CCWG-IG F2F Session notes
ICANN53/Buenos Aires
Wednesday, June 24th 2015

[30 participants- Renate has the list]

1. CCWG-IG membership: confirming the SO/AC/SG "no-objection reply" to widening CCWG-IG participation. Charter.

Olivier: It was felt in the view of other CCWG that we could broaden this, so the observers/participants will have the same right that the members to speak. This was sent to the leaders of the SO/AC and the response so far has only being positive (GNSO, ALAC)

Action item 1: Young Eum Lee to follow-up with the ccNSO for their decision.

2. Suggestions as to how we should proceed with the forthcoming activities and plan for the next session of topics for the year 2015 and beyond Calendar.

Peter: we should have a repository of all the material such as the speeches from other external events

Bill Drake: our group should be listed in the main icann.org website

Judith: Laura Bendford said that something could be done

Action item 2: Rafik to ask Chris Gift to make our group more visible in icann.org.

Olivier: I have a feeling that this will be possible in the long term

Peter: prepare an actual ICANN position for the WSIS+10 (1 page)

Young Eum Lee: I agree that would be useful but I don't know if we have a mandate from the SOs/ACs to do that.

David Fares: whatever statement we produce doesn't have to be to the WSIS directly but we can make it public by addressing it to ICANN.

Bill: our first objective was to provide an input to NETmundial but then after that it hadn't being clear, are they things that we feel that we do have enough consensus? Is it helpful for the community to be talking in parallel on what the staff is doing? (for example the WSIS). It doesn't make sense to be a WG if you don't have an agenda of work.

Nigel: Tarek's view that the relationship with this group was really positive.

Olivier: CCWG can give guidance but not instruct ICANN

Peter: We are ICANN so we are going to develop ICANN position. And staff will be feeding in that position. There will not be two positions.

Alejandro Pisanty: I agree with Peter that we are ICANN. ICANN has procedures to create a bottom-up position. ICANN's position is a community position.

Olivier: it appears that the only real deadline for us will be the WSIS+10 review.

Bill: we've being meeting weekly in Conference calls and in those calls some people said that we should continue to do what we did in the past (position/statement such as the NETmundial one). I'm perfectly happy if there is not a consensus to do that, if we prefer to continue discussing among us and sharing information. In that case we are not a WG but a Working party. I personally think that what we did for NETmundial was useful.

Peter:

I would like to support what was said during the public session:

1- There are these UN meetings where developing countries are unable to participate and where ICANN might be able to help.
2- Bertrand: are these meetings MSH or not (principles)

Veni: There is webcast by the UN for those meetings; there is no need to help for participation because the diplomats are there.

 Link: http://unpan3.un.org/wsis10/

Draft roadmap:
http://workspace.unpan.org/sites/Internet/Documents/WSIS%20review%20preliminary%20timeline_v5.pptx.pdf

Marilia:

This one is to close, but maybe we can organize ourselves for the next one. It's true that the meetings have webcast but I believe that what came from the public session is that ICANN could offer additional support for example for the IGF (hubs for NETmundial). I think it would be really useful if our WG could work on a position, we are an organized group and we could share a message, a vision of development. We can be relevant and not miss this opportunity.

Action item 3: Nigel to check if ICANN can help with the hubs for the IGF.

Olivier: We want a position/a voice from the community and not from a specific stakeholder group. If we can't do that, there will not be an ICANN community point of view.

Judith: I agree with Marilia in getting prepared to issue a statement in the name of the CCWG. The concern is to get approval in time from our groups. If we do put on a paper, this comes at the same time than the Dublin meeting.

Olivier: it seems to me that we don't have a consensus on drafting a position and send it directly apart from the staff one. Several persons here seem to think that the community is ICANN basically and that we should work with staff to draft position to these processes.

Will we continue being a CCWG or do we turn into a working party?

As Rafik said, if we turn into a working party, there will not be a link with the SOs/ACs.

Alejandro: ICANN's has many processes to make sure that nothing goes against the community. The WSIS+10 goes way beyond ICANN. Focusing on ICANN could bring some complications in an instance where ICANN is not even discussed.