

ccwgig_20150527_1048822_973029

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Start the recording, please. And then we can start the call.

Renate De Wulf: The recording has started, Olivier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Renate. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. This is the weekly Cross Community Working Group and Internet Governance Call on the 227th of May, 2015.

Our agenda today is going to consist of a quick review of WSIS, and from Nigel Hickson. Preparation of the WSIS Forum Workshop that is going to take place tomorrow, and then we will have a summary of the Internet Governance Public Session in Buenos Aires, and finally, we will be preparing the agenda for the Working Group Face-to-Face Session in Buenos Aires. But let's start with a roll call, please.

Renate De Wulf: Okay. We have Mark Buell, Hector Ariel Manoff, Judith Hellerstein, Bill Drake, Mary Uduma, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Rafik Dammak; and from Staff, Nigel Hickson; and myself, Renate De Wulf.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Renate. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Are there any -- is there anybody on the call that we haven't listed? No? Okay. Then let's go directly into -- Well, just one last thing; any additions or amendments to the agenda, so that we can add to AOB, in any other business? Seeing no hands up, let's go agenda item number two, that's the WSIS+10 Review. Nigel Hickson, you have the floor.

Nigel Hickson: Good afternoon. Nigel Hickson, Staff. I'll try not to talk too loudly, because I think it booms, and apologies for the background noise. I think can fairly brief. We had a call a couple weeks ago, and reflected on the CSTD Meeting that was going on in Geneva, and now we are at the WSIS Forum. So just to go back on the content of the WSIS+10 Review, this is the review of the WSIS outcome, as we drafted in 2005 at the World Summit on The Information Society in Tunis.

And the so-called Tunis Agenda set out a wide-ranging agenda, including a whole range of action lines, specific targets were set on accessibility, on multi-lingualism, on e-skills, et cetera. The effectiveness of these action lines and how the targets would be met or not, is something that the WSIS Forum looks at on an annual basis, and that's what we are doing this week, but also the WSIS+10 Review to be held in the United Nations General Assembly in December we'll look at as well, and there has been a preparation phase to this, that we've discussed before which included the CSTD Meeting, which is the U.N. Commission. Two weeks ago in Geneva, they produced a resolution on the WSIS process, or a resolution that mentioned the WSIS process, and that will be discussed at the ECOSOC Committee in July in New York, and we'll go as an input to the United Nations General Assembly discussions in December.

The preparation for those discussions in December will be intergovernmental, as we've mentioned before. A committee in New York, the so-called Second Committee of U.N. Governments, U.N. countries, commissions in New York, are starting their deliberations in June, in two or three weeks' time, and then there will be a break for summer, and those intergovernmental discussions will continue in terms of crafting a paper, that will be debated at the UNGA in December.

Now, between then and -- Sorry -- between now and December, a number of actions taking place; there will be various public consultations that will take place in New York, and also an (inaudible) Committee is being formed by the ITU and DESA, UN/DESA part of the U.N. network. This excellent committee is going to look at a number of issues concerning ICT for development, and probably Internet Governance as well. And we'll feed in some expert views into the United Nations General Assembly, and that the meeting of the Expert Working Group is taking place on the 8th and the 9th of June, so in a couple weeks' time, and ICANN is on the group. But it's a bit unclear exactly what that group will produce.

So I think I'll stop there. This is a process which we've discussed before, it's a process which we'll touch on at the IT Public Session in Buenos Aires, and also as discussed in the last call, staff will - - are preparing a background paper on WSIS+10 which we'll come to later in the agenda. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Nigel. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And yes, I was going to mention the action item from the last call, and about the background paper, so we look forward to seeing this. I see Bill Drake in the queue, so, Bill, you have the floor.

Bill Drake: Thank you. Just to say, Nigel, you know, these kind of machinations of the UNGA process are not really transparent to those of us who don't get thrown (ph) into the loop by the U.N., and so I have heard people talk about this expert group, but I have not seen any clear information about it. If you have any URLs, or pointers to, something you can direct our attention to, that would show us how these different phases of the process are being made up; that will be very, very helpful.

I don't now -- I assume you will put these into the background paper for the Buenos Aires Meeting, but from the standpoint of myself and Peter, who are charged with leading a discussion this, it would be nice to be able to see some of that in advance, if possible, so that we can think about how to tee up that conversation. So I think you can provide that onto your workload, anything you could provide, at some point, about that would be very helpful. I mean, I know that there are several different kinds of things happening in New York, but I'm not in touch with New York. Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Nigel?

