

20150603_CCWG_IG

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Renate. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everyone. This is the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance Conference Call; on Tuesday the 3rd of -- sorry -- is it the 3rd? It's the 4th here, but there it's the 3rd of June, 2015.

And today we have quite an interesting agenda with some of the work that we've done recently, but also primarily focusing on the Buenos Aires Public Internet Governance Session, and also the face-to-face session.

Is there any other business to add to the agenda? I believe there is one.

Renate De Wulf: Olivier, yes, from Marilyn she sent an email, just a little while ago.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I have it here, and she would like to add the deliberative calling proposal at IGF 2015, and whether ICANN was anyway engaged, including, as far as funding or promoting that proposal. So we'll be discussing this under any other business. And is there any additional any other business to add?

Seeing no one put their hand up, let's have the agenda as agreed. And let's start the roll call, please, Renate.

Renate De Wulf: Okay, we have Carlos Raul Gutierrez, Peter Dengate Thrush, Judith Hellerstein, Sam Lanfranco, Lynn St. Amour, Mary Uduma, Marilyn Cade, Olivier Crepin-Leblond, and Young-eum Lee. We have from Staff Nigel Hickson, and myself, Renate De Wulf.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Renate. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Have we missed anyone in the roll call? Okay. The roll call is complete, and we'll move straight to the action items, and there is an open action item that relates to later in our decision, and that's an action item from our call on the 12th of May, fro Staff to produce a background paper, regarding the road ahead, the topic would be WSIS+10 as well CSTD, and why are these external events important for ICANN and for the ICANN community. With this, I'll turn it over to Nigel Hickson who, I believe, is in charge of this action item. Nigel? And you might be muted, Nigel.

Renate De Wulf: Nigel, I've unmuted you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. It sounds like one of these calls.

Nigel Hickson: -- for choosing a background paper as I described one the last call.

Renate De Wulf: Nigel, we missed a --

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, we missed the beginning of your sentence, so if you could --

Nigel Hickson: Hello, yes. I'm sorry, I got cut off, or didn't hear everything. Can you hear me?

- Renate De Wulf: Nigel, please, can you repeat whatever you said.
- Nigel Hickson: Yes. Yes. Sorry. Good evening. Just to note that I understand the action that's been placed on us, we are in the process of producing a background on paper (inaudible/audio skip) and would hope to be able to circulate it early next week. Thank you.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. And you might wish to try and get a dial out or something, because I think your voice does cut out a little bit, just in order to avoid future problems during the call.
- Let's go to agenda item number two, and oh, that's again, back to Nigel Hickson for a quick feedback on the IGF Workshop on IANA Transition Process. There is some news about this.
- Renate De Wulf: Nigel I know you are trying to get --
- Nigel Hickson: Thank you, Olivier. Nigel Hickson. I hope you can (inaudible/audio skip) Well, I -- Oh, dear. What a life! I don't know what I can do, I can have a dial out, of course. Let me carry on.
- So, essentially in terms of the IGF Workshop, as I think we noted on the call, on the previous, call, the proposal that was put in by the CCWG for multistakeholder Internet Governance, IANA Stewardship was selected, it was in the first set of 50 of the workshop proposals selected by the MAG. We got confirmation on this on Tuesday, this week, by the IGF Secretariat, and so we know that we've got a proposal in, but any changes to the agenda on the -- what we put in has to be -- have to decide by July the 1st. So, perhaps we need to consider before July the 1st if we want to - - how we want to amend or to put the speakers down, et cetera. Thank you.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Nigel. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And so we have until July the 1st to change some of our speaker list if we wish to do so, as far as the content of the workshop is concerned, I know that we are going to be dealing with this shortly, because we had a bit of a test run for last week, at the end of last week, and that worked quite well, so I'm not sure if we want to change the actual topic or make any amendments on that. But certainly we can make some amendments depending on lessons learned.
- I don't think that we've heard anything back from the people that are listed currently in the workshop, as to whether they wish to be taken off that workshop. So far, it looks like we've only had positive responses, but what we might wish to do is to actually perhaps suggest to those people that the people that were included in the workshop we did last week, for example; them having been through this test run, could be the speakers at the IGF Workshop as well. I don't know how others think about this, or whether anybody else has followed this in any way. But the floor is open for comments or questions.
- Peter Dengate Thrush: Olivier, Peter Dengate Thrush, here. Can I make a comment?
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, please. Go ahead, Peter, you have the floor.
- Peter Dengate Thrush: Just the obvious one, that the IGF is a long way away, in terms of what might have happened in IANA transition between now, or even between the 1st of July, I mean; so what I suggest it will be to try and keep the description and even the personnel as placeholders, and then have a serious look at this around the time of the Dublin Meeting, and make sure to do the tightening up on it at that stage. I'm not sure we can do much till this system is out. Thanks.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Peter. It's Olivier speaking. Nigel, until when do we have to make any amendments? You mentioned July the 1st, is past July 1st, then completely frozen at that point?

