20150610_CCWG_IG_ID976492

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Yes. Well, first welcome everyone for this Cross Community Working Group, on Internet Governance, on Wednesday the 10th June, 2015. It's over to Renate for the roll call, please.
Renate De Wulf:	We have Bill Drake, Tamer, Olivier Crépin-Leblond ; and from staff, Alexander Dans, Nigel Hickson, and myself Renate De Wulf.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thanks very much for this, Renate. Have we missed anyone in the roll call? It doesn't appear like it, so that's a small group today. Welcome, everybody.

This is our last call before our face-to-face sessions in Buenos Aires, this is because, traditionally, the week before an ICANN meeting, with people traveling and being very busy preparing for the ICANN Meeting, we usually do not have a call, and I think that on this occasion, with so much going on, and some people actually traveling as early as Tuesday next week, it will be impossible to have any call, and before actually meet.

So, the action items today, are -- well there was just one action item that was from last week, which was mentioned on the call, and I'm not sure, I hadn't heard any feedback on it. And last week we discussed the same things as we are going to discuss today, which is to discuss the Face-to-Face Meeting, but also the Public Session of the Working Group in Buenos Aires.

Bill Drake and Peter Dengate Thrush are, effectively, co-moderating the Public Session, and so there was an action item for them to follow up on our discussion last week, and I'm afraid I have very little recollection of the discussions last week having -- I have so many other things going, but I gather this is in hand, and I wanted to ask Bill, since he is on the call, whether you've been able to follow up with Peter, and put the final -- the final touches to the session, which I think has got a pretty good shape already. Bill Drake?

Bill Drake:	Does it have a good shape? Because I'm kind of -- I was quite unclear what its shape was. Maybe you can help me. When we had a call about this a couple weeks ago, I found the conversation a little confusing as to what was being agreed, and the information that was shared afterwards didn't clarify entirely to my mind. So, is this the case that we are doing one chunk that is WSIS+10, and then one chunk which is (inaudible) everything else? Is that the deal?
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Yes, Bill. Thank you. It's Olivier speaking. I believe that this is indeed the case, there is going to be -- I think, yeah, it was practically in two parts. The WSIS+10 being the first thing as the big thing on the agenda at the moment, explaining what's coming up, engaging the community into participation, so it's effectively asking the community to participate and already start the dialogue there and then, indeed, there was the rest of everything else. But I thought that we had a lineup of the things that were going to be included, that we discussed on the call last week.
Bill Drake:	I was not on the call last week, because it was during the EuroDIG. I did adjust a number of times the seven topics that we could cover, I did not notice anybody really responding to those, so I am

looking again right now, at the email I sent on May 12, for this. And, yeah, I don't see really that there was much in the way of a response, so I would take it that what we are doing, you know, in 75 minutes; is that the first half-hour 40 minutes, will be focused on the intergovernmental process, and then the last 35 minutes if possible, would march through a variety of recent events that would be seeking (ph) the attention of the community, including the Hague Conference, developments with the GFCE, the NMI, IGF Renewal, other (inaudible) process, WSIS+10, and various others.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And thanks for this, Bill. Olivier speaking.

Bill Drake: And how we are doing, right, and who are the speakers?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah. That's partly -- Bill, that's partly correct. But the thing though, it's prior to this, Nigel Hickson, will publish a paper on which we can base our discussions. I thought that was the idea, so we'll start with the paper that's published by staff, that then forms the basis of the start of our discussion, especially with regard to WSIS+10. Nigel is on the call, maybe he can share with us how he understood this to be.

Nigel Hickson: Yes. And good morning. Nigel Hickson. Yes. No, absolutely correct. I think in the note we did of the call last week, I mean there was an indication that we would provided a basic briefing paper, that would go over some of the issues concerning WSIS+10 and the IGF mandate, because they are combined, and of course we can, in that paper, list a couple of other issues just as topics, i.e. provide links to the latest on the NMI, and provide links to the Hague conference, et cetera, and to the IGF itself, in terms of the preparations of Brazil, perhaps.

