

CCWG IG_2015-08-5_990241

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. I don't see a huge rush of people coming in. We're two minutes past the top of the hour and I recognize most people who are going to make it, are here. So, Renate, let's start the recording, please, and let's start the call.

Renate De Wulf: Yes. The recording has started. I will do the roll call now. We have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Rudi Vansnick, Rafik Dammak, Avri Doria, Judith Hellerstein, Klaus Stoll, Lynn St. Amour, Bill Drake, and some staff: Nigel Hickson, Ergys Ramaj, Alexandra Dans, and myself, Renate De Wulf.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Renate. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking on this Cross-Community Working Group on Internet governance conference call. Do we have anybody that are missing from the list hub (ph)?

Renate De Wulf: Peter Dengage Thrush just joined the call.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Anybody's name not been—oh, fantastic. Thanks, Renate. Anyone else? Okay. So, today we're going to be looking at the works that has taken place during the Buenos Aires meetings and briefly looking at the public session discussion, and then our face-to-face session.

And I guess that our job today is to try and pave the road forward for what our next task is going to be. Prior to this, we'll have a quick update on WSIS+10 review, the document which was submitted by ICANN staff with the feedback of our community, and therefore I just ask if there is any other additional items to be added to the agenda.

Don't hear anybody shout out, so the agenda is adopted, and we can look at the action items from our Buenos Aires meetings, or two action items that are remaining to be undertaken. One is for Rafik Dammak to ask Chris Gift to make the working groups—the working group itself more visible on icann.org.

I don't know, Rafik, whether you've had a chance yet to get in touch with Chris? Now, we can't hear you at the moment, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Hi. Can you hear me?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, we can. Go ahead, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Yes? Hello.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Evidently--.

Rafik Dammak: --to reach Chris and discuss with him next Monday. So, (inaudible)--.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, Rafik. Thanks very much. Olivier speaking. And so, we're going through--.

Rafik Dammak: So, I will keep you update on--.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: --the action items. Thank you. Next is for Nigel to check if ICANN can help with the hubs for the IGF. Nigel Hickson?

Renate De Wulf: Nigel has just requested a dial-out. I think he doesn't have any audio. So, he should be able to speak in a few minutes.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Fine. Well, we'll pass on the handover to him in a moment.

Then we've got three closed action items. And, as you know, one thing that we did manage to do was to find out that there was no objection from any of the supporting—or, the chartering supporting organizations and advisory committees, to interpreting the charter to have a slightly wider participation, and therefore being able to accept participants in the working group itself in the wider sense of the term, as defined in the other Cross-Community Working Groups that we've recently seen, such as the one on accountability and the one on IANA stewardship. So, that—these are the updates from the time itself.

In the meantime, I could also add that we did get a response from the GAC. You will have all seen in the emails, and I issued the consensus call for any objections to responding to the GAC, letting the GAC know that GAC members are welcome in this working group—individual GAC members are welcome.

The response was sent yesterday and I already received a response from the GAC staff that this will be passed on that they will liaise directly with Renate to add GAC members—individual GAC member countries to this working group. So, that's the update on the action items and on the things that we had to do.

I don't know if we now have Nigel Hickson for agenda item number 3. If we don't, then can I just open the floor, if there are any comments or questions on the action items.

Renate De Wulf: Nigel is on the call.

Nigel Hickson: Good afternoon.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks, Renate, and welcome, Nigel. We're now going to agenda item number 3, update on WSIS+10 review. And Nigel, you have the floor.

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Well, thank you very much indeed. I'll try and be fairly brief, as I think, looking down the list, I see a lot of names that know far more about this process than probably I do. But the WSIS process is well underway. As you know, the action, if you like, has moved from Geneva eastwards to New York.

After the ICANN BA meeting on the 1st and 2nd of July, there was a government preparation meeting at which various WSIS-accredited stakeholders spoke, and then there was, on the 2nd of July, a sort of stakeholder participation meeting where a lot of different stakeholders were able to air their views and take part in panel discussions. And I know that Marilyn Cade and others were in New York to do that, and it seemed a fairly successful occasion.

Following that, there was a call by the UN General Assembly, or DESA, which is—UN DESA, which is the arm of the UN that's dealing with the WSIS review in New York. They asked for public input or for input to the zero draft of the outcome document that's to be negotiated at the General Assembly in December.

So, this was, if you like, and opportunity for WSIS-accredited stakeholders to give their views on what should be in the output draft in terms of what the successes of the WSIS process were, or have been; what more could be done in the WSIS process; and giving other views on what could be in the output document, et cetera.