Nigel Hickson: Thank you, Olivier. Nigel Hickson. Well, no. I mean, I understand what people are saying as well, which is of course very sensible indeed. I think all the -- and I will check up on this with the people out there in -- out there in Geneva. What the email tells us is that in terms of what goes on the website, the website, I assume, for the IGF is going to go live, and when the website goes live, there will be information about the session. And that information will be the information that we supply by July the 1st. But of course, I mean, it doesn't stop us changing it in the future, I wouldn't have thought. I mean, I can't see that they would not allow us to provide information and now allowing them to update the update the website in due course, but I'll clarify that.

So I think it's probably a two-stage process that might want to look at it to tighten up any details, perhaps, by July the 1st, and then of course we can change it, depending on circumstances as Peter has said. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Nigel. Olivier speaking. And there was a question which Tarek had asked me when we met in Geneva, and he said, "What happens if the transition doesn't take place and the whole process collapses?" And obviously at that point I think that the workshop would just not -- does not take place as such, or perhaps take an entirely different form, but I believe we have to think that this is going to work, and the process is moving forward, and at the moment, it all looks as though it's going on course.

Lynn St Amour, you have the floor.

Lynn St Amour: Thank you, Olivier. I mean, I can't do anything but hold the course, and don't believe (inaudible) fall apart, may require more time, but I think the intent of the workshop is still useful, is it's focusing on the transition, per se, but on the multistakeholder community processes. So I think there's a lot of learning there, irrespective of what happens, hopefully they'll transition. But I was going to put my hand up initially to say that I think it would be useful to hear how the Panel went last week at WSIS and from there determine whether or not we need to, you know, exchange or tighten up the abstract or the definition. So maybe we could move to that, and then revisit this particular item after.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Lynn. It's Olivier speaking. Good point. So let's join agenda item three with agenda item two, since these are closely linked. Agenda item three is a review of the WSIS Forum Workshop. That took place on Friday afternoon, and my feedback on this, the way that it appends for those people that weren't here. So we have Pablo Hinojosa, who chaired the workshop, and there were three people from the primary operation community. So I was dealing with the names, proposal, Chris Buckridge (ph) dealt with the CRISP Proposal, and Elliott Blair (ph), from the IGF dealt with the protocols proposal. And we went through a PowerPoint presentation, it wasn't PowerPoint -- it was just a set of slides which was just showing the process.

A very full room indeed, we had in excess of 100 people, the proposal. We had about 90 minutes, and it took us roughly 50 minutes or so, to go through the presentation. It may be a little bit messy, we had a few technical problems at the beginning, and then there was, I would say a pretty good discussion with the floor, several questions being asked, questions about the multistakeholder process; whether that was working, whether the process itself was open enough for everyone to be able to participate. But it certainly appeared to have gotten a lot of people in the room to finally understand how the whole process has worked in all of the different communities, and also how this fitted with the accountability process, that's running in parallel with the CWG/IANA.

Apart from that, I would say -- generally I would say it was -- a workshop that was very well received. There was one thing that we didn't and that appeared to have been very helpful as well, which was to print some -- print a one-page glossary, that was available to participants for them to look at the different acronyms that are being used. It's a process that is full of acronyms. And as a result of the feedback I've personally received have been very positive, but I don't know if any of my colleagues who have been -- who were there were -- have any other points of view on this.

I'll give them the floor, and then I'll give the floor to Peter afterwards. Actually, I don't even know, maybe, Peter, have you, perhaps followed the workshop remotely? I know there were some problems with remote participation which was a bit of problem there, which hopefully we won't have at IGF.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Thanks, Olivier. Peter here. Yes, I did follow. My apologies to everybody, my problem was to get there, but I didn't seem to hold up anybody which is good. I thought everybody performed reasonably well. What I'd highlight, I think was actually complicated this is to outsiders, and I think that's the takeaway for future sessions. We, who are living with this, and some of us have been living with it for a very long time. Most of us on this call have been doing it for many years, so we tend to forget, it's not just the acronyms, which is a good point you made, Olivier.

And so I think, a couple of things, one of as many pictures as possible in the presentation that is helpful, and then many things to distribute beforehand and ask people to takeaway afterwards, will make a good -- make it easier for people to follow. I think you've got to work out in advance, as part of it. What are you trying to do? Are you trying -- a lot of people, it's just simply informing them, and for then it's too hard to then ask them to start making sensible contributions to the debate. Though, I think we have to be clear whether it's an information session, or a policy debate session, when we are having one of these things.

And I think, just, I'll close by saying I thought that the attack that we expected from the ITU which came in a personal (inaudible). Mr. Hill questioned, I think in the end the questions were relatively weak, and they were very handled by the panelists. Overall, I thought it was a very good piece. Well done.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Peter. Next is Young-eum Lee.

Young-eum Lee: Thank you, Olivier. I was just trying to unmute myself. I think it's very encouraging that you have the impression of the session was that people were able to get a better sense of what was going on, but actually my major question was, partially answered by Peter when he mentioned the Hill question, and I'm just wondering what his question was, and if there was anyone else that wanted to take issues with what was going on, and what those questions were. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes. Thanks very much, Young-eum. It's Olivier speaking. And my recollection which is faint, because so much has happened since, although it was only a few days ago, was that, Mr. Hill asked specifically about the openness of the process, and the ability of people to be able to take part in this. I might resort to other colleagues who were there at the time to, perhaps, give a fuller picture. I must say my mind is a little blurry on this already, would you believe it.

