG endorsing NMI as well. So there appears to be some question mark over the topic of NMI in that public session.

But let's hear from Bill Drake.

Bill Drake: Thank you. Before I repeat what I said online, I'm not clear I understand what Peter's suggesting. Are you suggesting, Peter, that the public session, the big meeting we do in front of 300 people would be something where we would work on a joint position on something? Because I would have thought that's be at the working session.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks, Bill. I don't think that's what I heard, but let's hear from Peter.

Bill Drake: Okay, good. The two sessions were kind of being blended together and then in to the question of text, which is another topic. So I was confused. So then shall I --? I'll just continue since Olivier --

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, go.

Bill Drake: All right, since you've clarified for me. So what I suggested was in an email this morning that indeed I think it's good to talk about WSIS+10. Seems to be really not a separate conversation so much, unless people really want to hear about a group of people locked in a windowless room talking about angels on the head of a pin for a week.

I think certainly WSIS+10 should be the lead topic, as I said. But I also suggested that we might try to do two other things because I think just having a meeting focusing on the WSIS+10 conversation could easily turn into a top down thing with a few insiders talking and not a lot of people in the audience really able to engage because frankly, most people are not really plugged into that process.

Operator: Welcome to the ICANN conference center. How can --?

Bill Drake: And so what I was suggesting was that we lead with WSIS+10 and talk about that. And then could secondly talk briefly about NMI, updating what's going on because by then there will be more things to talk about in that regard.

And then third, do a brief overview of other notable meetings, processes, initiatives such as our WSIS forum session, the IGF meeting in Brazil, the UNESCO meeting, the GCCS meeting, so on and so forth. In other words, that we could have a sort of -- which is basically the kind of structure we've used in the past actually. I mean the last session we did in Singapore also we talked about NMI, WSIS+10 and a miscellaneous. And I'm suggesting basically spreading the risk a little bit by covering those grounds again rather than having all our eggs into the basket of a WSIS+10 conversation that might be difficult for a lot of people to have.

So and I also think frankly these other things are worth other people knowing about as well. So that was my suggestion with regard to the public session. And I'll hold my comments about the working session and questions and text for later.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Bill. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And I understand that Marilyn Cade has joined us on audio. I wonder whether, Marilyn, I don't know whether you were here from the beginning of the call, but I asked for those people who have -- yes, hello?

Renate De Wulf: Yes, Olivier, it's Renate. Apologies for disturbing you. She dropped off the call.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. So I was going to turn the floor to Marilyn to ask summarize her points on the email.

Then that kind of throws something into the cogs. Effectively at the moment what we have then, I think we've got consensus on having WSIS+10 and CSCD. I've heard also about WSIS forum and other relevant sessions as well. There is a question mark on the LMI which has the potential, since there isn't any -- or there doesn't appear to have been any ruling from the board or movement on that matter. There's a potential for NMI to suck the air -- or some air out of the room.

Would we consider having NMI as a sort of, I wouldn't say a fallback topic, but an added topic at the end of this session. So that we have -- I think is it 75 minutes for this session, Renate?

Renate De Wulf: Yes, for the face-to-face working session?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Correct, yes. Not the working session, no. The public session.

Renate De Wulf: I think we also have 75 minutes there.

- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: As well, okay. Fantastic. So we have 75 minutes (technical difficulty) perhaps have the last silo. 10 minutes on Net Mundial, just adding this at the end. How did people feel about this?
- Peter Dengate Thrush: Olivier, it's Peter here. Can I comment again?
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Indeed. And we'll turn over to Marilyn Cade afterwards. Peter then gets (inaudible).
- Peter Dengate Thrush: Thanks. I agree with all of the things that Bill was listing as being important. I guess I as trying to work on a solution along the lines that Lynn St Amour proposed on the list and that is that people don't want to come to these sessions just to be lectured. There's two functions. One is imparting information, but in fact a lot of (inaudible) can bring all these people together and not taking advantage of that by having discussion and engaging people I think is a waste. That's why I think a paper listing all these things and explaining what each of them is, including NMI, I think all of these things go into that report. And some of the time should be spent with someone knowledgeable like Bill working through quickly and explaining what they all are. But it would be a shame to use the session simply as a way of imparting that information. And we ought to be looking at (inaudible) for ways of engaging.
- So I think that's why I think one or two topics only then should be brought back to the floor of that large room for input, discussions, opposing views. And if necessary, we can help say I don't want to use -- don't want to make it out official, but there's sufficient diversity of views just on this call without it being a whole bunch of talking heads to make an interesting conversation for the room and give people work to go away with back to their constituency knowing that two or three days later they have to come back and let us know what each of their different groups thinks of the one or two points that we want them to go away with.
- So sort of stress the difference between those two approaches I think. We don't want to just have it as a -- I'm not sure Bill's suggesting that, but I think there's a track to be avoided of just having it as an information imparting session. Thanks.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, thanks for this, Peter. Bill, any response?
- Bill Drake: I am most certainly not suggesting just an information imparting session. And that's precisely why I don't want to spend 90 minutes talking about the WSIS+10 because I'm absolutely convinced that that's what it would be. I think that we have to have some lead-off, some framing for people who are plugged into processes, but then we have to have open discussion inclusively with the audience.
- And anybody who's been through these sessions, and I've attended a dozen of them, as many of you, or more, as many of you have, knows that when it is one of these situations where insiders sit there and talk about this happened, this happened, this happened and this happened. When you open to the floor, often it's kind of crickets. And internal process -- undefined internal processes that people are not party to don't really lend themselves to really inclusive discussions.
- So my point would be to cover a couple of things.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks for this, Bill. And I understand Marilyn Cade is back with us on the call. Marilyn, are you there?
- Marilyn Cade: I am, Olivier. Thank you.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Just before you start, just a quick summary of what we've been doing. We're just summarizing and taking -- well, basically picking up from what we had on the mailing list and developing the points that we made on the mailing list. So the floor is yours.

Marilyn Cade:

Thank you. I'm just going to remind Peter, and perhaps anyone else who was there, of the first town hall that we did, Peter, when you were on the board and we had a multi-stakeholder planning group, if you will recall, that had Azumi on it and me and many others. And I think we were in Joburg. And how effective that was at the time. That was doing the WSIS preparatory process. And that was really an opportunity to engage.

We scheduled it at a time when we knew governments would be there. And we did also do some pre-event briefing materials. I think that although it's hard for us to find the time to put something in writing, that we should use the expertise that is in the CCWGIG, and there's a lot of it, to have a paper as a background briefing that is a neutral factual overview of the road ahead. And then I agree with the idea that we ought to be picking a couple of, I don't know what I would call them, issues or events or activities, where we really want to do what we did in the town hall that we organized leading up to Net Mundial where we had a position paper, we debated it and we took the sense of the room in support of what our recommendations were.

So the reason I say that is I think that bridges we provide information in written form, in a factual way, and then we see ourselves as the facilitators of debate and input and engagement with the ICANN community in what I hope will be a very interactive approach as I think others are saying.

I do think, however, we have to take the responsibility for explaining why an external event is relevant to ICANN and what its implications are for ICANN. And so that is something that I think we the CCWG ought to be thinking about as well. And see if we have commonality of views that will help us to prioritize what the one or two key activities are or issues are, or whatever we call them.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond:

Okay. Thanks for this, Marilyn. Olivier speaking. Are there any responses to Marilyn's points? At the moment, I think I see agreements that WSIS+10 and CSCD are two topics of interest and certainly from the past email thread as well, there seems to be, or there are going to be, several consultations. And so it's particularly important for us to treat this and to let the community know of those consultations and in fact even start the groundwork for these consultations.

The WSIS forum and relevant sessions, I'm not quite sure where that is with regards to consultations and whether there will be need -- much need or from the community or whether this is more of just a base point.

And the NMI, I'm still hearing various points of view with pushback for significant members of the group here who think that NMI is going to take a bit too much space during the public forum. Especially if we have -- I think, well, 90 minutes. I hear two points of view. Bill thinks that we're not going to have much to talk about for 90 minutes if we just stick to the two or three other topics and other things that we add. NMI, we're going to have too much on NMI and too many question marks, and perhaps even taking a lot more space than it should during the session itself.

Any other feedback? I'd like to hear some others on the call as well because we've heard from the same people so far who have drafted emails. And of course we've got more members here. And so if you could please contribute to this, that would be really helpful.

Marilyn, I think I heard you just now.