This was the—as I think I heard Olivier kindly mention, this was the subject of an ICANN draft that we put together with the help of the Cross-Community Working Group. Thank you for the input to that, and apologies that the timeframe was so short. We submitted that draft just by the deadline on Friday night, 31st of July.

And so far—well, there's been another 61 responses to that consultation. I think that's probably near the final number, because the—that's been the list on the website for the last couple of days. And those can—those responses will be looked at by UN DESA in conjunction with the co-facilitators. These are the two ambassadors, one from the UAE and one from Latvia, that are coordinating with the UN DESA and the UN General Assembly on the presidency of the UN to oversee the WSIS process.

So, out of this consultation we're expecting the first outcome document, the zero draft, I think in—towards the middle of September. And then that itself will be subject to review and an open consultation with WSIS stakeholders in the middle of October, a date which, at the moment, actually is coterminous with the Dublin ICANN meeting.

So, I'll stop there, but happy to answer any questions. What I will promise to do is to update this meeting with the link and the list of countries. I also am determined to find the hours this week to do a brief analysis of some of the responses, and I'll share that. For what it's worth. I'm sure other people will have done likewise. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Nigel. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And in the queue we have Marilyn Cade. Marilyn, I'm afraid we can't hear you at the moment. I'm not able to hear Marilyn Cade.

So, maybe, while we work out what's not working, I was just going to ask a question, then, for you, Nigel, on the timing. Of course, these consultations are extremely short. We're speaking always about a month; not even—sometimes barely a month for the consultation to take place.

Your draft—the draft that you managed to present to our working group was also a very, very short turnover. I think it was 24 hours. Was there a specific challenge on this occasion or is this likely to be the case in future drafts for the next consultations of WSIS+10?

Nigel Hickson: Olivier, thank you. This is Nigel, for the record. And you should indeed be a politician, or perhaps you are. [Laughter]. Yes. No. I mean, I apologize—I mean, we obviously were working on it internally. We had some internal reference points that we had to discuss with, before we were able to, if you like, share it.

And I appreciate the time was very short indeed for sharing it, and we would hope that on the next occasion, if we're asked to make representations on the—for instance, on the zero draft, that we would share it with the working group for more time.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I guess. Thanks very much, Nigel. Olivier speaking. And I was asking specifically because the—of course, the turnover is short on all of these papers, and sometimes it is understandable if you haven't gotten it cleared by the—you know, by structures and so on. And there is also, of course, the big question mark about making a draft publicly available when it is still in draft status before actually sending it out to the external process.

Now, are there any questions or comments on Nigel's review, and specifically on the way that this has worked out on this occasion? The reason being that, here, what we have managed to have is some input; perhaps not as much as we might have wanted to, but some input in response to a

request from staff in having input from the community or from the members of the community that are part of this working group.

One thing that we might be looking at is to perhaps develop clear positions or some kind of guidelines—bullet points, maybe—prior to even responding to a first draft by staff. But that's just one of the ways that we can contribute.

Are there any comments? I note a lot of activity on the chat again [laughter] and I wonder whether anybody wishes to share what they're typing, in voice so we can engage in a discussion on this.

Bill Drake: Hello. This is Bill Drake.

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

Bill Drake: Okay. I wasn't actually planning on speaking, but since Marilyn has prompted me in the chat to say—to share my views, I'll just point out that there are some quite interesting elements in some of the contributions to the WSIS process, and it was in anticipation of that that I was arguing for some time that we might have considered trying to have some sort of a community input into the—into this process.

But, in any event—well, I think the most interesting ones, of course, are the—as I just mentioned in the chat, the Russian contribution, which calls for the gradual transition of control over domain names and IP addresses to the United Nations; calls on states to implement the storage of personal data of their citizens inside the territories of their countries to place domestic servers serving the national segments of the Internet; and to develop other elements of the critical Internet infrastructure, and only support the prolongation of the IGF mandate if the IGF's work is reformed to include strengthening the role of the governments and the improvement of practical efficiencies, I think it's called.

Oh, and the UN—the General Assembly should establish a special committee for the preparation of a universal convention on Internet governance to establish an international legal framework.

And then, of course, there is the Chinese document, which is a bit more calibrated, but calls for the United Nations to play a—facilitate a role. And it'll be interesting to see what people put on the table in the course of the discussions to come.