Nigel Hickson: Olivier. Nigel here. If I may? I think you are absolutely right, but also his point was that his views, his personal views, Richard Hill's views has not been fully taken into account in the actual proposal of the naming community, and that was rebutted by Mr. (Inaudible) from Iran, who said that any views that had sort of support from more than just one person, were taken on board, and were to be considered seriously. So that was the sort of -- that was the response. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. Indeed, perhaps one of the things that we do have to put across is that the proposal that is now on the table is the result of a consensus more or less which might not be directly where individual members of the working group, or indeed individual members or organizations that commented the process, wanting to see, but that's the nature of consensus, being able to find something that will take into account the points of view of -- that were expressed, and finding a middle-of-the-road solution that will satisfy the great majority of people, and of course, undeniably at that point you will have some -- points of view that will, I guess, not be reflected in the final proposal.

I certainly can see a number of points in the final proposal which neither I nor the ALAC, or the ALAC Working Group that works on these issues are particularly happy about, but we can live with them. We are just not objecting to those points, and perhaps that's one way of answering and providing information on this.

Young-eum Lee, your hand is still up, so you have the floor. Ah, you've put your hand down. Okay. So thanks for these points, Peter. That's very helpful. I gather -- I know that Marilyn Cade is on the call, I'm sorry to be appealing to you, but you were in the room at the time, and I wondered what you thought could be done to make things better, or help with the way things were done at the time. The way for those people who weren't in the room or did not follow the program, so we first had the three operational committees that explained the process, and then we had different angles and points of view that were expressed by various members of the community that were also on stage, which included Marilyn and also Bill Drank, and others, and including also, having Marcus Comer (ph), a member of the ICANN Board.

So they all expressed different way -- different points of view with regards to the process, and how things went. I initially thought that we were going to be asked questions about the actual substance of the proposal itself, it looked as though the audience was quite understanding in the fact that this is an ongoing process, we were solely looking at -- solemnly looking at the process itself rather than the proposal itself.

Any other comments on this?

Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah, go ahead, Marilyn Cade.

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. I wanted to speak for a few minutes about a change that I would propose for the IGF itself, taking into account that there will be an even larger number of people who took part, non experts, in not just the terminology but also the process. And I think the overview that was done, and Olivier, I really want to compliment you for organizing, and also the work that you and others put in to making sure that there was a very robust and simplified set of materials that people could look at, and come around to asking questions.

But I think coming into the IGF, we will need to probably get closer to it. Have a good understanding of who is going to be attending the session, and hopefully it won't be those of us who are insiders, but people from the broader Internet Governance community who are attending, and will therefore really benefit from the overviews that were done. Even though they are time consuming, I think they are very important to make sure that people have a good understanding. I think it may have changed a little bit by them, one change that I might make is to put the respondent, people like myself, and Bill, and others, who are from the stakeholders, down in the front row where -- so it doesn't look like there are so many panelists.

And yes, still allow us to respond, or for someone to take our place and respond, I'm happy to be replaced. Then I think that also; make it appear from the launch of that segment much more interactive, by having the microphones and the respondents down in the front row, and then moving into the audience. I really -- I do expect a lot more questions at the IGF than what we got at the WSIS Forum.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Marilyn. Olivier speaking. And let me ask a question then. I was a little concerned about the fact that the presentation did take so much time, and so we actually ran out of time as far as the questions were concerned at the end. I noticed several people that have still put their hand up, and we weren't able to take their questions. Should we try and crunch the presentation a little bit more than what it currently is?

Marilyn Cade: Well, I think it will be simplified by then, right? I mean, I assume we will have made more progress in certain areas, and things like elaborate timeline, and other things, I think would automatically be simplified.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: So we might lose a couple of slides, I guess. Especially, the road ahead might actually a smaller road ahead, than what we've got at the moment.

Marilyn Cade: Yeah.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks. Coming back to the question that was asked earlier, is this workshop meant to be a -- just an informational workshop, or are we looking at really gathering views of the community, and getting a discussion going on this. I thought that was an interesting question. Anybody?

At the moment, my feeling is that it's more of an informational workshop, and I guess the audience is there asking questions. There were some points of view that were expressed, and these were the usual points of view; which actually, you can also sometimes see in the comments that were made by specific countries, and some people that don't believe the process is open enough. But the overall -- overall it looks like a lot more like the information session, than a question where we are debating a topic and trying to find a solution to the problem at hand.

Marilyn Cade: Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We are checking with everyone, if there's any other point of view. Marilyn Cade?

Marilyn Cade: Yes, thanks. Marilyn speaking. We are not trying to shift decision-making outside of the ICANN process. The ICANN process is open and inclusive, we may be inviting more people into the ICANN process which, I think, is the point that we were trying to make. But I think -- you know, I don't see this as an additional form of a public comment. I see it as an additional way to encourage people to participate in the public comment processes that we establish at ICANN.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. And I gather that by November there will still be a chance to be involved in the accountability process since there is -- and if I recall just from memory the diagram that was showing the future of -- a future process as far as accountability is concerned will be several, further commentators (ph) especially when it comes down to implementation. But that, hopefully, would help with more people getting involved.

And I'm not quite sure whether there have been more comments received as a result of our workshop on Friday, the public comment for the accountability is still open, I believe until a few hours from now. So, we might have -- I'm not even sure, I don't think we need to sort of check on this, but certainly the workshop would change.