Marilyn Cade:

Yes, I just wanted to clarify my comment in my email about the relevant session in the WSIS forum. The only reason I mentioned it, and I think it gets into the WSIS+10, is there will be a stakeholder outreach session on Friday speaking (inaudible) that will include attendants from New York, from Dessa. So I think that fits into the WSIS+10. I just thought it as being -- it would be informational about the process that will take place in New York and the kinds of engagements that will be made available to stakeholders. So I think we could assume relevant sessions at WSIS forum up into the WSIS+10.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. There is some discussion about the schedule when the chat room leads as to the chat.

I think we have -- and my co-chairs will obviously correct me if I'm wrong. But I think we have so far with the two topics of CSCD and WSIS -- well, two to three topics. WSIS+10, CSCD and WSIS forum that could probably fill the overall 90 minutes or 75 minutes, whichever it is that we'll have in Buenos Aires.

Certainly I hear -- I think there is agreement on having a paper done in advance, important paper done in advance, drafted in advance. I was going to suggest an action item for staff. I guess Nigel, to just collate because he has already produced background papers and so on, on these topics. But if you collate the state of where we are today with regards to -- (telephone ringing). If you could just bear with me for a second.

With regards to WSIS+10 and CSCD and I would guess a provocative background paper to let people know where we are rather than spending all the time in the session to actually tell people where we are and lecture them as such.

Bill, you have the floor. Bill Drake.

Bill Drake: I'm just trying to clarify, Olivier, you keep -- I've heard you say several times it sounded like you were suggesting that WSIS+10 and CSCD were separate conversations. And they're not really I think in terms of (inaudible).

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: No, they're not. I'm just saying (inaudible). I'm just making things up as we are at the moment. WSIS, I've got them listed. WSIS+10 and CSCD is the same, but then there's WSIS forum underneath that, which actually is confusing, but it's something hopefully different to WSIS+10.

Bill Drake: Right. For that, that's just like -- that would be briefly telling people what we did in a workshop. And again, my question is do we -- can we really see an interesting and inclusive and highly participatory discussion just on the WSIS+10 process? I am hesitant, but I'd like to hear from other people.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Bill. Olivier speaking. You suggest to take up some more time on that public session to have NMI -- I mean you must be seeing in the chat at the moment a mention -- you've got Marilia who says that they are -- NMI is a very different thing. And there's also some concern from many in the chat that achieving some kind of ICANN position on NMI is going to be sensitive and difficult. Obviously if we were to present this, where we are with NMI, we would have to present many of the points of view. I'm not even saying both points of view. I think there are many different points of view on that and maybe many different interpretations of it. I just am a bit concerned about the time that it would take.

As I said earlier, 10 minutes was my suggestion on how much we were going to have time for this. Bill?

Bill Drake: Hi, Olivier. But you keep confusing me. What I heard people reacting to was the suggestion that there could be some sort of shared position about NMI. And some people said no, they did not think that that could be possible because people's preferences are different, which is entirely fine by me. I didn't understand people to be saying that we shouldn't talk about NMI at all in the big public session, but if that is what people are saying, then I'd like to hear about that. But we're not negotiating a text. I don't think anybody is proposing that we would negotiate a text if in a room with 300 people. So we need to not go back and forth between different things here.

Marilyn Cade: Olivier, it's Marilyn, and I do apologize.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes, go ahead, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade:

I have to drop off, but let me be clear about what I'm saying since I seem to be misunderstood. I am strongly objecting to our debating a role, taking (inaudible) the endorsement of NMI in the CCWGIG. I think it's out of scope for us to be criticizing or critiquing or endorsing an initiative. I think that airing the fact that there's multiple views and there are multiple views, is also -- and there's nothing wrong with having multiple views if something is in scope first. My own view is what's in scope for us is to provide advice and guidance, drawn widely from the community of stakeholders. And I really think I would be put in the position of having to go back to the business sector. I think that would just air a lot of questions and negativity that's unnecessary. To me what is happening at NMI should continue to happen. But I think asking the CCWGIG to take to own, first of all reaching its own point of view or putting that in front of the community to critique, criticize, endorse is going in the wrong direction in terms of our time. And I also will just clarify that actually CSCD and WSIS+10 process are not the same thing. CSCD feeds into the WSIS+10 review process. So I don't object at all to putting it together.

But I think there's also the question of the implications for ICANN of the post 2015 development agenda, which will be focused on the SCGs and how that also offers either opportunities or risks for ICANN. And that is a parallel to the WSIS+10 review and will not be integrated together until -- we don't know how we integrate it together until the high level event.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Marilyn. Olivier speaking. Do we have feedback? I see some activity in the chat on this.