
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the bi-weekly CCWG on Internet Governance Conference Call on Wednesday, 9th of September 2015. Let's have a roll call please.

RENATE DE WULF: On the call we have Bill Drake, Gary Hunt, Judith Hellerstein, Marilia Maciel, Nigel Hickson, Tom Dale, Veni Markovski, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, and myself, Renate De Wulf. Is there anybody else on the line who's not in the AC room? I think that is it, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Renate. Today's Agenda is going to be looking at primarily to follow up on the AIs, and then we'll be discussing WSIS+10 for the bulk of this call. IN the second part of this call we have to start thinking about ICANN 54 in Dublin. That's coming up very fast, and we're going to have two sessions there. We have to start thinking what we want to do there. Are there any AOBs anyone would like to add to this call?

I don't see anyone. I'm aware Marilia Maciel has provided us with some details about Net Mundial as well. I think we can discuss this in a future call; hopefully when we'll have a quick update from her. Or perhaps if we have a bit of time remaining on this call, Mariiii, this is a heads-up for you, if you want to summarize a little bit what you emailed about, in the AOB part of this call, at the end of the call. I apologize for not having

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

given you advanced notice on that, but I just remembered this right now.

Ladies and gentlemen, Agenda Item #2 is the follow up on our open AIs from Buenos Aires. There was one we discussed last week, but unfortunately Nigel Hickson was unable to be on the call: “Nigel to check if ICANN can help with the hubs for the IGF.” Nigel, have you followed up on this and found out a little bit what can be done with that?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. The IGF - perhaps we might touch on it later too, because there was a MAG Meeting last week, and there had been some developments on the IGF front. Our technical people are in touch with the IGF people over hubs. The IGF, the Brazilian hosts, have arranged about 17 to 18 hubs. We’d like a few more. That conversation is taking place, so perhaps something might happen. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this update, Nigel. Are there any other points or questions anyone would like to raise regarding this Item? I don’t see anyone. The other AI that’s still open involves Rafik Dammak, and Rafik I believe isn’t on the call. We can punt this Item until next week. Let’s move onto Agenda Item #3 then - the WSIS+10 process. As you know, the WSIS non-paper has now been distributed. It’s an initial draft, and part of this call is ready for us to discuss any initial views about this WSIS non-paper.

The person who has presented or relayed the paper to the Working Group, in my belief, was Nigel Hickson. I'm not sure if you already have, Nigel, a few initial vies about the paper that has been put there now for community consideration?

NIGEL HICKSON:

I would defer to Veni in a second, who perhaps would be able to give an update on where we are on the New York process. Essentially, what we've seen in the last few days was the process was that the president of the GA sent the paper to member states, and it didn't appear on the website until this morning, European time, probably last night in Washington. The paper has only just gone out into the public, so to speak.

This is a non-paper, so it's not a draft in any sense of the final resolution. It really is a paper summarizing the issues, which has been put together as a result of the consultation that we took part in with others, and the CCWG helped with the ICANN position, and on which I circulated a summary of views. So the non-paper lists a number of issues, including Internet governance. I think the overall view of many is that it could have been a lot worse, so to speak, in terms of the issues raised. I think it's a fairly comprehensive job by UN DESA and the co-facilitators and their staff.

It seems to have captured the main issues that were captured in the responses that were given to the UN. Of course, now, this non-paper, which is a list of issues, will be commented on by a number of people, and we'll come onto that, and it will be turned into this zero draft, which

will be more in the form of a document for negotiation. This is an issue paper that lists the issues, so one would expect now that the zero draft would take up some of those issues and be a bit more concrete in the recommendations.

I think there are a couple of sections that of course ICANN would be at least aware of, which is the Internet governance part and the part relating to the IGF, et cetera. There is one factor - and I'll finish here, because Veni might have a view on this - but when I circulated to the CCWG, that was the non-paper, plus the letter that had gone to member states. On the WSIS site this morning, the non-paper is there, and it mentions also that there is a letter.

It doesn't specifically say on the site what the date is for consultation responses in the letter it was the 14th of September, and there is a question - talking to others, to ISOC this morning, here in Geneva - there is a question, they think perhaps the date might be put back a bit. I'm afraid I don't have details on that, but I'm sure Veni will be able to add more to what I've said. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Nigel. To quote Bill Drake on the chat, it is astonishingly anodyne. But over to Veni Markovski.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Thank you Olivier. I actually already had a couple of meetings - more than a couple - before the publication of the paper. To my amazement it turned out it was not distributed to all member states, as Nigel was

saying. It was distributed only to some. However what I heard is there are certain member states which are not happy with the non-paper and will make comment in that respect, so we'll be reading those comments hopefully next week. Mainly the unhappiness is that there's no more direct reference to United [unclear 09:32] of ICANN, if I can say that.