Unfortunately, a lot of things are going to happen, I guess, at that October meeting when we're all in Dublin. So, it's going to be very hard for any of us to really be following what's happening. I don't know whether Nigel or others intend to go to that meeting. I'd be interested to know exactly how we're approaching it.

But that will be—I think it is—somebody help me out here, the date—the second WSIS meeting I think is October 20 to 22, to review the text. And I think that's the last scheduled meeting before the text is supposed to (inaudible).

And, oh, yes, the Saudi Arabian, one, Judith, is also very interesting. So, there's a number of varying—so, it's quite interesting to note that, while I think some people were, I think, some time ago feeling fairly confident that some of the kinds of geopolitical dynamics that we had seen 10 years ago, perhaps would be abating in the current context, that in fact it does seem to—some member governments are looking to this meeting as a means of advancing what we can probably guess will be non-consensual claims—non-consensus-oriented claims. And that there will be some efforts to link the renewal of the IGF to those claims for a greater role for the UN in some manner.

So, the question is, from here, given that we have not done anything yet, in particular, what, if anything, we might want to do as a community in conjunction with staff, taking into account all these dynamics. And there, I'd want to hear from, you know, Nigel and Marilyn and others, who probably are likely to be attending some of these meetings and engage more directly. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Bill. Olivier speaking. And thanks for this good summary of some of the contributions and some of the more worrying contributions. What would be your preference, Bill, for this? And then I'll get others to comment. What would be your preference on what this group should do?

Bill Drake: Well, I had suggested, going back to—not even Singapore; I think the meeting prior, that we might have tried to submit some sort of a document. But we didn't do that. So, that would have been my preference.

As to what to do now, I guess only to coordinate closely with Nigel and others, and perhaps further interventions from ICANN or other parts of the technical community could emphasize the extent to which the community has been consulted and is in agreement broadly with the positions being advanced.

The other thing—I guess one operational thing I would say is that we should—it would be useful to look at the—to read the other proposals carefully, and to think about which ones actually contain elements that we might want to echo and support in order to strengthen any kind of input we do make.

I mean, I think that there are a number of things in some of the proposals from the Internet Society, the Association for Progressive Communications, and the US Government, and others; the European Commission—European Union, rather, which are worth that going and tying (ph) to, and seeing if there's some ways—haven't read the RIR one yet, but—seeing if there are some ways to perhaps support coalition-building around this. Because—and to think about, I suppose, if certain demands are made and held up as, if I don't get this, then I'm not going to budge on that, is there a plan B? Is there something else that can be offered, et cetera?

Those are things, I think, to think about. We are not going to have that direct a role, but those are issues for the whole process. Thank you.

Renate De Wulf: We have Marilyn--.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much, Bill. And I was going to hand the floor over to Marilyn Cade.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. I'm hoping you can hear me.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Very well.

Marilyn Cade: Fantastic. I want to thank the staff for dialing out to me. I'd like to think a little bit differently than perhaps we've heard so far. Here's how I would like to think about this. So, there were 15 government submissions into the WSIS+10. There were 20-odd civil societies, 7 technical and academia; 9 business, private sector; 7 POSSIBILITY OF contributions. Okay.

What does that tell us? I think what it tells me is, we are in a new day. We are in a new day. I am the girl who flew to Geneva during WSIS 1 and couldn't even get into the room. Really. We have come a far way.

I want us to think about how we advance what we are doing. The IGF-USA was privileged to have a participant from the UAE and from DESA to come and listen and participate in our WSIS+10 event. I want to take a very optimistic approach here and ask what we can do. ICANN has done—and Nigel, thank you so much for the work you've done, really.

But I want to think about this very, very positively. I want to look at what we can do at National, Regional IGF coming up to the IGF. I want to also think about what we might do, leading into the MDG summit in September. If you go and talk to the developing countries, it is financing for D (ph) and SDGs, over and over and over. And the (ph) government pales—pales—in comparison to financing for D (ph) and the SDGs. So, why don't we take advantage of that? Why don't we think about what we can do to provide a useful input?

Secondly, I'm just going to call attention to the WSIS, the ITU working group on WSIS, which is open. It is in Geneva. And I think ICANN—I mean, I will certainly be there, but I think ICANN needs to be there as well. We will have a competition for timeframes between the ICANN Dublin event and the WSIS+10 consultation in New York.

But there are many of us. There are many of us. We can divide ourselves between those events. We then have the UNESCO—Connecting—we have the UNESCO conference in Paris. And then we have João Pessoa, the Brazilian-hosted IGF. When we lay this out as a timeframe and think about our input into each of these different events, I'm much more optimistic.