I see a note from Lynn St. Amour in the chat, "With a proposal submitted obviously there would be changes to the workshop itself since we would be speaking more about the past rather than the future." But there's still going to be a significant amount of follow up on that, and perhaps we might be able to reflect n any of the additional discussions that will have taken place until then. So the presentation itself, is obviously not cast in stone.

I hear someone?

Lynn St Amour: Yeah. It was Lynn, Olivier. I'm not sure it needs to change that much. I mean, the the intent of this workshop, as I understood it, was really to explain multistakeholder processes, the role of the various organizations, and that's not going to change substantially. If anything I think this whole process is probably bringing to light the roles of all the organizations involved in the IANA functions, all of the oversight administration, but I mean, I hope we are not thinking that there'd be some significant change once the proposal is submitted, but it's still I think -- it's still I think that we lose enough, I'd say, to explain to people why this was an appropriate process. About the role

of the community, the strength of the communities, et cetera, is something I think, you know, frankly enough isn't made of.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Lynn. It's Olivier speaking. I think that it's just the diagrams, of course, looking at today being early June, and then we will be in November, it probably would be better to put the diagrams as being today being November rather than early June. That was the gist of the -- of what I meant by having to amend the presentation slightly. But certainly the contents of the presentation, I think would probably have to remain the same.

Okay. I see no further questions on this. Just to let you know there is going to be another test run of this presentation that will take place on this Friday, and the Euro Day, with Sofia Bulgaria (ph), where I think, in fact, all of the three operational committees will be there, so the same people. So it's myself, and Chris Buckridge, and Eliot Blair will all be here to speak about the process, and then there will be other community members that will be commenting on the process itself. Hopefully it will be a different audience, and it will be interesting to see the reaction we have from a purely European audience, that might actually know a lot less about the stewardship's transition. And I will report back to you in our next call to let you know how it went.

And let's move on now to the next item in our agenda, that's the preparation of the Buenos Aires public session in -- well, public session and also the face-to-face session of our working group. In our last call we had a number of discussions about, first, the public session, Bill Drake took the floor and in the absence of Peter Dengate Thrush being there, he brought his point of view about what he thought would be discussed at the time. The idea is to start with the paper, the staff drafted a paper. Go through it very quickly and pick things up from there.

I know that Peter Dengate Thrush is on the call this time, and as we've said Peter and Bill would be the people in charge of this session. So I hand the floor over to Peter for his feedback and his point of view and his thoughts on the public session, in Buenos Aires.

Peter, you have the floor.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Thank you, Olivier. Peter here. Really just to apologize; Bill and I had arranged a meeting in Geneva last week when the -- when we were going to be together and we haven't yet caught up. I realize that the time is running for the BA Meeting, but we haven't yet -- I thought we had quite a good discussion though, about the way we -- the way everybody wanted the session to run. So, I'm not sure whether I've got much to add to that. I think to take any directions from propel, if there's been any changes of mind, or if people want to confirm or strengthen any particular position. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much--

Peter Dengate Thrush: Oh. And just say, Bill and I will talk -- Bill and I will try and talk either late this week or early next week, to make sure that we are on track.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. That's very -- that's a good thing, thank you. It's Olivier speaking. So, just to remind you all, Bill Drake, last week, spoke to us, and suggested that we have a few minutes to start the conversation about the paper that Nigel Hickson would have put online. About 15 minutes or so to build up and interactive conversation starting with the WSIS+10, and then obviously speaking about, in that respect, about the CSTD, what we imagined would be the discussions taking place in New York, and I think Bill mentioned about 30 minutes on that. And after that, if there is still time, and hopefully there would be, we could also spend a few minutes on the NETMundial Initiative, a few minutes on the meeting that was held in the Hague a month ago, and also the -- a few minutes on UNESCO and other discussions there.

Now, I gather that, Peter, you'll be able to work with Bill Drake the exact timings, and so on, of this agenda. One concern or -- not a concern, but a question, was the identification of speakers,

and we happen, so far, certainly -- to put this in -- cast this one in stone, and I wonder whether you have any thoughts on that.

Peter Dengate Thrush: No. Peter here. No particular thoughts. There are, obviously, people who know a lot about this, many of them are on this call. How would the group like to handle to that? Do you want us to reach out to people? Do you want people to ask us, volunteers, and call that, or do you want us to show the (inaudible) to people that are appointed. You know, all good mechanisms, in their own way. I'm happy to work with whatever people want.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks for this, Peter. It's Olivier speaking. And actually I just realize now that there was also talk of Ben (ph) being part of this, as far as leading this, especially with regards to presentation. I'm a little confused, I'm afraid, because the discussions last week didn't touch onto that. Are there -- I guess I can ask here, since we have -- as you've said, several people who would be good speakers in that respect.

Marilyn, or Lynn, or others, are there any volunteers to be on that Panel?

Marilyn Cade: Actually, I'd like to ask a question about, when we go through the list of events that we need to cover, we are going to have the background paper, that Nigel and others are working to -- the staff are working on. Right?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's correct, Marilyn. Yes.