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Thanks for that. Nigel Hickson. Yes, I mean, we don't have information, but we do have an agenda, I think, and terms of reference for this excellent group, so I can forward that, of course, to the group, and once we know a bit more about the agenda of the different meetings, not just the Expert Group, but also there's going to be some public consultations where effectively the President's -- the U.N. President, also will be consulting with stakeholders on the WSIS process, so --

Bill Drake: And I'm sorry, Nigel. I don't quite understand. Exactly when and where and how did those consultations take place?

Nigel Hickson: Well, as I said, it's very unclear what exactly is going to happen, what we believe will happen is that the United Nations General Assembly has what they call their Presidential Office, and the Presidency will appoint these two co-facilitators, these co-facilitators will be ambassadors, one from the G77, and one from, probably, Europe, and those ambassadors will be tasked with socializing the thoughts of governments with stakeholders. So July 1st, I think, or July 3rd, is being slated as a possible time when there will be a public, sort of, consultation on WSIS+10.

- Bill Drake: Nigel--?
- Nigel Hickson: And then, perhaps another one in September, et cetera, but I just think (inaudible).
- Bill Drake: And that will be in New York, or they will be online? First of all, do you know?
- Nigel Hickson: Well, I mean, certainly -- Thank you, Bill, I mean certainly, I mean, if it wasn't online that would be a serious omission, but physically I suppose those meetings will happen in New York -- will happen in New York, certainly not in Geneva as far as I know.
- Bill Drake: Okay. Thank you.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, gentlemen. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. With regards to the process, I gather that closer to the time, you'll be able to liaise with us, and let us know about -- a little bit more about the details of the process, and whether those input are also required from the Working Group. Nigel?
- Nigel Hickson: Yes. Sorry, I was on mute. Yeah, thank you. Nigel Hickson. Yes, I mean, as we discussed with -- at the last meeting, we'll produce this background paper which no doubt we'll discuss, and then we can also discuss what opportunities there are for inputting into the public, sort of consultation on this, as it goes forward,
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Nigel. Olivier speaking. There s a question in the Chat from Judith Hellerstein, "Has the facilitators been named?" Judith, do you want to expand on your question:
- Judith Hellerstein: Yes. Judith Hellerstein, for the record. Nigel mentioned about the co-facilitators, and I know those are supposed to be named on June 1st, they have to be named by June 1st, but I was wondering if they were -- if you have any inkling of, have they been named, or when do you think they are going to be named?
- Nigel Hickson: Thank you very much. Nigel Hickson. We did hear the rumor that they will be named during the WSIS Forum, the WSIS Forum and probably Olivier will give some information about the WSIS Forum which is taking place in Geneva, as of now. Whether they will be named in the closing session or something like that, and they haven't been named yet, as far as I'm aware of. Traditionally the co-facilitators; is 177, and we know Tunisia have been approached, because the Tunis, obviously, held the summit in 2005. And Latvia has certainly been approached, we know for (inaudible/audio skip).
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: There is a strong background noise, which doesn't appear to come from here, which is kind of around --
- Renate De Wulf: No. It's okay, Olivier. I've muted him. I'm afraid it's Bill.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh, it's Bill. Oh, okay. But could you just repeat your last sentence, Nigel, because I think it wasn't heard correctly.
- Nigel Hickson: Yes. It's quite difficult here. Yes, we'll update the group as far as -- as soon as we know when the co-facilitators have been appointed. We think it's -- well, Tunisia is one of them, and the other one could Latvia, it could be Estonia, but we'll know exactly, but we'll certainly let you know when we know.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this update, Nigel. Let's move on with our agenda. Let's go to agenda item number three, the preparation of the WSIS Forum Workshop. As you will have seen from the recent traffic on our mailing list, as there is a workshop that was taking place at the WSIS Forum tomorrow afternoon local time, at 16:45 Central European Time. It's called, IANA Stewardship

Transition, a Live Example of a Multistakeholder Process. And the aim of the workshop is to provide an insight as to what processes were used, and are currently being used, what multistakeholder processes are currently being used to build the proposal that the operational communities are putting together for the transition of stewardship in the IANA function.

The work, as I just mentioned, is ongoing, and we will be speaking about the ICANN process for the stewardship transition, but also the ICANN Accountability process, the CRISP process, I see regional Internet registries, and also the process followed by the IANA Plan Working Group, which is the IETF Working Group on those issues for the protocols.

There are two links in your agenda; one is to the actual workshop description itself. We will be -- open an action -- to do item four. Nigel, right now, actually as we speak, to update that speaker final list. There have been a few changes, minor changes on there, but what we are more interested in is some feedback regarding the actual presentation that will be given, and the presentation, I don't know, can we put that briefly on the screen and just quickly scroll through the few slides on this, Renate? Are we able to do that?