I look at the submissions. I've read every one of them. I have to tell you, this is a new world compared to the submissions that I saw 10 years ago—5 years ago. It's a shorter list of countries who do not agree with multi-stakeholders.

Why don't we try to advance—advance—what we can do? And I think ICANN has already done a fantastic job and a fantastic contribution. But I think we need to do more to reach out into our own communities beyond ICANN.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, Marilyn. Thank you very much for this intervention. It's certainly a new world. You sound very positive. And so, it sounds like a new chapter is opening up. But certainly one that will have a lot of work ahead of us. And I therefore note from what you mention here—you've mentioned the SDG summit and the ITU working group on WSIS.

I was going to turn over to Nigel Hickson and find out, what's ICANN's involvement going to be in those processes? What's the plan for this? And maybe, then, how can we prepare for that?

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Well, thanks—thank you very much, Olivier. Nigel Hickson. And thank you, Peter and—sorry, Bill and Marilyn, indeed, for the comments. I found them very interesting.

As I said, on—in terms of the substance, we will be looking at the proposals. I think the Russian proposal was mentioned by Bill, that clearly is problematical. The ones by Egypt, Saudi Arabia and China are not that brilliant. In contrast, the proposal from India is very positive, and of course that from the US and the EU, and a few other countries. The business one from ICC BASIS, I found particularly positive as well. But, as I say, I haven't read them all.

In terms of the process, then, in a bit more detail: in the next few weeks, we'll obviously be talking to the missions in New York and in Geneva on this issue. We're also in contact with the co-facilitators in New York. Veni is in dialog with them. We also hope to have some perhaps high-level meetings with the co-facilitators and the new presidency of the General Assembly, which is Denmark, in due course.

And as you saw from the timeframe, the timeframe is such that the next draft—the zero draft—will be published at the end of September. So, this will be at the end of the conference on the sustainable development goals, or the summit, I should say, because world leaders are gathering in New York for the SDG summit, including the Pope and Obama, et cetera, et cetera.

So, it's going to be, as Marilyn said, a very significant week. And indeed, we think that probably not a lot of work on WSIS is going to take place at all between now and the end of that particular

summit, because of the concentration in New York on that summit. But in the first two weeks of October we would hope to be able to, all of us, look at the zero draft.

Obviously it'll be public. And we can discuss nearer the time how we coordinate on that. Obviously we'll be providing—well, I say obviously; I think we'll be providing a response on the zero draft unless it doesn't warrant one. And obviously we can coordinate our input together on that, so we work perhaps more effectively than we did before. And that—I recognize that was the fault of staff.

Also mentioned was the WSIS Working Group. So, the last week of September, first week of—sorry. Yes. The last week of September, first week of August, is the Council Working Group week in Geneva. We have the WSIS Working Group on the 29th of September. And, yes, we'll be indeed attending that.

And then later in the week there's the Council Working Group on Internet public policy, which we can perhaps discuss also at some point, as this is the one where we gained the, if you like, open public consultation the day before. This was one of the planning potentiary wins, so to speak. So, I'll stop there. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Nigel. Olivier speaking. I think I just must correct you on one thing. You mentioned last week of September, first week of August. It was first week of October, I think, that you meant for that.

I note that Bill Drake mentioned earlier that we should really all read the proposals carefully and see which ones we support, and I also noted from the chat Peter Dengate Thrush, who was suggesting perhaps that would be a synthesis of position paper, with commentary. Is there a plan from staff to do a synthesis of the position papers at some point?

Nigel Hickson: Thank you, Olivier. This is Nigel. Well, I mean, I indicated earlier that we would hopefully do some sort of analysis. But, you know, I can't promise anything specific. You know, it just depends on how much resource we can put onto this. But certainly, yes, I mean, we can at least indicate where we think there are positives, as Marilyn has said. I mean, some of the proposals are very positive.

But we must remember that these are—this is not quite the same. And I—you know, I don't want to get into semantics here, but this is not quite the same as, if you like, a proposal like you have at the ITU or in some other negotiations. In other words, these proposals are not text; although the Russian one is text, I think that's the only one that is actually text. The others are giving opinions—giving views. And the idea is that those views and opinions are reflected in the zero draft. So, it's slightly different.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes. Thanks for this, Nigel. Olivier speaking. I wonder if we perhaps then could do something a little bit halfway, in that we would have a list—so, build a table on the wiki with a list of the proposals, and having our working group members being able to comment by those proposals as to which ones they believe are ones that we could support, and which ones are the ones which need to be pointed out as being particularly problematic. That might be a good use of—I don't know. You call it crowdsourcing, of—or, involvement from group members here?