Marilyn Cade: So, are we trying to treat this as helping people to put on the current page in terms of what's going on, in which case I think we would want to spend more time on the WSIS+10 agenda and events, at least at an overview level. We know who the co-facilitators are, we are not going to know a lot more, but we'll know a little bit more, and we'll know even more by listening. But, you know, I think -- Are we asking people to give short briefs, to duplicate what the paper is doing, or just to be a subject matter expert to field questions?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. Over to Peter, yes.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Olivier, I just wanted to agree that Marilyn's question needed answering, and to add to that. Again, if we could be a little bit more precise about what we are trying to achieve. Again, is it an information session in which case, we can pop up the material and have skillful people explaining things, including the processes that have been followed today, and give people a lot of up-to-date information? Or, are we asking for people to participate? Or is this a call to arms? We are actually asking people to get on -- you know, storm a barricade somewhere; or a combination of all of those? Because that will make a difference to obviously in the event that we do, including who we ask to do it.

I think there's a tendency to treat all these things as information, and in which case people can get it just by, you know, logging in and picking up the paperwork. If we want, I would prefer and I think we agreed on it the last time, to try and make it somehow more interactive. We need people to contribute that, I think we just have a bit of discussion about the right balance between those three or four other objectives, which I think is going to cover the basic information and tell people where it's going, and we have to be realistic about the size of any barricade we ask people to storm. But just to talk and talk -- teaching session is probably not going to be the most interesting thing we could do. Thanks.

Marilyn Cade: And I would just, Peter --

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you, Peter.

Marilyn Cade: Can I just respond to a comment Peter made?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You have the floor, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: I think it's a -- storming barricades is not a good call to action for the meeting, but being aware of how they can participate, and why they should participate or comment inactivates outside of ICANN. That's why that paper that Nigel is working on, to me is -- you know, perhaps after we see the paper, under each section might be a proposed action, or how to comment, or how to participate. I mean, use the session to elaborate on how people can get -- can get more involved. The WSIS+10 process, for instance, we don't even know if it's going to have a public comment period. If it did, it would be good to encourage people to contribute to that public comment process. But we don't at this point know, if there will be an online open public comments process.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks for this, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. I sense that with the audience that we are going to have, which is a sort of wider ICANN audience, certainly a significant part of the session should be informational, so as to bring people -- well, make people aware of what's coming up. With regards to a discussion, I certainly have concerns that if we have an unaware audience, we've been wasting much time and discussion some points which might not be particular relevant to the topic itself, but that of course will really depend on the skillfulness of our moderators in the discussion.

I certainly do love the idea. I wouldn't have called it call to arms, but certainly having, perhaps, more people in ICANN interested in these topics. And I refer here to what Lynn is saying in the chat, "Why are these external events important for ICANN and the ICANN community?" And that's an important -- that's an important point.

With regards to what Peter has put in the chat, "Preparing a resolution or a declaration that would be the ICANN condition on this going into the UNGA. There was a discussion last week, and I think that we've reached some kind of an agreement. I wouldn't call it consensus, because there weren't many people on the call, but an agreement that it would be an interesting thing to look at the submission that we made to NETMundial, and actually, perhaps, tailor that submission for the UNGA and the reason for looking at the submission for NETMundial is that it was quite a middle-of-the-road, lowest common denominator between the different SOs and ACs and the communities that make up the ICANN community, that set a certain set of principles which, I think, would fall in line with any input, any official input that ICANN, or the iStar communities, because let's also know the iStar communities are involved in this.

ICANN and the iStar communities would also be sending into the process. So we wouldn't be singing a different tune, than the tune that's currently being sent. And because we have already agreed to the NETMundial statement, it looks as though this is an easy pick, as such, and something perhaps to propose to the community then.

Any thoughts on this? I note, Peter, "Good precedent to apply in this case." Marilyn, I know you - there was pushback from you on the issuing of a statement, and I can understand on the process question of course, if this Cross Community Working Group is going to draft input for external processes, one needs to have the approval of the SOs, ACs and SGs, and the reason for looking at the NETMundial statement, is that this has already gone through extensive feedback, and has been presented at an international conference.

Any feedback on this? Peter, does this sound like perhaps something that can be presented to the community as well at that point? I know that's a lot of presenting. I you are presenting. If you are presenting first the issues, and then presenting a potential statement, or at least, maybe alerting the audience of a previous statement that was done, hat might then give us the green light for our face-to-face session, to work on the statements and start working on developing such a position.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yes. It's Peter here. Thanks for the question. I'm not sure what the answer is. It touches on some fundamental political issues inside as to how the processes work, and who speak, and particularly who speaks international. We don't really have a process at the moment for the work of this

working group to go through channels it seems to me. I wasn't part of the NETMundial process, but that's something that we should be looking at. Normally, what you would expect to happen as a Working Group like this, including once it's got the support of the ACs and SOs that have members on the working group, in terms of a charter, that should then go through a process; and I might be old-fashioned, but this way (inaudible) is to put us through a Board Resolution, so this becomes a community feeding up through the bottom-up process to the Board, and then the Board adopting, and saying, here's the ICANN position. And the reason why I think we could do that in this case, is because these positions are so well established, it's the sort of position that ICANN has been adopting since 2005. '06, and '07 and onwards, so it's not likely to be challenging.