Renate De Wulf: Okay. So, is it on the page on the Wiki?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes. I've put it on the Wiki. It's IANA Stewardship Multistakeholder Process Showcase, that sends us to Wiki page on which -- from which you can download Second Draft of the Presentation, Version 0.2 Having said that, to --

Renate De Wulf: Okay. I'll go and get it while you can take it up --

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'll ramble on a little bit, as I'm used to do so. So, there's one more slide, a couple more slides that will be added by the IETF, they have sent those slides, so it's pretty much ready to go. We start with the page -- the first page looking at the big picture, which effectively shows the NTIA announcements, it's all diagrams effectively; the NTIA announcement, ICANN feeding into the ICG, and with the CWG Stewardship, CRISP and IANA plan groups. It's something that's been shared already within ICANN, but which we are going to use here.

As you will understand from what I'm just seeing here, lots of acronyms, and so we have built a glossary page that Nigel will print, and that will be dispensed to other participants that will be present in the room, so it's a hard copy, and so they will be able to navigate through the alphabet soup that we are used to, but that they might not be able to weather on first encounter.

So that's the plan for this. We plan to first go through the presentation, description of what the process is, then the second page would be the Coordination Group. We are just loading up; it would be easier to -- if we look for it.

Renate De Wulf: It's getting there, just a couple more seconds.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You do have to upgrade from this 14.4 kilobit per second line. All right, that's okay, thank you. It's there. Thanks, Renate. So, first page is this, the big picture, and we'll explain the process by which the NTIA has asked ICANN to convene the process, and effectively just getting the parties to work on this. The ICG was formed, and it was then determined, thanks to some suggestions by the Internet Architecture Board, that the CWG Stewardship, CRISP, and well, the three operational communities would be dealing with the different parts of naming, numbers and protocol parameters, and then we've got the link to the ICG proposal, which will come up, and of course we are in the middle of the process, ICANN Board, and then over to the NTIA.

The second slide is to do with the composition of the ICG itself, that will be shown on the big screen in the hall, so I expect that people will be able to read all of the different names of the different groups and will, probably, ask someone from the ICG to say a few words on this specifically.

Then after that the timeline to date, on the CWG Stewardship, important timeline showing, primarily, all of the work that has been done in gathering public comments; the first public comment period being in November, and reaching, today, which is just after Istanbul, and that's where we are now with the second -- So, first public comment, second public comment, and where we are going from here.

Then we'll have the end with the road ahead, and looking at where we are now, effectively the second public comment has just finished. The review of the public comments is not being -- taking place, and that will then be submitted to the chartering organizations, and then submitted to the ICG, and the ICG will take it into a proposal that will also include the protocol parameters and the numbers proposal.

On the ICANN Accountability part, as you know, the two are connected together. The CCWG Accountability is currently working to present -- put together its proposal and a component part of that will go over to -- will be joined up with the ICG proposal. The accountability progress, again, we are showing the site that there are quite a few members. A lot of participants, and an enormous amount of interaction taking place here. I don't expect that we'll have time to go specifically into details of work areas, but this really -- this diagram is meant to show the overall division of work between different component parts of the Working Group in order to enhance the efficiency of the work.

Also important, both in the NTIA's stewardship, but also in the accountability track, that we do have legal input. That's been very important to make sure that any proposal that comes out will actually be able to hold the road, and will work as far as the legislation is concerned.

The road ahead is still very crowded for this, for the accountability track, so we are now reaching the time for the first comment period. We are in the middle of the first comment period. Of course we are going to be asking for extensive input from people, participants here, letting them know that there is still time to comment on the first -- not even a draft, but the first of documents that the Working Group has published.

Then there will be second public comment end of July, spanning most of August, and then the work beyond that goes into an actual proposal that then needs to be delivered to the supporting organization, the advisory committees, and from that point onwards, if it gets the green light, there is the implementation project planning, that starts, along with all of the different implementation, and that also includes a public comment period. So we really are looking here at an enormous amount of -- a number of, a very large number of opportunities to get comments from everyone on the Internet.

Then there are two slides from the CRISP Team that supervise the work that they've done on their side. The first one, just shows the different calendar and what they've, secondly, been doing with the regional Internet registries that you have listed on the left column, all feeding into this CRISP Team that they have prepared, and that they've put together, and that will then be sent over to the ICG with, of course, work -- parallel work, ongoing work that will have to happen with the regional Internet registries, and the CRISP Team, and their community on the development of IANA Service Level Agreement, and the definition of the review committee.