I don't see anyone jump up or down, or telling me this is a terrible idea. I'm looking for feedback on this one. Anyone?

Marilyn Cade: Sorry. I don't—can you say it again? Because I didn't really understand it.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes. Thanks, Marilyn. Olivier speaking. The suggestion is to put the list of the different proposals on the wiki. So, by proposal number or just by title. And then have the working group members and participants comment by those in the box next to it, so as to comment on whether

they think that's a proposal that's a good proposal, or whether it's something that we might need to look at twice, or focus on, because we see things—quite problematic, in that proposal.

Marilyn Cade: Yes. I'm not going to--.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'm not going to dig down to the proposal itself in each one of the contributions. I'm actually saying, each one of contribution. So, you know, contribution from ICANN is one entry. And comments next to it.

Marilyn Cade: Yes. Thank you. I understand now what you're saying. But I'm going to say no to that. We have work to do, and being critical of others is not our best—it—that's not a good use of my time. And I'm going to do—I'm going to speak about me. I can't do that.

I think, instead, remember there are 15 government proposals; there are 20 civil society proposals. I think, instead, we need to think about the road ahead. And the road ahead has an opportunity for engaging with governments, whether they are coming—for instance, this week, Chenga (ph) Tai is speaking at—sorry, at the Regional Latin American IGF. And we have other speaking opportunities for ICANN, and other parties are speaking.

I'd rather we focus on what our key messages are, and then the rest of the submitters would be judged against our key priorities; rather than, we go through and mark up theirs. It's not a good use of our time, in my view.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks for this, Marilyn. Olivier speaking. What you were speaking—there are some positions of support in the chat. So, this is one thing which I think—and some people have said this is a good idea. We could just have an—the page, the wiki page, created, and whoever wants to contribute to it, they can; and others will be able to focus on the road ahead and on things that we need to work on. Or even, some people might do both.

I'm not making it mandatory for everyone to contribute in these things. We all know how working groups work. And who am I to mandate anything? I can't [laughter].

Marilyn Cade: Yes, but, Olivier, I'm just going to come back to this. It's Marilyn speaking. What would the purpose be? Asking us to take our time to evaluate all these submissions—what's the value added to that?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. I think part of the value added, as is mentioned in the chat, is to actually explain and share the information with the ICANN community, and in effect that would help explain the ICANN position on this, when it comes down to responding to some of these proposals. There was—Peter Dengate Thrush mentioned this in the chat, and I personally agree with it. I don't know how others think about it. And of course, the floor is open for commenting. So, if anybody else wishes to respond--.

Marilyn Cade: I'm just going to—yes. I'm just going to come back on this. So, what's the criteria by which this working group would evaluate other contributions? What's the good, bad and ugly criteria that we would use? Do we have such criteria?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks, Marilyn. Olivier speaking. I don't think that it's actually going to judge on the positions; but what they will do is laying out the position, and perhaps—it doesn't have to include a critique of the position itself, but it would certainly summarize the position, rather than having to read a 5, 10, 15-page paper. Just point out what the main points are in that contribution.

In effect, that would be a tool to help us, and help anyone interested in the topic. Rather than spending 5 hours reading all the papers, they could read a summary in an hour or less. I think that probably is the direction that we're moving in. Report and summarize—there you go—Peter Dengate Thrush mentions in the chat.

Okay. We have Lynn St. Amour in the queue. Lynn, you have the floor.

Lynn St. Amour:

Thank you, Olivier. Just two quick points. I think Avri just put a comment—a similar comment in the chatroom which is, I think, if some of us find it helpful and are willing to take the time to contribute, then I don't think, you know, any of us should stop that. We all work and think differently.

But I actually put my hand up initially to suggest, if—and I'm not sure, but if the primary goal is to make this information accessible to the broader ICANN community, both for informational purposes and for participation downstream, I wonder if just a slightly different refocusing of the paper that Nigel kindly offer to write, would do that.

Something, in other words, which says, they're—you know, the proposals are in. Maybe there's a tally of where they've come from. Comment on those that, you know, are generally supportive of the WSIS principles or principles that ICANN has previously stated. And then perhaps draw out those that suggest something that would impact, you know, ICANN's current direction or the multi-stakeholder principles.