So, I'm not sure if that's the answer to your particular question, Olivier, but what I would take in this case is that material would have to go out before the meeting, so people will have some time to prepare in time for the meeting in an organized sort of way. And I think what we were talking about last time, was actually using the face-to-face sessions, or I suggest using the face-to-face session as way of actually retrieving comments through the first session first, get some comments, and then use the second session to polish it up, as well as the other things we need throughout that session. Is that what you were asking, Olivier?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Peter. I think you are right on the dot. Absolutely! That's sounds quite right. The only question is with regards to the ICANN process, I note that ICANN itself will be sending in a statement. I wondered if Nigel Hickson could share what they were going to do. I understand it's an iStar -- well, it would be an iStar statement. Nigel?

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Yes. Thank you, Olivier. Nigel Hickson. Well, I -- I mean, I think we have to go back to where -- where we started a few minutes ago in that we have now got news on the appointment of the co-facilitators, so at least we know that, they are the permanent, representative from Latvia, and the permanent representative of the UAE, at the U.N. in New York, and they are going to be starting their job on the first intergovernmental meeting we have on Wednesday and Thursday of next week in New York. What we don't know as I mentioned earlier of course, is what sort of public consultation it's going to be, and what kind of call for comments it might be.

So, as well of course we can always we can always make, any month, I suppose to make a public statement on what they want a certain process to achieve. We don't know whether there's going to be a formal call for input. So all we have done so far, we haven't, I mean, obviously -- when I say we haven't written anything. I mean, yes, I mean I've written tons of stuff in terms of speeches that Fadi has made, and other people have made on the WSIS process, and it's been going on for two years. But we haven't made a -- we haven't made a formal statement as such, and we are having these discussions in the iStar community.

There is a group that's been set up, that's chaired by ISOC, and we had a call last night to discuss the overall strategy, and we've agreed that we would need to sort of codify that in some form -- in some formal statement at some point. So I can certainly share that, as we develop, but whether that's going to be, as I say, a formal input statement to the U.N., I just don't know yet. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. Do you have a timeline for this?

Nigel Hickson: Well, yes. I mean, I think we are working towards having a sort of iStar position in the next -- in the next month or something. With perhaps an expectation that certainly either just before the summer, or after the summer, we might -- you know, there might be a call for comments or something like that, but we don't know. So, I mean, certainly, I take Peter's point that, you know, what sort of process should we have here. I mean, we are always been informed by discussion, so if there's going to be a -- in the discussion in Buenos Aires, in the public session, we will hear -- hopefully, we'll get feedback on WSIS from the community and therefore that will -- that will inform our contribution to the iStar work. So it's a continuous process I suppose. But, you know, we are obviously in your hands.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Nigel. Next is Marilyn Cade.

Marilyn Cade: Hi. Marilyn Cade speaking. Let me provide a little bit of information for us to all consider. First of all, I have the recent MAG meeting, the Internet Governance Forum MAG Meeting. I made a proposal which was a repeat of a proposal made at the last MAG Meeting, and it's at least on the table, that we are inviting the co-facilitators, or someone from the PGA's (ph) too, that IGF in Brazil. Brazil itself is positive about that idea, and that the public comments, that would bring a public consultation outside of New York into the IGF. So the question of how the co-facilitators will arrange stakeholders' consultation at the height of that, is very unclear.

Latvia has committed to be very open, it was something of a surprise that the UAE was chosen. The expectation was that it would be Tunisia. The UAE is very strongly trying to position itself in the various, but it was a surprise. The PGA changes in September from Uganda to Denmark, and incoming President -- the incoming country has indicated that they intend to also try to be very open for consultation. I say all that to say there's a lot we don't know yet, I think we would need to ask ourselves, if we are speaking for the ICANN community, in a Cross Community Working Group, what are the messages that we want to give, and I -- it's suitable for actors, and ICANN community can give about the WSIS+10 process.

Are we just going to opine on ICANN's roles? Are we going to try to take on some of the larger issues that are under discussion and consideration on WSIS+10? I'm certainly happy to have us do some of that but I think that means people really have to dig in and understand what the review is about. And I say that in relation to whatever ICANN and the iStar would say as well. That if we are going to get -- if a statement is going to be made, it needs to be made in taking into account the larger context of what the WSIS+10 review is. How ICANN fits into it, but also what the larger challenges are for the next 15 years.

So, we could certainly lay some of that out, as a discussion in the meeting, and begin the dialogue, look back at the statements that we made to go into NETMundial, and see if it actually has any credibility or life in it, that is relevant to WSIS+10. I'm not going to -- until I look at it further, I'm not going to project that it does or doesn't, but that would mean, we need to treat this as a real working session, not just as a briefing session.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Marilyn. Can you hear me? I'm just Adobe Connect as an emergency at the moment, I don't know whether that works.

Marilyn Cade: Yes, fine.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Excellent. As they are calling me at the same time --Okay, and I'm back on Adobe Connect. Sorry about this. Good point, Marilyn, and I was going to suggest that the public session would be effectively more of an informational thing, and setting the questions, for the audience, and then to transform our face-to-face session into the time that we actually start working on this, and collect the feedback. The reason for it, being, I'm a little -- Am I still on?