The main plan goes to the NTIA. We have Chris Buckeridge who will be taking us through this -- through those two pages. And then finally the IANA Plan Working Group; there is actually one additional slide that we will have, or a couple of additional sides from IANA, but this one is the main one showing their process with input in the base of RFCs, memorandum of understanding, service-level agreements, all feeding into the IANA Plan Working Group, and that feeds into the IETF, IESG, and ICG. All of these terms are explained in the glossary version of what is distributed to participants.

And that, in effect, is the overall presentation. Is there any feedback on this? Have we missed anything on there? Is anything unclear? Now is the time to say, we still have time to make amendments.

Okay. It seems that I've put everyone to sleep. I see Nigel. Nigel, wake up.

Nigel Hickson:

No, it's good.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. So, I think, well, there are no comments on it. So, we'll see how it works. I mean, we've had a meeting earlier this morning to look at the flow of the whole session. Pablo Hinojosa will be moderating the discussion, and we -- well, I think everyone else is pretty much -- are all knowledgeable about where they are going. But I see Bill Drake has his hand up. So, Bill, you have the floor.

Bill Drake:

Okay. Olivier, further to our discussion this morning, I will leave you a practice question, so I'm in the audience, you just went through that. I raise my hand and I say, how will we see very clearly what the governance is? How are governments participating? All I see is a box with NTIA at the end of it, which implies that the U.S. is in control of everything. So where or how are governments participating in this process? Please explain. Could you -- could you respond to that?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yeah. Thank you very much, Bill, for this. A very good question, I'll hand the floor over to our GAC representatives who are present in the room, and they'll be able to explain, I guess the internal process of how the GAC is taking part in this; the GAC being the Governmental Advisory Committee part of ICANN. They take an extensive part in the process itself. Today of course, are also -- in fact several governments have actually made use of the public comments to bring their views into the process. And these, of course, being taken into account very seriously by the working group, but that, I guess, is not going to be me answering this question, it's probably how I wouldn't answer it. How would you answer it then?

Bill Drake:

I think it's -- in the presentation they will they will direct the question to you. I mean, you can bring the situation, but I think I'll ask you. Anyway, we'll see what people ask, but I think you will be asked to perform the exercise for a larger context of how GAC members participate in the process and, yes, public comments and so on, but I've just -- one could look at those -- I guess flogging the point, one could look at those slides as an outside person, the person who work in the more ITU type environment, and kind of go; gee, where are the governments (ph) in all of this? And, you know, I would so simply anticipate questions like that and have responses to them ready.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Well, thanks Bill. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking.

Bill Drake:

Anyway you can go on.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:

Yeah. Thanks, Bill. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Actually you bring a very valid point, because that last slide does say question and answers, and that might trigger people to think; ah-ah, now is the time for us to ask our questions. But the plan was to, first go through the presentation and then immediately after that, give the floor to different component parts of the Panel, in which we do have GAC members, and we do have people from the business community, and from civil society, yourself, and others, and they would give -- I think they would bring their angle as to how they took part in what was the process in their community to bring their input to the process.

And so, I think only after that should we then move into question and answers. So the question is, maybe -- should we just change the text on that last slide, perhaps, and, stakeholder involvement, maybe, an open question? And if there was place to think stakeholder involvement, then I'd be able to say, well, now, I'll hand the floor back to Pablo, who will be taking us through the involvement of the stakeholders in the process. And that's a good bridge to --

Bill Drake: Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Bill?

Bill Drake: Since you are not reading the chat, so I'll just repeat it. Just drop the slide.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: There is sun here. Okay. Well, it was just a slide to -- the problem is that --

Bill Drake: No, it's just --

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We are stuck on that last slide of the proposal, so maybe we can just have a blank slide up.

Bill Drake: Yeah. I'll agree to -- Well, whatever you want to do, but then I'm just saying, that cut, that slide makes it sound like people are going to ask you questions drilling down right now, and you want to address the rest of the Panel. So I would just give them a personal --

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I agree. Yes. Okay. Just a note, we are getting attacked by the sun right now, which makes it harder to read the screen. Nigel is hiding away. Let's try and see, put stakeholder involvement so that it doesn't have questions and answers on there, and that opens the floor then to the rest, and then Pablo can take firm control, and get this -- get the process to -- Well, get the flow basically to continue, and then ask questions and answers I think. We'll take note of that. Take the Q&A slide out and just put something blank here, or something. And I want to thank you, because that, again, will be sign as though we are finished. Good point.