And perhaps use that as a discussion document for the broader community. But again, that comment would—presumes that the main purpose for doing this is to begin to develop broader awareness in the ICANN community openly with helping to establish future positions from ICANN. So, if that's wrong [laughter] then I suppose it's—the suggestion is less helpful.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Lynn. Nigel, any response on this? Nigel Hickson.

Nigel Hickson:

Yes. Thank you very much. Well, obviously, we're in your hands. But I felt that comment from Lynn was very helpful. I mean, I think the idea was—you know, when I initially mentioned it, was really to—would be the sort of thing that we would find useful as well, to do a brief analysis of the proposals.

And I think I also take Marilyn's point that this isn't an occasion to say that the—you know, the Cuba proposal is bad and the European Union one is good, so to speak; but really, just to have a sort of—a high-level summary of where the governments are coming from and where civil society is coming from, in terms of the main themes that they're addressing in terms of the WSIS review. And that's something we could do.

And at the same time, obviously, we could put the—all the proposals up on the wiki in some form that was—that people would find it easy to download or whatever. So, you know, we could get comments, if anyone wanted to comment on them, of course. Yes. You know, something along those lines. But, yes. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Nigel. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And Lynn St. Amour, you still have your hand up. Okay. Your hand is down. So, it looks like we can probably move forward on this, and just have this wiki page created as an action item.

We'll work out with Renate and with Nigel, whether Renate needs help on building this or whether someone else will just build that table. It's just a listing of the different contributions, and then we can all add next to it, as to what the main points are in those contributions, or points to look out for.

And if some people wish to critique a specific contribution, I guess we cannot stop them from doing so. And the working group will probably need to work out later whether it wants to make use of the critiques specifically, or whether—I guess, and at large—sorry, not at large. ICANN staff will probably also see all of this, and we can see where we work from there. That's one of the ways--.

Marilyn Cade: Olivier, it's Marilyn.

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

Marilyn Cade: What's our criteria? I mean, I don't mean to--.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: What's our criteria? Well, you read a contribution and you put down what the main points are in there. I don't know. The—what criteria do you want? There's no criteria in reading a contribution. There's criteria in critiquing our contributions. But that's a different thing. I said we—yes, go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: None at all. I—yes. What's the—can we please at least come up with a format so we have something—look, I'm giving an interview later today with media, and I'll give my personal point of view. But what's the criteria we're using? I do not object to our doing this. But is—it's ICANN. It's not the world at large.

Is our criteria—you know, we want to see what comments were made on in enhanced (ph) cooperation. What comments were made about transition of the IANA function? What comment were made about—do we have some kind of general criteria? Which I think would be fantastic. That—or, do we just want to have a spreadsheet, and people can input their views?

I'm happy to go either way. But let's have some kind of standard analysis so we're not all wasting our time. You know, one criteria might be, did the contribution call for extension of the IGF? If so, under what circumstances? I—right? We need to have some kind of criteria for the analysis.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks for this, Marilyn. Olivier speaking. And that's a very good point. And I think you've actually also touched on something where we can cross-reference things later on. At the moment the proposal is to have a table with each contribution that's just listed there.

And, yes, criteria I, agree with. Maybe specific points that we should look out for and a certain format, perhaps, that's saying, well, extension of the IGF, yes/no, et cetera. And you've listed a number here. So, I think we'll probably take it from the recording and put them in there as guideline criteria.

But you've also mentioned on a per-topic basis, we could actually cross-link that table, and therefore end up with having, on a per-topic basis. So, you'd have, regarding IGF extension and may—basically, link all of the—or, mention the contributions that were for it; contributions that were against it; contributions that took a middle ground, or asked for specifics. And then—so, you basically have this on a per-topic basis as well. But I think that's probably the second line of work that we would do after we have that first table built up on a per-contribution basis.

Are there any suggestions—other suggestions for criteria in addition to the ones that Marilyn has mentioned? And obviously I'm putting everyone on the spot here, so it's not probably the best way of doing things. We can definitely follow up by email on this, and get suggestions.

But the sooner we have criteria down, the earlier we can then just format that table, and then have something that will be useful as a tool to, one, get our community to understand what's going on in this process; and, two, for us to be able to formulate a response. I think that would—the right information—input information, we'll immediately have a better idea of what we should really focus on, and what is already out there as far as the trends are concerned.

I see some criteria being suggested in the chat. So, that's good, as we go along. Avri does mention that people have been writing neutral synthesis for quite a while. So, indeed, we could certainly ask that—whatever synthesis is done at this stage is neutral, and we could perhaps have a separate column for anything that is not neutral, or any opinions on those points.