Some countries say there should be more strict language that ICANN should be an international organization, or the UN should take over what ICANN is doing. I'm telling you only what's relevant to us, because I think we have to pay closer attention to what's happening, talk to our governments, and figure out also what kind of documents we, as ICANN, will be sending. Other than that, I'm expecting that starting today there will be more comments.

I am participating at a conference today and tomorrow in New York organized by the EastWest Institute. They're a cyber conference, but there are two topics on Internet governance today and tomorrow, so clearly we're not the only organization that's concerned with what's happening at the UN, and we'll see what will come out of this meeting as well. That's all from me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. Very helpful indeed. What we have now is an open floor, if anybody has any questions or comment on these updates? I don't see anyone putting their hands up. Tom Dale, from the GAC Secretariat has put a link to a useful blog on the non-paper, a blog by Sam Dickinson. It would be interesting for us to read through it in our own time later on. What are the next steps now, really, as far as we're

concerned? Let me first go over to Marilia Maciel, and then we'll see what the next steps are. Marilia, you have the floor.

MARILIA MACIEL:

Hi Olivier. Thank you very much. Just to make a quick comment, I completely agree with what people are saying on the chat. I know that some people are evaluating it was a good non-paper because it was not as bad as it could be, but I think it doesn't do justice by the work that's been done even by UN organizations, in producing documents on the WSIS Review. I think some like UNESCO have moved forward with debates around bloggers, the protection of bloggers, around whistleblowers - and I don't see any of this captured in this non-paper in any way.

I think that overall it's a repetition of what we already have. It's a more short, concise repetition of WSIS documents, so it's not like it's a small step backwards, and it leaves us exactly where we were ten years ago, and for that to be an outcome after everything that happened, I think it's a poor outcome. So I'd be a little less optimistic. Of course I agree that things were not included in the paper or they were included in a very vague way, so this is good.

But in a way advancement was not made, and I wonder on how in the comments, and politically, we could try to include at least some of the things that were mentioned by UN reports. Because then we'd have UN based topics to try to include there - how much we can try to make this paper better and more valuable to everybody. Thank you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Marilia. Next is Bill Drake?

BILL DRAKE: Thank you. I actually agree with Marilia here. I think that a lot of people who are concerned that anything the UN will do is going to open a can of worms and unleash all kinds of geopolitical monkey business may celebrate a text that basically says nothing and has no aspirations, but at the same time I do feel a certain sense that we did spend a lot of time, a lot of people put a lot of energy over an extended period of time to try to bring the world together to discuss the kinds of issues that were under the aegis of the WSIS and try to stimulate some forward movement.

It seems that now we're throwing up our hands and saying, "There's so little we can agree on and there's so little in the way of resources to deploy to promote desirable objectives, that basically we're going to say hurrah, we endorse what we endorsed ten years ago and move on." It seems to me a little bit of a sad ending for the WSIS project, frankly, but then again that may not be the ultimate outcome. This is where we are now, and we'll see what happens after December. Just so say that I agree with her; that it's good that there's no problematic stuff, but it's sad that there's nothing else either. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Bill. Reading between the lines, does this mean that if there's so little progress forward, or if the progress is taking such baby steps, there might be part of the member countries saying, "Look, this is

just a waste of time, and we'll end it all"? Is there a danger to this happening? Just an open question to everyone in the room.

BILL DRAKE: That is as point of contention. So we end it all or have any continuing activity. Obviously there's a big divide there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Bill. Yes, Veni?

VENI MARKOVSKI: First of all I saw that we have Renata on the call, and also Tom. The question is for the time-being in September - that's what I'm getting here from the diplomats at the UN - nobody really has the time and capacity to work on the WSIS+10, so the non-paper and the zero draft, which were supposed to be published by the end of the month, they are to be published, but I don't expect any conversations, even in the hallways, to take place, because they're overwhelmed by the fact that the 150 heads of state and presidents and prime ministers will be coming here at the end of the month for the [SEGN 00:15:53] and the high level meetings.

What they were telling me was that, "Yes, same comments, and participate in the official discussions, but don't put too much hope in that we'll be talking it before the press come in October." So we have about six or seven weeks in which we can go through documents, send comments, et cetera, but also get ourselves ready for the real discussions to take place after that. These discussions will be informal,

in the UN language, which means this will be between countries, bilateral, multi-lateral and with hopefully participation of some of the technical community and civil society who have access to the UN.