Okay. I see no one else with their hand up, so let's move then to our next agenda item, and that's just a quick summary of the Internet Governance Public Session in Buenos Aires, and that will take place before our face-to-face session. We did discuss it in the past to some length, and the notes which were taken, give us an agenda that's quite broad, but that will be able to cover most of the points that we wanted to make.

First, a quick welcome, then there will be a review of the background paper, WSIS+10, CSTD and NMI. There will be a discussion on WSIS+10, the WSIS Forum and the IGF in Brazil; and finally, any other business. I wonder if we need to flesh this out a little bit, we do have a few minutes to spend on that. So the floor is open. And Bill Drake, you have the floor.

Bill Drake: Since I'm supposed to be commandeering (ph) this discussion, I have a certain interest in having greater clarity about what we are doing. I wish Peter was on the call, but we'll try to coordinate. I had understood that lasted somewhat chaotic, you know, I thought the call that we had, to point at a somewhat different direction in terms of order. So, if what you are saying now, is that we will -- that the conversation is going to begin with a dissection of Nigel's background (ph), and that that all happens before those discussions, that's also what I understood, and I had also, based on the times, whether we weren't going to have a part in the discussion for updates and views of miscellaneous developments in multiple different environments, and apparently that's not there anymore either.

So, I'm wondering exactly -- I personally, have a little trouble selecting, how I understood that last call with what I'm seeing in front of me, and I'm not quite sure how people see the conversation going, or to do whatever it is everybody wants to do, but I don't quite understand the logic of it, in terms of presentation, and I'm not sure who we were having speakers. So, the discussion online, frankly, while all of this is kind of drifted into multiple directions. And so I don't know where we are with that. But we do have -- we do have four weeks until we do this, and I hope that we can get people to engage on the list, and a little bit more clearly, and I think the discussion there will have to be more coordinated. And I think we can really decide everything and involve some people.

So, hopefully the list, it started out more clearly. In the meanwhile, as Judith just pointed out, we are not sure if we have 90 minutes or 75 minutes, but that said, tell me what it is you are

envisioning here, Olivier? When you say, we start with this review, does that mean that you start with Nigel talking for 15 minutes about what in his review paper before we go into the discussion? Is that what you got from that?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Bill. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I thought Nigel could speak for 90 minutes, but he is shaking his head, so I'm probably not going to say that. Actually, may I comment on this? We just took that list from Alexandra Dans' notes on the meeting when we discussed it, so I didn't go back to the actual call, and I'm not sure, we might have not captured that full agenda so well. Since you are going to be facilitating the whole flow, and facilitating the session with Peter, I wonder whether the two of you can make suggestions on the list, as you mentioned, work it out from the list, and perhaps build up from what we have here. We know the topics to address, but perhaps not the right order and the right speaker order, and that I'd be really interested in your -- and everybody else's suggestions on there.

I must add also, it's Olivier speaking; I'm a little concerned, this is not Olivier's session, this is the working group session, so I would be very interested in seeing that -- an input from everyone, and certainly, you know, my colleagues, co-chairs, and the whole working group is going to build this, and I hope that you can coordinate as well.

Bill Drake: As long as there's no -- since there's nobody else in the queue, I will speak again. What I would suggest is that we put Nigel's paper online, well enough in advance, for people to actually look at it, and then we do not (inaudible) through it. Not that I don't know how to use the (inaudible) -- tones for Mr. Hickson, I'd be happy for him to be one the Panelists, but I think having a walkthrough of the deeper covers, this is happening, and that's happening, and that's happening, and that's happening, and that's happening, for 15 minutes before we get into the discussion is not a good way to build up an interactive-feeling conversation. There's a part of part of the paper that deals with WSIS+10, and we would start there, and talk about WSIS+10, and reference that part of the paper and tell people to look at it, while we are talking about it.

And for also to the CSTD, in relationship to that, and then from there we could go in several different directions. And what I was suggesting is, you know, if the WSIS+10, if we are imagining the first chunk of discussion is, you know, 3 minutes or something, for WSIS+10, which I hope we will get, I hope enough people that will feel connected to you and the discussions happening in New York, if they don't have access to it, if they ask questions (inaudible), but if we do, like, 30 minutes on that, then we turn to these various other items, and that's where I would have said we could, again, reference the background paper and say, you know, here is a few minutes on the NETMundial Initiative, here's a few minutes on the meeting held in the Hague, here's a few minutes on UNESCO, and review some of the major discussions that's been happening about the broader Internet Governance, and particularly those that the -- that ICANN has been involved in.