But, again, I think first step is to get the facts, organize, and next step is to comment on them. And in the meantime, I think—yes. Okay. I see certainly a note about consistency in the review of the submissions is quite critical. But I think we've moved quite some way on this, and we were only going to spend 10 minutes on this originally. But I'm glad that we've had this discussion, because that certainly brings us further in an actual policy process, and not just dealing with organization.

So, that's a good way forward, and I'm sure it's to be—reviewing the call, and finding out our—any further action items on this. And of course the chat has a life of its own. Right.

I was going to spend the last, I guess—it was going to be 30 minutes, but perhaps only 10 minutes required now, because a lot of the questions that we've had seem to be answered, and we have some work on our table.

First, it was just basically getting feedback on the Buenos Aires discussions. We had a public session that took place, and we also had a face-to-face session, which unfortunately, due to clashing with other very important sessions that took place at the same time, was not very well-attended.

And at the time our main discussion was how this working group should be organized to work forward and move forward. Was it there to write a position paper, or was it there to just support staff in their dealings with those presences (ph)? Or, was it there to just inform and get updates—regular updates? In which case, then, it stops being a working group and moves into being a working party. And then, the concern being that if it becomes a working party, we start losing this cross-community aspect to it—the formalization of this cross-community activity.

So, as a result, I think that we left it at that. And perhaps the middle ground, which upon hindsight I thought about and discussed with a handful of people, would be that we continue operating in the way that we do, by not only being a good sounding board for staff, who then pass their contributions by the working group, and perhaps amend it; but at the same time, we could also—and this can easily be done—produce our own papers that would just be internal papers, so as to make clear the various positions sometimes that are found in ICANN.

And that actually brings forward the ability to not requiring full consensus on a paper, but actually being able to document the varying and sometimes very different views that our different supporting organization advisory committees have. And that would be done, by the way, through the input of our group.

Marilyn Cade: I'm sorry, Olivier. It's Marilyn. I didn't understand what you were saying. You were saying you would have a paper that (inaudible) above (ph) consensus papers?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, Marilyn. Olivier speaking. So, what I was suggesting is that, if we—if this working group was to write a paper, this paper would not be something that would be submitted. So, you—we're not looking at writing a—drafting a paper that is then submitted to an external organization; that's, say, submitted directly into the WSIS+10 process. But, more like a paper that summarizes the points of view that are held in our community on a specific topic.

And that means we don't need to actually have a clear message of consensus by saying, well, if the community doesn't agree on a specific point, we're not going to be able to put out point across. Here, what we're basically doing is documenting the points of view in our community, that can then be used by ICANN staff or be used by others, in being able to convey this to external entities by saying, well, there's consensus on this topic; there is no consensus on—no broad consensus on this topic. And various parts of our community are—some parts of the community are saying this; some parts of the community are saying that.

At the moment I don't think there is an actual process by which we can tap and find out what the different parts of our community think on these topics.

Marilyn Cade: Olivier, I—it's Marilyn speaking. I don't understand the value of that. Any individual will be able to submit comments into the next stages, as they could have into the WSIS+10. I'm not sure why we would spend time or take ICANN resources—our own resources—to say, on the other hand, Bill said this; Marilyn said that; blah-blah-blah.

I'm not sure I understand what the value would be. I think the value for this group is to look ahead to Dublin, and then look ahead to Marrakech, and focus on outreach and education.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Marilyn. Olivier speaking. I was going to let others respond as well, if they have points on this. I don't want to monopolize the line, although I've been guilty of that most of this call already [laughter]. I do know how annoying it is to have a moderator that actually responds to each and every point made, and rambles on.

Marilyn, I don't see anyone putting their hand up on this. You know, the concern about having the different parts of ICANN, and individuals go and bring their input directly into these processes, is that everyone else finds out about their points of view after the input has been submitted. And there are times when it does help to be able to federate and bring our inputs together, and help each other out, and certainly collaborate. And I think that without this internal ability to do so and to voice our points of view internally, the—it would be pretty hard to collaborate on anything.

Certainly, taking an example of net modelle (ph), for example, you'd think, well, what was the different point of view—the different parts of the ICANN community? And it was totally impossible to find out until we created this group, I guess. So, that's, I guess, the value in being able to collaborate and perhaps even find alliances so as to give maybe greater weight to some of the input that staff is building into these processes. But also, being able to have our different groups work together, when they submit the—their individual points.