And then, I think the idea was that paper in the Face-to-Face session would just be referred to and perhaps give it out, or made available to participants. And then, you know, it wouldn't be read through or anything like that, it would just be referred to as a number of issues, and then, as Bill has just said, discussion first of all, perhaps, would be on the WSIS+10, and of course by our next -- by Monday week, I guess we are talking about 10 days, or so, away, or more than 10 days away, there will be some developments on WSIS because of those meetings taking place this week, and they can be referred to and we'll probably be in a better situation to be able to indicate where the community input might be appropriate for the WSIS process.

So I think that that is right, what you said, and we'll certainly endeavor to circulate something in the next, say, 24 hours or something like that. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. And Bill, I guess I somehow stopped you in your tracks, but I thought I would add about the paper, because that's on the basis to the discussions, we'll then follow up afterwards in the Public Session. Are you -- are they coming back to you now? Are you okay with this, Bill?

Bill Drake: I don't think I've forgotten, I think I had understood differently. I had understood, as per what Nigel just said, and we were not taking these section of the time to talk through the paper, but rather that the paper would be referred to as background, and to these issues, and that the conversation would go directly to WSIS+10, and then during miscellaneous. And then in my parts the moderators could direct the attention of the audience through Nigel's (inaudible), as a reference point, to help them be keyed up and ready for conversation. So are we talking about across each other, or are we in disagreement? I don't understand.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I think we are in violent agreement. It's Olivier speaking.

Bill Drake: Oh. Okay. Violent agreement. I like that. That's fine. And then the questions that are -- (inaudible/audio skip) we don't want to be stepping on each other's toes, probably the logical thing would be for me to simply moderate one part and Peter to moderate the other part, that would be

my suggestion. So that each person knows what they are doing, and could shape the conversation accordingly. Does that sound okay, to you?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: It's Olivier speaking. In the absence of feedback, it's going to be difficult to structure exactly how you are going to be running the session. What I would suggest is that we follow up by email after this call, and go into the details as to whether you want to moderate, what are the specific parts, and he could moderate another part, or whether we have co-moderators, where one moderator is on the floor, and the other moderator is on the stage, trying to involve the room a lot more. Obviously in Peter's absence, it's going to be difficult to know what -- how he saw, or how he is seeing the moderations of the session.

Bill Drake: So, fine. If you could send the message raising the point that would be good, but I think it would logical simply to try to do what (inaudible) going back and forth, because otherwise we may be fumbling all over the place, and that, I'm not sure would be helpful as a group. So then the next question is, who are we teeing up as go-to people for each of the respective topics? And people always express and they develop new faces, and expect the problem is always (inaudible/audio skip) WSIS+10 for actually a relatively small percentage of the population in the room (inaudible/audio skip)--

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Is it me, or is it Bill who is breaking up?

Bill Drake: So, I'm not sure how to proceed with that. The last time we had Janis, Wolfgang, Marilia, Marilyn, again short of people, I believe our emails a month ago, Megan and Alice and Tom, but I don't know who would be actually available. Although we should decide this, and we should let them know, it's in two weeks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's correct, Bill. It's Olivier speaking. I believe that they are all available, so you said, Janis, Wolfgang, Marilyn, Marilia and -- well, I know Marilyn is and Marilia too. The only question mark is Wolfgang, you know, I believe it is Wolfgang Kleinwächter, and I think that he is coming there, because he is an ICANN Board Member.

Bill Drake: Yes the question is whether they know that they are doing this, and if they had been contacted, and are coming teed up, and will be listening on the program accordingly. I know --

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I have thought --

Bill Drake: Okay. Now, we are agreed that they would be the people? Or it will be appropriate to send the message to them?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes. Agreed. It's Olivier speaking. --

Bill Drake: Am I making sense?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's fine, you are making sense. I'm taking notes at the moment, so Janis, Wolfgang, Marilyn, Marilia. Did you mention any other names? And then I'll follow up with them, and email them, and of course copy you and copy Peter on this so that we, within the next 48 hour or so, we've got a good lineup of people, and that -- yeah, I guess that's how it would work. I don't think we need to have too many people on stage, obviously, because we want to have that interaction with the audience, or the participants as one calls them these days.

And I'm a little -- just a little concerned this is going to turn just into a boring lecture of some sort, when really what we are looking at is interaction with everyone. Of course, there is the message too, to transmit to the audience, and that message is how important those deadlines are, and those processes are this, week -- this week -- this year, and it's just a week. This year, and how to get involved but at the same time generating a discussion is obviously going to be a major target point

for this session. So any other people? Janis Karklins, Wolfgang Kleinwächter, Marilyn Cade and Marilia Maciel.