So, to give people a little bit broader perspective, and that's what I'd suggest. So that if there's an email sent (inaudible) was here, I send along most of the acronyms, obviously we don't want to go through all of them but I think few of these meetings were significant, and are configurative fashion to go forward, and I mean, I think people should know about the capacity building things the Dutch are doing, and so on. So I would say, WSIS+10 main chunk, and then miscellaneous.

And our speakers we can identify for WSIS+10, there are speakers we can identify for miscellaneous, and use the background paper, integrate it into that discussion, rather than spend much time reviewing it. I just worry about people sitting there and not talking. We want an interactive flow.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah. Thanks, Bill. It's Olivier speaking. I've absolutely agreed. And I think the suggestion that was made about having that background paper to start with was one that, Peter Dengate Thrush had listed on the -- explained on the mailing list, and that gained much support, when once that's review, of course it's not going through line-by-line, page-by-page, explaining the thing, I think perhaps I could give a few minutes, four or five minutes, and maybe as the flow, that you are

saying, take each one, each part, have a discussion, and that would actually stop from having a long lecture about all of the different issues, and then opening the floor afterwards. So that, to me, sounds like a good plan forward.

Are there any other thoughts or comments on this? I see Nigel, Nigel Hickson.

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Thank you very much. Nigel Hickson. I mean, just a note. What we did following the last call, is because we were faced with the deadline, I can't remember what it was now, is we put in a description to the ICANN site for the meeting, so there's a sort of a section that we have to update in terms of possible speakers, and we put the moderators, co-moderators down, et cetera. And I think the description I did, I haven't got it in front of me, but it was quite general, in that it mentioned that the discussion would focus on WSIS+10, and related to the issue, and in addition will take into account developments at NETMundial, and in the NETMundial Initiative, and other related issues.

So I think we tried to cover the -- cover the context of a fairly wide-ranging discussion, depending on how the moderators and the group see it going, but I think -- yes, I mean, the background paper might well serve to -- you know, hopefully cause a number of questions to be raised by the audience, which is really what we want. So, we shouldn't, clearly, spend too much time at the beginning, I suppose. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: If I can unmute myself, sorry. It's Olivier speaking. Thank you for this, Nigel. Bill, any comments so far? Are you okay with where we are going at the moment? You've got the right direction?

Bill Drake: Shall I raise my hand or just talk. That's fine. I mean, look, you know what, it will all be fine, they always work out, they are always -- they are always well attended, they are always interesting enough, I was struck -- if people had some special thing that they had in mind for how we were going to organize it, I wanted to get my head around what that was, if we -- if it's okay, Peter and I will sort out a proposal and put it back to you.

On the list if -- Nigel, will you have a chance, you could send us your information, whatever it is you posted to the program. I understand the program is supposed to go up next week, that will cover the offer, and we will, over the course of the next few weeks, identify a few more speakers that will be relevant to the two different parts of the conversation.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Bill. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Now we have to move on to the preparation for the face-to-face session of the Working Group. That will be on Wednesday, the 24th of June, at 17:30, that's to be confirmed. And on this we haven't really had very much discussion about, what we are going to talk about, bearing in mind things happen so quickly, and so then we are dealing a moving target here.

I open the floor for suggestions. I don't if Rafik is able to speak on this, a few words on this as well, or if he is not, I do realize the time in Japan is rather late.

Obviously, I guess maybe, some of the discussions we will have face-to-face will obviously have to do with the first session, the public session, but obviously we also do need to make use of our face-to-face time to plan ahead for our future activities, and what we are going to be doing in the next few months afterwards, and perhaps forecast things instead of just behaving in a reactive manner a few weeks before things happen. The Internet Governance calendar is very full, as you all know, and there are many opportunities for the community to be involved and proactively doing things.

So let's see. We have Rafik in the queue. Rafik, you have the floor.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Olivier. I'll just note, I suppose what you want me to comment, is about our face-to-face meeting, and as you talked about the planning?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, thanks. It's Olivier speaking. It's about the planning for the face-to-face meeting. Our session, we need to make full use of our time there. It's not often that we meet face-to-face, and one suggestion I had was to look at our calendar of forthcoming activities and actually plan for the work. I don't think we have very much need to discuss our charter and our internal issues. I note that my now most supporting organizations and advisory committees have now acted, and there have, so far, been no objection to the Charter being interpreted to have a wider "membership" as such, and I'm using quotes around membership; by being able to have participants that take part.

