

CCWG on IG Teleconference - 2015.08.05

AGENDA

1. Review of open action items ([from ICANN Buenos Aires Meeting](#)) (10 min)
 2. Update on WSIS+10 Review (10 min)
 - [Document submitted by Staff](#)
 3. Follow-up on Buenos Aires Discussions (30 min)
 - Public Session - <http://buenosaires53.icann.org/en/schedule/mon-ig>
 - [IG Public Session - 2015.06.22 @21:15 UTC](#)
 - Face to Face Session - <http://buenosaires53.icann.org/en/schedule/wed-ccwg-ig>
 - [CCWG on IG F2F Meeting in Buenos Aires](#)
-

MEETING DISCUSSION

There were around 25 members / Observers on the Call; Chaired by Olivier Crepin-Leblond

1. Open items:
 - Rafik Dammak to reach Chris Gift next week about enhancing the CCWG IG's visibility in ICANN's website
 - Nigel was asked to see if ICANN was helping to provide "Hubs" at IGF (*he will update group*)
 - GAC will liaise directly with Renate to add members to this group (this was following the letter from GAC to Olivier re membership)
2. Update on WSIS+10 Review by Nigel

He noted that the process (now in New York and preparatory Geneva phase) is well underway:

- Meetings in New York on 1st and 2nd July (with participation from Staff, Board and Community) were successful) enabling diverse expression of views;
- Noted subsequent "Call" from UN (DESA) for comments on WSIS process ahead of formulation of "Zero Draft" of Outcome Document (from December UNGA Session);
- Noted ICANN submitted our contribution with the help of the CCWG by the deadline of 31 July;

- Noted that there were 61 responses; gave high level overview; <http://unpan3.un.org/wsis10/nonpapersubmissions>
- We expect the first draft Outcome Document at the end of September and then public Consultation in mid October;

In discussion

- Some concerned on timelines for CCWG input to ICANN submission (we only gave them 36 hours); though several noted they had time to comment;
 - Olivier noted perhaps some initial work from CCWG was needed to help staff thinking;
 - Bill Drake highlighted Russian contribution and the proposal to “gradually” transfer ICANN role to UN;
 - Bill also noted that we had “option” to have submitted something; from CCWG; own contribution. Also said there should be “plan B” from ICANN (eg fallbacks)
-
- Marilyn detailed some submissions; noted process tells us (especially with more civil society contributions than any others) we are in a “new day”
 - Noted baton was in all of our hands; we can help within our national government’s input; and through business
-
- PDT called for a synthesis of all proposals; while others thought may be better to have a shorter high level summary;
-
- Marilyn thought we should not look back (so to speak) or to critic individual proposals but should look forward
 - Olivier – though we should explain more to ICANN Community on this issue;

So consensus would be to put some form of form / outline on WIKI with a high level “analysis” of proposals. We needed issues such as “IGF” mandate or “ICANN” reference; to be highlighted.

Action item: Group would consult internally on an exercise to construct an analysis of WSIS+10 Review contributions based on content; Renate to construct template (**done**) on WIKI

3. Follow-up on Buenos Aires Discussions

Oliver noted the discussions that had taken place in BA and noted that the main issue in F2F meeting was to delineate **purpose and scope of this WG**; and what it was here to achieve;

He referenced the discussion there; before in ICANN Sessions and on e-mail subsequently;

Noted his “middle ground” compromise (see below), which would allow staff to understand Community view; without a separate CCWG input being made to consultations;

- 1. That the CCWG IG is NOT a body which gives instructions to ICANN Staff on matters of Internet Governance*
- 2. That ICANN Staff can circulate ideas and drafts to the CCWG IG to obtain feedback on policy papers drafted by ICANN Staff*
- 3. That the CCWG IG can draft position papers and circulate them internally to evaluate the level of support of its various Chartering Organisations and that if there is support, ICANN Staff can get a better sense of the Community's point of view.*
- 4. That none of the work of the CCWG IG binds an SO/AC into any opinions expressed in the CCWG IG except if the Chartering SO/AC wishes to explicitly support the opinion*

There were no objections to the approach Olivier outlined (although little time for discussion) ; though Marilyn noted concern of CCWG should be “outreach”

4. AOB

Nigel noted we needed to discuss the Dublin IG session (format and timing etc)

Agreed that Next Meeting in week of 17th August;

ICANN Staff

10/8