Nigel?

Nigel Hickson:	Megan Richards.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Good point. Megan Richards as well.
Bill Drake:	Can we think of anybody from the developing world, besides Marilia?
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	On these topics -- It's Olivier speaking -- on these topics I'm not even sure who is following these topics directly. Perhaps --
Bill Drake:	I know Marilia is in New York now for the WSIS+10 Process, so that probably is good that she will be there and be able to add something.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Someone close to the action. Okay. Excellent! Let's go now --
Bill Drake:	Sam Dickenson was there but I don't think -- sorry. I was just going to say, if Sam Dickenson was there, but I don't know if she will be coming to our session or not.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Yeah. Well, let's starts with those five people, and I think if we can add one more person from a developing country as well, so as to balance this out a little bit more, because at the moment it's entirely, in fact, very heavily European, and only one person form the South, and everyone else is from North America or Western Europe. So, let's try and balance this out with one more person. If, of course, someone who knows about the topics and follows them closely.
Bill Drake:	The people that I can think of off the top of my head, who follow WSIS closely are not involved in ICANN. So we can leave that one open for now.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	All right. Thanks, Bill. I hear Nigel Hickson in the background. Nigel, you have the floor.
Nigel Hickson:	Sorry, Olivier. Nigel Hickson. Perhaps I can give a bit of thought on who might be at the ICANN Meeting that is following the WSIS Process. It should be, you know, we had a lot of people at the CSTD and the WSIS events in Geneva, and perhaps some of those in Africa or other -- or Asia might be at ICANN, of I'll give that some thoughts. I mean, I'd be happy from staff to be there. I mean, just as a respondent in case there's any questions on what ICANN is doing on any of this.
Bill Drake:	We were inevitably charged to announce that, so. But Nigel, can you think of any particular people that are here for CSTD that would fit the profile we are talking about?
Nigel Hickson:	Yeah. I've got --t here's something at the back of my mind, I just -- I'm sure there are a couple of people that -- you know, that do fit the bill, but I just need to go through a couple of lists. I'm just -- I'm thinking Marilyn might be a good resource t think of a couple of people. But I'll give it a bit (inaudible) something out.
Bill Drake:	In this space and -- I'm sorry.
Nigel Hickson:	Sorry. No, I'll give this some thought and report back.
Bill Drake:	Okay. On the WSIS part we can name people. For the miscellaneous other events, we could just leave that kind of open, and ask who in the room wants to speak to us. We are still trying to tee up individual presence for each one, that might come up, that will be a simple way of doing it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thanks for this, Bill. It's Olivier speaking. And I think that we can, indeed do that, although I would feel a lot more confident if we had at least someone in the room who could speak to those things, because there's nothing worse than saying, well, who wants to speak about this process now in the room, and then no one puts their hand up, and we are just in a situation where we are the topic on the agenda but nobody knows about the topic, or nobody is willing to talk about it. But I do like the idea of asking for someone to come forward, and perhaps we could also have all the topic matter experts, or whoever can speak about those topics, in the sort of early row, -- somewhere in the front, so we can get them to talk about them, and that actually might reinforce the interaction between participants and the people that are up front. Bill Drake?
Bill Drake:	What I was going to say is that the same group of people probably can be useful here too, so if you want to talk a little bit about what's going on with the NMI process, and Marilia, and Wolfgang can do that, if you want to talk about what's going on at the WSIS+10, both of them have had observations about that, and you guys would know. If you want to talk to about what's happening in the IT (inaudible/audio skip) -- or public policy, whatever Marilyn -- you can certainly talk about that. I'm breaking up you said. I don't know why I'm breaking up, because I'm on a landline. I have a landline, it should be working better, but it's a (inaudible), I don't know. Anyway, my point was, I think if we identify six core people, both as sort of like the -- Again, they are not speakers, they are just initial conversation starters, go-to people, those same people will probably be useful for both such as the activity goes. Thank you. And anybody else in the room can chip in. So I think it will be fine, so don't worry. We don't have that much time anyway.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	It's Olivier speaking. I have one last question for you. Actually, it's just rereading the transcript from last week's call, perhaps you might wish to read through it, it's a fast read, you can just scope through it, and so on, and see what Peter Dengate Thrush had suggested, there. He had mentioned a Call to Arms and there was a little bit of push back, I think it just answers the expression being used as in, this is not the time when the -- we are not asking for the ICANN community to go out there and storm the Bastille, but certainly we are looking at the ICANN community to be aware that we have all these topics and all of these contributions that will be required of them in the near future. And so an aware participant is always better than someone who has no idea, and suddenly learns about some things, just a few weeks before the deadlines. So the idea -- I guess the main name of the session here is not only to alert, but to also generate some vocations in the audience, for people to want to be involved in this, and follow this up more closely. Yes?
Bill Drake:	I am looking at it. I am looking at the notes, and I don't see anything here that changes anything that we were suggesting to do, so we are talking here about the public session, the Face-to-Face is a different thing?
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Face-to-Face is a different thing, yes.
Bill Drake:	All right. So, do you want to talk about the Face-to-Face now?
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	No. I was talking about the Public Session.
Bill Drake:	Okay. Well, Call to Arms would be something for the Face-to-Face. It could be the one -- I could make it Call to Arms.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	I'm not sure actually. It's Olivier speaking. I think that the Face-to-Face, we already are up in arms.