So, it's a very open group, and I don't think we should lose time on it. But with regards to our own preparations and our own planning process, obviously our key deliverables and key deadlines that we need to deal with. And not only just pointing those out, but starting to organize ourselves in a direction which will make us proactive. Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Olivier. Okay. What I think, I mean, it's more, like, we have, I think, a kind of trust (ph) calendar, and just we agree for the deliverable for each, maybe, event, that it's -- it's possible to give input. I think we started that discussion a few weeks ago, that if we agree on this way to proceed I think we can make it. We have also the priority with, I think the U.N. General Assembly and before, the latest process. I think that can be our focus for the next one. And I don't think we have to spend any time in any procedural process related to the working group itself. I think we are done there, and well, let's focus on make deliverable to make us relevant to the rest of the community and to show that we are doing progress.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Rafik. Olivier speaking. Anyone else? Any other suggestions? Bill Drake.

Bill Drake: I'm not feeling good about this right now. You know, the last time we did this we have a fairly full room, and I think a lot of times people come into these sessions not knowing quite what to expect, and looking for something to be reasonably well structured, and if we are kind of pouting around, and I don't think that will be optimal. There was discussion on the previous call, people kept raising the question of whether they might make any kind of joint statements about anything. I would also discuss repeatedly on multiple calls now, and hearing the reviews, those who say that the working group should not do anything like adopting text, in which case I'm not sure why we exist.

Then there are others of us, they say, well we did it, or we wouldn't have anybody else, and we did really well, and the extent of which we will lead. And I think that fundamentally the next question of, what is the purpose of this Cross Community Working Group, and do we wish to engage in any kind of joint activity that has actual outputs? Because really we weren't getting to spend a little bit of time on, in a focused way, because it's been sort of just a few people who happen to participate in these calls, saying yes or no on the side. We've not gotten much of a sense from the 150 people who had signed on to the mailing list, nor from the, you know, 100 or so, or 70 or so, that show up to the actual meetings, were thinking.

But I think maybe we need the -- not quite a reconstitution of convention, but some sort of a -- a little bit of an inward-looking discussion about fundamentally what is the purpose of this activity. If at the end of the day all we are going to do in this group is have weekly phone calls, and then program the public IGF sessions three times a year, personally, I'm not sure that this is the right structure for what we are doing. So I would like to have conversation again, and I don't know how this (inaudible), but I just feel like we are just spinning our wheels.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Bill. It's Olivier speaking. A very good point indeed, and yeah, and also concern about the fact, we are only a handful of people on the call to discuss this. And perhaps it would, indeed, be a good moment to engage with our wider working group. I gather the majority of people that won't turn up at the working group's face-to-face session, will be working group members, and certainly launch into this question, from the calls, I must admit, I haven't seen any consensus on that, but if we can work out a middle-of-the-road position, that would be good.

It is difficult since, of course, there are different component organizations are not able to -- they have different things that they can do in such a working group.

And I guess that the NETMundial submission was a very broad, generic, non -- well, it didn't break any ground in any specific way. It wasn't particularly controversial in any way. But if we are, to actually make statements and draft papers for our five issues to input into other processed, then we probably need to work out what our limits are on this, and what our opportunities are as well. Bill Drake?

Bill Drake: I just -- further to that point, Olivier, I mean, what I suggested several times on previous calls, was we already agreed with that text for NETMundial, it does represent the least common denominator, consensus standpoint across the community, we stand for multistakeholder, we stand for single interoperable (ph) of the Internet, blah-blah-blah. It's very process oriented, it's not taking positions on any substantive issues where the different parts of the ICANN community might be in disagreement.

And so my question was, in the context that something like an intergovernmental WSIS+10 Review, why would we not consider to take that text, and tweak it -- update it a little bit, and repurpose it, because it is saying things that are the common view of the community, simply to establish the premise, just like we are doing tomorrow, by having this meeting during the WSIS Forum, by trying to say, look there is this multistakeholder presence, and this is community reference, who come together and this is how we do things, which is not understood by a lot of people in the wider world.

So, you know, to me the same kind of document can be used again, and we don't have to reinvent the wheel. And it would be useful to do that. If people feel that we can't even tweak and reuse a text we already agreed to, then again, my view is, we don't have a lot left to do. But I think either way, we have to have the conversation, and get a clear, renewed sense of mandate, the purpose for this group. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks or this, Bill. It's Olivier speaking. And sorry, when is the deadline for the input on this process? Is it over in September?

Bill Drake: You are sitting next to the expert.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: What's that?

Bill Drake: Nigel knows. I don't know.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So, let me turn it over to Nigel. Nigel Hickson, do you have an answer to that? When is the deadline for submitting input to the process?