And when I said, not the points of—point of view of Marilyn, or point of view of Bill, I'm saying here, the point of view of the different SOs and ACs. And that's when, of course, we need to do that early enough so as to provide enough ability for our SOs and ACs to express a point of view on this.

Anyway, I'm not going to try and push for this too much. It's just something that's on the table, and if there is support, there is support for it. If there's no support, we can continue as we've operated so far. I personally think it's worked out pretty well, but perhaps, you know, we need to do more, and certainly more that could help into letting the ICANN community, or communities, should I say, know about these processes; but also being able to collect their voice, and having them being able to express their view.

Okay. Ladies and gentlemen, we have two minutes until the end of this call. I was going to ask for any feedback on the Buenos Aires discussions. I don't see very many people putting their hand up. There's certainly some activity in the chat, but perhaps we have to think about this for our next call.

And this is where agenda item number 5, any other business, comes in. Does anybody wish to bring anything forward? I don't see anyone put their hand up, so we just have to choose on when our next call would be.

I do know it's been a while since our last call. It might take a little while for us to build that matrix, if we are to proceed forward on this. I was going to suggest perhaps not having a call next week, but having one the week after next week. Is there any support for this? Would that give just a little bit more time to breathe and to do things?

- Marilyn Cade: It's Marilyn. I would support that we wait until after the synthesis report from—so—and Nigel, I'm just looking at this. We're going to have a non-paper (ph) from the WSIS+10 at the end of August. Do we want to—you're proposing a call, Olivier, maybe three weeks into August? So, it'll be before the non-paper (ph)?
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks, Marilyn. Olivier speaking. Correct. I was looking at the week of the 17th of August. And—the reason being that, by then—and we could always just have it there. But if we have nothing to say, or no progress on the table until then, we could always cancel it. But just pencil it in, so as for us to prepare it, to be able to discuss some of the points that are made on the table until then.
- It might be very hopeful. It's very hopeful, in the middle of the traditional European summer holidays, and I know that others around the world are also taking a break. For some, I might be very hopeful that there will be much movement on this. But, who knows? So, week of the 17th, I was going to suggest. But would you say the week of the 24th?
- Marilyn Cade: Oh, I'm happy with either one. I just wanted to just take note.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Two weeks call—so, it's time. So—sorry, did I just say this? Two-weekly calls suit me, says Peter. And so, I don't see anyone going against this. So, hopefully—let's see. Next call on the week of the 17th of August. And Renate, if you could deal with the doodle. I believe it's always on the Wednesday, these days.
- Renate De Wulf: Yes.
- Nigel Hickson: This is—Olivier, this is Nigel. Could I just mention two things?
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes, please go ahead, Nigel.
- Nigel Hickson: Thank you. Very quickly, first, Marilyn mentioned the end of August for a WSIS paper. I'm not sure whether she was referring to the—it's the end of the September for the UN, unless there's another paper coming out.
- On the agenda, we ought to discuss—well, I say we ought to discuss, but perhaps we should discuss the upcoming Dublin meeting in terms of the session there. Because we will need staff to respond in the next few weeks, I suspect, to a request for—to—you know, in terms of a slot. I've already requested that we reserve an Internet government public session as a high-level interest topic. But we'll have to reserve a slot for it in the next two to three weeks, probably. Thank you.
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Nigel. Olivier speaking. And therefore, that already gives us one of the agenda items for our next call, on the week of the 17th of August. Okay.
- Marilyn Cade: Olivier?
- Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Marilyn. Go ahead. Marilyn Cade.
- Marilyn Cade: It sounds like—yes, I might. I just want to mention a couple of key days that I think support Nigel's comments.
- So, the Sustainable Development Goals Summit is the 24th to the 27th of September. It's in New York.
- Then there's the ITU Working Group related to the Internet, one of which since the WSIS Working Group that I think ICANN would want to have comments into. That's the 29th to the 30th of September.

Then we have the ICANN meeting (inaudible)sessions (ph) and consultation in New York. Maybe we could pick up these agenda items—these activities—and share information. Not just what ICANN's doing, but what others are doing, for our next call, and have a kind of a call to share information.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay, Marilyn. Thank you for this. Olivier speaking. Let's do that also for our next agenda. So, sharing information about the upcoming—all of the upcoming summits that are going to take place in—from September onwards, I gather.

Great. Thank you very much. Thanks, everyone, for attending, and I believe that this call is now adjourned. We have a good set of action items. So, let's move forward on this. And Renate has said she will work with Nigel and his crew in building that table. So, we'll all follow up on the meeting list. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, and goodnight.