Bill Drake: Are we?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah. Yes, absolutely, we are. We are, one way or another we are already there. So, I guess we are already on the war path, if one could call it this way. But, okay, let's put the Face-to-Face -- sorry the Public Session, aside, we are fine with the Public Session. On the Face-to-Face session, I think we are more into the idea that we are going to look at the calendar, and from there, start working out the statements that we have to -- that we are going to need to contribute at some point to the process. So, this will be the -- the Face-to-Face will be a follow up to the public meetings, because we will have already called up our people for participation and so on, in the public meeting.

                        Obviously we are going to be talking about the Face-to-Face meeting that happens later in the week, and at the Face-to-Face Meeting, we are going to look at the main calendar of what is coming up in the next few months. Make a choice as to what we wish to really closely follow, and what the group wants to contribute from that point onwards, and I think that there's also going to be a discussion regarding the actual deliverables of the group.

                        Whether the group will be able to deliver some statements to these external processes. The idea, for example, for the WSIS+10, if there is indeed a public consultation at some point, there was a suggestion that we would start with our NETMundial contribution, and amend it so as to make it fit the WSIS+10 type of format.

                        Perhaps it's just -- so taking this as a starting point, we do need to discuss face-to-face, whether -- the mechanics of how this would work, and how each one of the SOs and ACs would be able to engage in this, because obviously, we are all individuals on that Cross Community Working Group, and then some SOs and ACs, they have a much wider -- sorry, a much easier way to -- process wise, to voice the input of their community, and others they are not mandated to voice the input, so everything then needs to go back to their SO or AC. And I guess that we need to work out where our limits are on this.

                        That said, I would be I'm already saying here, I would be very disappointed if we were told that, effectively, this is just going to be with this working group, will just be a talk shop, because the participants are not able to relay back to their SO or AC, I think that would be a very poor answer.

Bill Drake: Okay, I hear somebody is typing.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah. Someone is typing. But I see Young-eum Lee has put her hand up. Sorry, Young-eum, I hadn't seen your hand, I was reading another document at the same time.

Bill Drake: The conversation has been--

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You have the floor now, Young-eum.

Young-eum Lee: No problem. Thanks, Olivier. This is Young-eum, speaking. I'm just adding to what you said about the (inaudible/audio skip). I'm wondering if -- I'm sorry I joined a bit late and I don't know if we talked about discussing about the NETMundial in Public Session, and what we can do to maybe get a feel from the room or rather say that, although we don't have a mandate from our respective SOs, and maybe we could kind of try to get the community to just -- feelings towards certain issues. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks, Young-eum. Olivier speaking. Bill? Public session? NETMundial I understand is in the second part?

