

## Summary

A constructive meeting. Positive reflections on the WSIS Forum Workshop (on IANA Transition process) which many noted was a useful dress rehearsal for IGF session in Brazil. On this CCWG pleased with confirmation of acceptance by IGF. Immediate concerns focused on agenda's for the IG public and F2F sessions in Buenos Aires. While was agreed that WSIS Review related issues would be focus of IG session (based in the staff Paper being prepared) there were differing views on whether (and if so how) F2F meeting should deal with a CCWG position on WSIS.

## Detail

*There were 10 or so present on Call; Oliver chaired.*

### 1. Agenda and outstanding Actions

Marilyn C asked to add Stanford / IGF project to AOB (agreed);

Nigel reported (in response to Olivier) that the staff Paper on WSIS was being written and would hopefully be available next week.

### 2. IGF Workshop proposal from CCWG: IANA Stewardship Transition process

I noted that the CCWG project has been accepted by the MAG (following discussions before and in Geneva) and that we had received a letter from IGF concerning this (which I had shared with the CCWG co-chairs).

Olivier noted we had some time to review the content and the speakers for this session; and suggested that we might also want to include speakers from the WSIS Session last week; PDT agreed, and noted we should be flexible as lots of issues were up in air. Suggested we do not come to firm conclusions until Dublin meeting.

I noted we had been asked to view contents by 1st July as workshop proposal would go live on IGF site; was agreed this should happen.

### 3. Feedback from WSIS Forum Session (24/5 – Geneva)

Olivier reported on this; noted and thanked cast including chair (Pablo – APNIC); Chris Buckridge (CRISP) a Eliot Lear on Protocol Parameters; also thanked respondents and Tarek from staff.

He noted there were over 100 in room; majority of which probably had some level of knowledge or indeed involvement in process.

Was noted that feedback was generally positive – especially in terms of raising understanding and awareness of what was taking place.

Was agreed the PowerPoint and Glossary (thanks to Grace) of acronyms went down well PDT said he followed remotely; thought went well; showed how complicated it was; need to keep this in mind; not just acronyms; more pictures and handouts needed for IGF session; ; Yound eum Lee – wanted to know what the approach from Richard Hill (who had asked question) was about;

I and Olivier noted his questions and responses, not least from Mr Aresteh....

Marilyn – said for for IGF would be “newer” audience so approach will need to be altered; also presentations will need to be adapted as proposals will have been submitted

Essentially thought we could probably be more reflective; though essence was same  
Olivier noted there would be yet another “test run” on Friday at EURODIG.

#### 4. ICANN 53 – Public Session

In introduction I referred to meeting posting; on the chairing (agreed Bill Drake and PDT) PDT said he had not spoken to Bill yet but was reasonably clear of overall approach; namely to build the dialogue on the elements of staff Paper;

Olivier noted a few issues around NY WSIS process and need to capture this and noted we also needed to consider who would be “respondents”

We agreed that it was no *just* information session; we agreed needed to be inter-active and fluid in nature;

We should be asking *why* WSIS is important “outside” of ICANN - for example would be good to get wider Community to contribute to expected WSIS Review consultation.

PDT said session should help inform ICANN position going into NY

#### 5. F2F Session and WSIS Position

There was a follow-up discussion to that which took place the previous week, namely on whether the CCWG should work up a contribution on the WSIS+10 Review;

Olivier reminded Group that we would need SO/AC sign off for any public CCWG position; I also noted how ICANN was contributing to a joint I\* strategy; and that this was underway; though of course is being conditioned by ongoing dialogue;

We discussed taking the *sense of the room* on an overall WSIS position during IG session and then using the F2F session perhaps to develop something;

Marilyn C noted the IGF Brazil session to feed in views to the co-facilitators and PGA

PDT was insistent that there could only be “one” ICANN position; which has to be worked out with staff as well as Community; perhaps should have Board sign off; there should be no intention of tying staff hands

Generally all were supportive of this approach.

#### 6. Any Other Business

Marilyn brought up the proposal Stanford had made to MAG; to “poll MAG members”; this had been discussed at MAG;

She noted that the cost of this was \$700k and that an ICANN Board Member (Wolfgang) was on project board.

I (having taken advice) said that while an supplication for funding (from Stanford) had been made no decisions on whether to had been made.

Next Call: Next week