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Thank you very much. Nigel Hickson. Well, you know, as we mentioned earlier, I mean the whole process concerning the negotiations for the U.N. General Assembly text are unclear. I mean, I think what is clear is that at various stages during the process, and I mentioned that there might be some form of public consultation, perhaps we'll notification in a couple of weeks' time, that there will be a physical consultation in New York on the 3rd of July, or something. And obviously people will be able to go along for such a session, and make their views clear, and perhaps at that session, the co-facilitators might say they would welcome some comments in writing. I suspect that will be the case at some point; that there will be initiation of a written consultation round -- against certain criteria, or against certain questions. So, clearly there will be an opportunity to comment.

The view taken by ICANN is conditioned by the view taken by the iStar. So, the iStar organizations discussed the WSIS+10 Review at their last iStar coordination meeting, and decided that we would not put an individual submission to the UNGA, but we would put in a single iStar

contribution. So I'll be working with ISOC and the RIRs, and we had a brief meeting here at lunchtime to that effect, on how we sort formulate our views going forward.

I mean, I suspect this might not be a perfect process, but I mean, that's what I've been informed that we are going to do. So, how that affects what this group does, of course, is for you to decide, but it's quite possible that ICANN, itself, and that's been exchanged, won't have a -- won't individually, be putting in views for ICANN, it will be part of a technical community, part of -- a contribution. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Nigel. Olivier speaking. (Inaudible/audio gap) --

Bill Drake: I guess the only point would be whether we want to have a separate statement on the part of the community that will be different from just the Board, the bureaucracy, the staff mechanism, (inaudible) you in terms, et cetera. And the point of doing that would be to emphasize the community nature of the business. But if people would prefer to simply have ICANN as part of an iStar thing, representing our views, then we don't have to do anything, except other than to ask that we have some engagement in whatever it is the iStar was doing.

And would we also -- Nigel, do you know if the other iStar entities, are they doing any kind of consultation with their members around this, or is it just the top staff, the leadership of these organization that are saying, this is what we think?

Nigel Hickson: Shall I answer that, Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Sure.

Nigel Hickson: Thank you. Nigel Hickson. Very good question, Bill. Two comments; first of all, you know, depending on what this group thinks, of course what -- I mean, if iStar have a common position, then ICANN's contribution to that will be significant. I mean I think that's obvious, if you like, and therefore us putting in a contribution as staff, we can obviously consult like we did before with the CSTD. I mean we can consult with this working group as we did for the CSTD process, so that's obviously -- there's no problem, there so to speak.

In terms of the other ISOC members I know that ISOC, what I've seen, is that ISOC has been very proactive in explaining the process to the Chapters, and in taking comments from their industry, if you like. I think it would be fair to say that probably the original internet registries had another focus at the moment in terms of the IANA process, et cetera, and have not, if you like, moved the staff forward as far as ISOC and ICANN have.

But, you know, as I said, the process is slightly unclear. Once the process becomes a bit clearer, then I'm sure that they will sort of react. And as I've said, we've established this iStar Working Group to make sure that there is some sort of coordination of positions. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Nigel. So, I think it sounds like a very good topic to work on when we meet face-to-face. That should definitely be one of agenda items, and it might take most of the discussion that we have on that date. So the first part would be looking at the calendar planning for the different things that we need to work on, and then a chunk of time discussing whether we want to -- well, how the working group will participate in the input for this process.

How does that sound, everyone? I see "hunky-dory" from Bill Drake; and no other comments on the call. So that's probably a good step forward.

Renate, are you taking the notes today? Or is Alex taking those, or?

Renate De Wulf: No. It's Nigel, actually.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh, Nigel taking notes. That's why he's been scribbling away and writing, and being busy and all that. I was thinking he was doing his personal correspondence in the meantime. Okay. Excellent! Right.

Renate De Wulf: No. No. He has been weaving a way for you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Good to see. I think I owe him a coffee now, and a beer later. All right. Ladies and gentlemen, we are reaching the end of this call. Let's go into any other business. Seeing no one put their hand up, I would like to thank you all for this productive call today, and we'll follow up by email, and Bill, I don't know whether Peter will be able to listen to the call today, but please link up with him, and so work on the agenda for the IG Public Session.

I'll remind you all of the call of the ability to participate remotely into tomorrow afternoon's WSIS Forum. And I know that Mary Uduma is on the call here, and she will be able to participate also by -- remotely and we'll have a -- there's and Adobe Connect room that's linked from that page, and there is the ability to have voice and video for people outside the premises.

With this, the call is -- Well, I don't see anyone putting their hand up. So, the call is adjourned. Thank you very much. Have a very good morning, afternoon and evening. Bye-bye.

Nigel Hickson: Thank you.

Unidentified Participant: Bye all.