Bill Drake: Yes.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Well there we are --

Bill Drake:	It is one of -- it's one of the -- Again, we can have this whole discussion, about whether we want to have a separate discussion of the NMI, and then several people should know, we shouldn't be spending time on the NMI, and then obviously said, well, we thought that we ought to, and my understanding was that the compromise was, NMI, like all other miscellaneous topics, goes into the second, miscellaneous part of the public session.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Yes. That's correct. And thank you --
Bill Drake:	We forgot the Private Session -- can I? So with regard to the Private Session we -- the proposal that you mentioned was for me, that we should pick the NETMundial Initiative statement, and customize it, and consider submitting it to the WSIS+10 in order to underscore our -- could be a bit about the stakeholder process, and the single Internet, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera (inaudible/audio skip) --
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	You are breaking up.
Bill Drake:	At that point several -- well, Marilyn, and I think somebody from FCC, I can't remember who, expressed reservations about whether or not we should be doing any kind of statements, and so I suggested, well, I think then what we need to have is the many conversations about what is the purpose of this group, and do we intend to work, and have been working as a cross community working group with deliverables. Or should we admit and cannot agree anything, and become a working party, discussion group of some sort.
	So I think that that's the antecedent discussion, but if it was enough (inaudible) to go forward with trying to do joint statements, or something, certainly I would think that the WSIS+10 would be there (inaudible) be focused. And that is where I think the voice of the nongovernmental stakeholders will be severely under-represented, as evidenced to the fact that they are having the meeting in New York today, where only those people who are ECOSOC-affiliated NGOs, where other entities have been told once they've (inaudible) to participate.
	So, a lot of our community is not going to be able to engage in any direct way in the WSIS+10 Review and I would think that -- of course believe my view that the only way to get a view from the ICANN community on the table, is for us to be coordinating it. And if people can't come to agreement on that, then I don't know what else we would ever do joint statements of. In which case I'm not (inaudible/audio skip) --
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Bill, you are breaking up. You dropped for a part of your last statement, Bill. It's Olivier speaking.
Bill Drake:	Well, I guess it's Adigo. I don't know why, maybe I should take a call back again. I'll probably just try it. Anyways, I was just saying the Face-to-Face is the place to talk about all these things, and let's do that.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Okay. Thanks very much for this, Bill. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. So what I have at the moment for the Face-to-Face is the first part agenda -- well, first agenda item is the review of the calendar of forthcoming consultations on Internet Governance. And then the second part of the agenda is, work of this group, whether we can start with a NETMundial joint statement, and start from there to submit to -- submit to WSIS+10 Review. Obviously the -- I imagine that this is -- this discussion is going to take the most of our Face-to-Face session. Is there anything else which anybody here would suggest we should cover when meeting face-to-face?
Nigel Hickson:	Olivier, good afternoon -- sorry -- good morning. Nigel here, I mean, just on the Face-to-Face, for those that come to the Face-to-Face meeting that weren't at the public Internet Governance session, I suppose they might want to -- they might want to be aware of what the CCWG has done since -- or has contributed to since the meeting in Singapore, because it was quite a good crowd in Singapore at the Face-to-Face meeting. So I suppose they might want to know what's been going on. Just a thought.