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

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Oh. Okay. I just saw, "Lost you now," so okay. The reason for it being, I really wonder whether people will be at the time able to give us feedback, there and then and on the spot, and I know that it was suggested that we circulate things in advance, that given the limited amount of time, and the time that we'll take for Nigel and his colleagues to actually draft the background paper, and then if we may need it to draft something else on top of that, and perhaps amend the NETMundial statement to reflect the issues in WSIS+10, it just doesn't seem feasible, bearing in mind we've only got a few weeks left before Buenos Aires.

So, the Face-to-Face Meeting, and I see from Marilyn mentioning in the chat, yes, the Face-to-Face Meeting would be beginning the work on this, so we'd have the public session alerting

everyone, getting the first -- getting the ball rolling, then the Face-to-Face Working Group Session to perhaps draw in from those people that will join into start providing feedback with having on the table our NETMundial input, but also, of course, we certainly need to be finding out, and I hope that maybe we would have Board Members coming to the meeting, or even the Board Chair, I'm just throwing things at the moment, that, you know, possible things, to find a process by which there could be a comment from the ICANN community.

Looking at the starting material, the NETMundial material, with the stuff that we sent to NETMundial, I just cannot see this statement being drastically different than the points that would be made by the iStar community, although I'm convinced that it might well be that our NETMundial statement is very generic in its form, and the iStar community statement would be a lot more pointed or focused on specific issues of WSIS+10.

I know Peter Dengate Thrush has his hand up. Peter, you have the floor.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yes, thank you. Peter here. I wanted to agree with Marilyn, and just perhaps add, I think the time, going back to the high-level, what I think we are trying to do here, is prepare -- make sure there's community support and awareness for an ICANN position, going into a United Nations both in -- later in the year. There is going to be an ICANN position, there is an ICANN position, but it may not be very well understood and it's not clear that it's got community support, although I personally think it probably does.

So, what we are trying to do is tie up and support external warriors. When they go into statements and have statements that can stand up to the multistakeholder process, so that's what we are trying to achieve, I think is the ICANN supporting and helping create an ICANN position to go into those debates. We've got quite a lot of precedence in terms of NETMundial, and we've got a whole lot of existing ICANN position on these topics, so it's not a very difficult one, it's much more about making sure we follow a reasonable process.

And the extra bit is that we've also got the Dublin Meeting, which could -- may very well be the sensible time to sort of tie up this. So we start this process in Buenos Aires, we have the forum, we can give people the information, tell them what's going on, tell them that we are crafting a declaration or a statement or along the lines of NETMundial, and look to Dublin being the meeting where we finalized that. That would mean we would do less of a rush, we give people much more warning, and we can work, and it doesn't hold up Staff, or Fadi, or anyone else from making the statements that they were already doing. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks, Peter. It's Olivier speaking. When you mean, and ICANN position, do you mean an ICANN community position? Or would that be the position that would be transmitted by Staff?

Peter Dengate Thrush: I don't understand the question. There should only be one ICANN position, not a multiplicity of them.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Right, and it's--

Peter Dengate Thrush: At the moment ICANN is (inaudible/audio skip) --

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: At the moment the ICANN position is the iStar position. So ICANN staff are working with the iStar organization, and the common iStar will be drafted. What we are looking at is whether we should have a separate ICANN community position, I'm not sure whether we would be in the position to feed into the iStar position, and that might be something we need to discuss, and I sense that there would be an ICANN community position, and an iStar position, and at the moment obviously we don't know which ones -- what the position is.

But the way that I saw it so far, is there would be two positions, one through iStar, one from the ICANN community. And, Nigel, feel free to jump into this if I'm completely wrong, and I'm making an absolute dog's breakfast of this at the moment.

Nigel Hickson: Nigel Hickson. Well, I'm mean, I'm not really -- and you are not making a dog's breakfast, it's later for you than it is for me, I'm only in Brussels. But, no, I mean, I think essentially, as Peter said, I mean, one needs to try and avoid separate positions. I don't think there's a -- I don't think there's going to be any significant divergence between positions. I mean, you know, as an example, in the iStar call we are talking about things like having the objective that the discussion that the WSIS and UNGA should be primarily one of development, one of linking the WSIS process to the sustainable development goals, and continuing the WSIS Forum as a multistakeholder vehicle in terms of analyzing progress and action lines, et cetera.

You know, these are fairly sort of high-level objectives, which I think, you know, a number of organizations would share, and which were outlined at the WSIS Forum last week, by a number of speakers. But I'll stop there. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks, Nigel. Peter Dengate Thrush, you have the floor.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yes. Thank you, Nigel. I agree. I think the point I'm making is that it's difficult for staff, at the moment, to point to an ICANN community process, which develops and supports what you are taking into the iStar position. And if you think back at the moment at the iStar position, there was some surprise by members of the ICANN community at some aspects of that statement. And I think what I'm trying to help is avoiding that and support the work that the Staff does, but that as much as we can on the basis of developing a position in the community and then taking that position forward.

Obviously, we all know no plans survive contact, et cetera, and when you get into a community like the iStar community, and develop then a joint statement, things will move on further. But at the moment we don't -- we can't point to the ICANN process, or developing the ICANN position at the iStar negotiation or at the WSIS .