Bill Drake:	(Inaudible)
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	It's Olivier speaking. I hear agreement from Bill Drake. I see Carlos n the chat is asking, "Are you going to bring drafts?" (Inaudible) these calls all the time?
Bill Drake:	Huh?
Carlos Raul Gutteriez:	Can you guys hear me?
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Carlos? Are you able to speak, Carlos?
Carlos Raul Gutteriez:	Hello? Can you hear me?
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Yes, we can hear Carlos now. We can, and you have the floor.
Carlos Raul Gutteriez:	It's early in the morning. Yes, I got a little bit late into the call, I understood you are going to distribute a paper in the next few days. The question is, if this paper geared to what you are aiming for in the Face-to-Face meeting? Is this going to be a document to be distributed before the meeting that covers this idea f the joint statements? Thank you.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Yeah, Carlos. It's Olivier speaking. No. I believe the paper is for the first -- the Public Session. The paper is one that talks about all about what's coming up in Internet Governance in the Public Session, and that will be a background paper that will be distributed, and that people can probably read through, whilst we -- whilst the discussions take place in the Public Session.
	The Face-to-Face, the way I have it at the moment now, is a review of the CCWG's on Internet Governance work in Singapore; that can be done within 5, 10 minutes just to bring everyone up to the speed. Then we'll review the calendar of forthcoming consultations in Internet Governance, and I guess that bridging from this that we can move into the third one, the third item, which is whether we can start with a NETMundial -- with the NETMundial joint statement, and submit it to the WSIS+10 Review when there is a consultation there, and that, that I guess, that third agenda item is going to go to the core of this Working Group's activities,.
	As Bill said, some have said that they do not want this Working Group, this Cross Community Working Group to be able to produced papers for external processes. Some do, I guess that, Nigel, you will have to chime in that discussion as well, since I know that ICANN was going to -- Just to remind everyone, ICANN was going to work in conjunction with the other iStar organizations and submit a joint statement to the WSIS+10 Review. Obviously, there needs to be -- well, we need to make sure that the -- the two statements, if there are two statements at the end, one from the community and one from the iStar organization that those two don't row in opposite directions, or don't walk on each other's patch of grass either.
	Did you have time to think about this, Nigel?
Nigel Hickson:	Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. Nigel Hickson. So, just a comment on two developments, since the call last week that we had, we had a call with the iStar, we've formed a subset of the Internet collaboration call, called iStar and WSIS, and this is the likes of ISOC and the Regional Internet Registries, and IETF, plus a couple of other bodies. And we had our first call on WSIS last week. And the idea, as I mentioned on the call -- on our call last week, is that we are going to work up some common messaging for WSIS so when -- represents this from ICANN or ISOC or the Regional Internet Registries, or in the international meetings, we draw from the same message.
	I mean, this isn't a, if you like, a word-for-word script, we are going to -- You know, we can't always come out with the same words but, you know, the overall messages would hopefully be --

would be consistent, and that's something that's being drawn up, and probably will take another couple of weeks to draw up.

Separately, in New York this week, there's going to be an open meeting, yesterday and today -- sorry -- Monday and Tuesday, so Monday and Tuesday were an Expert Working Group on WSIS that was called UN/DESA and ITU and that took place. And today and tomorrow is an open meeting, with member states, that's going to be streamed, to talk about the WSIS process. During that session we should learn about the modalities for contributing views, documents, whatever. So hopefully by what -- definitely by Buenos Aires we will be able to note what the mechanisms are for inputting documents or inputting views into the WSIS process because that could be useful in terms of the CCWG discussions. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Nigel. Olivier speaking. And are there any further questions or comments on this? So, Nigel, you believe that there is space for -- both the paper via the iStar organizations, and also for the contribution that could come from the ICANN community?

Nigel Hickson: Well, no. I wasn't really commenting on that. Though it might useful to comment on that. I mean, I think our view is that, you know, we need a consistent message that -- Yeah, it's just it would be useful to be able to identify with where the mechanism was for input of any views into the WSIS process. There has been a lot of consultation already, so it's possible that the U.N. will say they don't want any more written contributions, but we'll see.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: We'll see how it works. Okay. Thanks. Olivier speaking. All of this will be discussed and opened up, I guess as the time comes close. So just summarizing for our Face-to-Face session, we'll have a review of the CWG -- CCWG's works in Singapore, then we'll have a review of the calendar (ph) forthcoming consultations, and then we'll have our Face-to-Face discussion on whether joints statements can be drafted, based on the NETMundial joint statements, and the mechanics of this, for each one of the SOs and ACs that are participating in this Cross Community Working Group.

Now, it will be interesting to also I guess get the comments and input from the rest of the community. We had about 100 people in our last Face-to-Face session in Singapore, so likely we will have a good turnout there as well, and hopefully they will have followed up from our Public Session earlier.

Anything else to discuss face-to-face? Are there any other suggestions as to what we can make use of our time when we meet there? We are all okay? Okay. So I think that we are -- Well, we have a better idea of what is going to happen in two weeks' time.

As action items I will follow up with Bill and with Peter on the organization of the Public Session. I will carbon copy Nigel on all the correspondence, so, as Nigel, of course, is our staff that deals with the room, and then needs to be aware of what's going on there. And I think -- is it Nigel or Renate who could amend the explanation on the website?