So, what I'm suggesting, is that this process should be able to do that, so there's a little bit of backfilling, filling up what the negotiations with the iStar community is very helpful, and we can make sure that that gets run through this process, and everyone signs onto it, and if they don't, you should want to know that now, or as soon as possible, so that either you can correct in its apprehension, or you change course.

What I'm trying to do -- what I think these sessions are trying to do is build a logical, consistent process with information and in development, and then everyone can get in behind, and you know, the decisions as they come out. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Peter. It's Olivier speaking. And I realize we are 8 minutes past the top of the hour. Just looking at the chat, I note there is support for starting the whole process face-to-face. Peter, do you sense that -- you wanted to start the discussion then in the overall public session? And then should we just follow up at that point and say for all those interested please meet us in our Face-to-Face Session, the Working Group Face-to-Face Session to start the ball rolling? Would that be the idea forward?

Peter Dengate Thrush: Yes. Peter, here. That would work.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Sounds good. Marilyn, any thoughts on this; I know that you are very much involved in this process? I'm not hearing Marilyn, you might be muted. Anyway, I see Lynn St. Amour has typed in the chat, that works for her. I think we are starting to see the sessions take shape. So, Peter, if I could ask you to, then, follow up with Bill Drake on the public forum for -- and the next week we'll be able to build a little bit more than to have a firmer agendas on the discussion and the flow

of the discussion, but I think we have a much better sense now of how the public forum will do. And then afterwards -- or the public session will go and actually really make good use of our Face-to-Face Session to get that ball rolling.

And that actually also, gives us the whole summer to relate back to our SOs and ACs and get the feedback that we need to get from the SOs and ACs to see what they are comfortable with. Obviously nothing -- this working group can do nothing without the SOs and ACs and being comfortable with it, and as you know, there are many different points of view being held out there, so we need to try and work on this as much as we can.

The summer, yes, I'm sorry. So, June, July, August, for those of us in the (inaudible) that's a different story, not summer.

Okay. I see no one else putting their hand up on this. Quickly, any other business? And we had the question or the discussion on the Deliberative Polling Proposal, the IGF 2015, and whether ICANN is in anyway engaged, it's included -- sorry -- including funding or promoting that proposal.

Marilyn, did you wish to just expand on this, a couple of words?

Marilyn Cade: I'll say briefly, what this is, it's over at Stanford University, to do a deliberate to call on Internet Governance, it was ascribed to MAG Member, to learn about it, it's -- I'd like you to share more thoughts with others about this process. But my primary interest in raising it here, is to understand ICANN's relationship to it. There's significant concern about it, among some of the MAG members that will be brought up in the MAG. I don't mean to bore this group with that, but I'm interested in ICANN's relationship to it. Particularly with --

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Marilyn.

Marilyn Cade: Particularly because the budget is \$709,000.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks for this, Marilyn. I don't know whether we have anyone on the call who knows about this. I guess, Nigel Hickson, do you know anything about this?

Nigel Hickson: Oliver, this is Nigel. I didn't -- a couple of hours ago but I -- well, I knew something about it, but I didn't see the details. ICANN have been approached, and we get approached on a number of projects, and the (inaudible) project is rolling out, and we have been approached, or the public responsibility to mean ICANN for funding. But no, you know, not actually funding the project, but supporting it in some way. But no decisions have been made at all. So there's no ICANN involvement at the moment, and that's -- in that project. And obviously Marilyn -- yeah, she's been discussing, in the MAG and whatever, but no funding as yet.

Marilyn Cade: Nigel, that's so humble. But I noticed that actually a member of the Advisory Group is noted as a Member of the Board of ICANN, ICANN's Board of Directors.

Nigel Hickson: Sorry, I didn't -- a member of the Advisory Group of the project is directing it.

Marilyn Cade: And it's actually, you know, Wolfgang Kleinwächter is a Member of ICANN's Board of Directors, and using that title as a Member of (Inaudible) Group, which is why I asked what ICANN Staff does.

Nigel Hickson: Yeah. Well, yeah, I mean, I'm not -- Yes, I mean, if got here, I think Wolfgang is in -- Wolfgang Kleinwächter is involved, I think Carlton (ph) is involved as well, from what I was being told earlier. But, you know, as I say, I mean, there is no funding from ICANN. I mean, individuals can serve on Boards of other -- of other organizations, of course.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. I sense that this is all pretty new -- It's Olivier speaking -- perhaps in the interest of time, we could punt this over to our next call, whether there is any follow up on this. And obviously so far we've been told, so no funding for this, and we can certainly discuss it on the list but we can have this as another AOB in the next call, and perhaps we'll have a bit more information at the time. And perhaps Nigel will be bit more prepared and have a bit more information by the. It would certainly help in the interest of transparency to know what is going on there and any feedback on this.

I realize we are 15 minutes past the top of the hour, and I apologize for yet again, finishing late. But I sense we've made some good progress, and I thank all of you to have been on this call, and look forward to speaking next week and following up on this. We have, certainly, some work on our plate, and Peter, hopefully, you can hook up with Bill Drake on the public session and then next week we can focus, perhaps, a little bit more on the agenda.

And with this, thanks to all of you. This call is now adjourned. Goodbye.

Peter Dengate Thrush: Thank you.

Nigel Hickson: Thank you.