Renate De Wulf: Both of us could do it, but you can send it to both of us.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. So I'll copy both of you then, Renate. Both Nigel and you, and I guess we can probably make a few minor amendments then, on the website page, so it gives us a little better -- a better understanding of what's going on, in the agenda details. Breakdown of topics to be discussed. List of speakers, panelists laid out to the relevant subjects. Hyperlinks to any relevant documentation. All of this needs to be provided, so we need to build this up. I note that Bill Drake is already, instead of being a moderator, will have Peter Dengate Thrush there as well.

Renate De Wulf: Okay. Just send it to me and then we'll make sure it's put on the website.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay.

Bill Drake: Excuse me. This is, Bill. May I suggest that you copy Peter again on this email exchange so that we can get the text that's going to be on the website, as far as being with what we understand we are supposed to be doing as moderators?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes. Thanks, Bill. It's Olivier. You are not going to be copied because you are the persons to whom the emails will be sent to. So both you and Peter, I will be sending this to you and Peter, and it's Nigel and Renate who will be copied. So, yes, the five us have to work on this closely.

Bill Drake: Okay. I'm just saying before text contact with the website, we should see it. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah. For everything, for everything. You know, I like copying the whole world to emails, so at least we are all on the same page. We have not that much time left, but we need to get that done. It's just a matter of a couple of emails and we should be getting there. But the Face-to-Face session, I'll also be following up, sharing with the whole Working Group the suggested workflow of that face-to-face. That, I guess, because it is less public facing, it can be updated maybe a little bit later or -- well, we can update it now, but we still have a bit more time to discuss the exact timings, et cetera.

And Bill, if you do have the time, and I think you have mentioned it actually, that you've read the transcript quickly from last week's call, that will at least will also synchronize you with the discussions we had last week. We appear to have either you or Peter Dengate Thrush on the call, but not both of you at the same time, which makes it a little difficult, but I think this is all going to come together within the next 48 (ph) hours, so.

And with this, are there any other points or questions, or any other business? I don't see anyone put their hand up.

Just one more piece of news, last week at the European dialogue on Internet Governance the EuroDIG, and even shorter version of the presentation that was presented to the WSIS Forum the previous week, was presented to the audience and the participants of EuroDIG. Konstantinos Komaitis was the moderator for that session. We had three representatives from the three operational communities the names, the numbers and the protocols that spoke about how work went in their part of the world, and then we had some stakeholder, or different points of view from the other panelists, that were there to basically let us know or let the audience know how the discussions went in their part of the world, and what their take was on the process itself.

There was a little bit of discussion on the contents of the proposal, but the discussions, I think, revolved mostly on the process. Of course, as you know the process is ongoing, so we don't really know if it's going to work at the end, but trust me there enough conference calls to make it happen.

So that's one more session that we had, one more rehearsal, it went very well, there was a good reception from any -- everyone with feedback, and we therefore are on course for our big session that we will have at the Internet Governance Forum at the end of the year. Of course much will have happened until then, and it might be that we were in the meantime to explain the process in other fora as well, there are many different fora that will happen between now and the end of November.

I know that Bill Drake was there, as well, and Nigel wasn't at the EuroDIG session, but was at the previous session. Bill, do you have anything to add on this session we had at EuroDIG? Which wasn't strictly a Working Group session obviously, but it's members of the Working Group and we made use of the material that had been developed for the session at the WSIS Forum.

Bill Drake: Well, I thought it was perfectly fine. The conversation, I think, that the time was a challenge when you tried to present before a mixed audience with a lot of different backgrounds and interest that would improve or not inside the ICANN bubble, and you try to explain in a very short time what's going on, and then, you know, inevitably you'd get -- ICANN people who stand up for the Q&A,

and asked very detailed (inaudible/audio skip) -- what to do with it, but it's all part of the game, and overall I thought it went fine.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Bill. It's Olivier speaking. And you are right, there were a lot of ICANN people that stood in the queue to discuss things. One thing, again, we received very positive feedback about that was the one-pager that was the list of acronyms there. It seems that it's very helpful for people, so it's something to keep in mind for any future presentations, especially to other audiences as well.

Any other, other business? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I thank you all for joining on this call. As I mentioned earlier, there will not be a call next week, because people are traveling, and I'm not sure how many of you will be in Buenos Aires but we will have those two sessions, so we'll see much of each other. And so then, have safe travels, see you in Buenos Aires. Thanks very much. (Inaudible) my turn.

Bill Drake: Okay, thanks. Bye.