But most of this will be done after working hours, late at night, and whoever has the capacity - besides myself - to send people to New York, to be present here and participate, or advise their government in their capitals is more than welcome to do that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Veni. When you mean sending people to New York, this being the UN process, one has to be of organizations that are registered in the UN system, right?

VENI MARKOVSKI: Yes, but not only. Yes, it could be organizations like ISOC, for example, who have accredited status to ISOC, and they have access, but it also could be anyone who can be either on a delegation, like officially this can be done very easily through the foreign ministry of any country, or even somebody who's an expert in the field and their government would not have anything against... On the contrary, they may ask them to help them understand the process better. I'm talking here about the act that these diplomats need information and we, the technical community, the civil society, have the experts that can provide them with this information in real-time.

Let's not count on search engines and the Internet; that diplomats will sit there and start searching for something. Let's try and figure out ways

to bring people here. I'm hopeful that ISOC will be able to do that here, because they're three hours away from New York. But maybe other organizations can also help.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Veni. Of course, one of the problems I think is that the process is going to take place in the same week as ICANN 54 in Dublin. Am I correct about this?

VENI MARKOVSKI: No-no. Sorry Olivier, I meant... Yes, this is the [unclear 0:20:14], which is during the meeting. But I was talking about the time after that, so the time between October 20th and December 15th. It's two months. As time passes and as close as we get to December, the high level meeting, there will be more and more negotiations. I'm not saying somebody for two months in New York, but it would be good to have people through that time; to come for a week, a few days, two weeks, and just be part of the delegations.

Don't forget, in some cases it's going to be bilateral, in some cases multilateral meetings, so they can be organized by any government. Say you can get on the UK list of experts and they invite you here for a week, you can come and have meetings with other governments, as an expert. That's absolutely fine, and that would actually be extremely helpful.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Veni. Obviously, that would be great, if there was funding available for that, but I guess for some there might not be. You

mentioned ISOC, finding some fellowships of some sort. I wondered, would ICANN have any thought of fellowships for this kind of thing? Or is this at the moment not on the budget?

VENI MARKOVSKI: We don't have anything like that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Veni. Any comments or questions on this topic? Additional comments from any one on the call? I wondered, was there something that at this stage, that short of work that we're starting to do on the analysis of submissions, is there anything that this community here should engage itself in, in the run-up to this, or following this process, so as to be useful both for ICANN staff, but also useful in the process of staff. Veni already mentioned getting in touch of our respective governments and seeing if we can participate in other ways. Is there anything for ICANN or this Working Group to do?

NIGEL HICKSON: Perhaps I could comment. Veni was talking rightly about post-October, and post-October of course there will be the zero draft that we mentioned. But in the immediate future, I think there are two steps. First of all, we have the ability to comment on this non-paper, although as I said at the beginning of the call, it's unclear what the exact date for comment is. The letter that Veni just mentioned, perhaps didn't go to all member states. It mentioned a date of the 14th of September.

Whether that date will be modified, I'm not sure. It seems quite inappropriate to put a document on the website on the 9th of September and expect comments by the 14th, but nevertheless this is a difficult process. First of all, there are comments on the non-paper, and I think those comments can clearly be both in terms of the content of the paper, on the non-paper, but also in terms of what it doesn't include. So the very useful dialogue we had on this call earlier, Marilia mentioned the contribution that UNESCO had made to bloggers and freedom of expression, et cetera.

There were other issues that came out of the ITU work, which are not included in the draft. So if people feel strongly on those, then it's possible that they might be raised. I think there is the ability to comment. Secondly, the meeting on the 19th of October in New York, these public consultation people are able to register for that, organizations are able to register. There's a link on the website. Registrations have to be in by the 11th of September, and although the format of that day, from the website is unclear, Veni might know more about the format - whether there's going to be a call for speakers, or whether it's going to be more of an open dialogue. Perhaps the latter.

But again, that will be an occasion for people that can get to New York to be able to give their views. As a result of that, there will be this production of this so-called zero draft, which is scheduled to come out at the end of the month, although might be slightly later. Not as a result of that, but the comments on the 19th of October will be able to take into account what's in the zero draft. So I think there are opportunities for dialogue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Nigel. I guess our first step is really to look whether we'd like to comment in any way. We're given a very short deadline of the 14th of September. I hope this will be somehow extended, and we can probably follow on after this call. It's just short notice like this. Bill Drake, you have put your hand up. You have the floor.

BILL DRAKE: I would suggest that given the way this stuff is playing out, I personally don't see any need for the community to be busting its chops to try to do or say anything at this point. I would rather we just devoted the time to figuring out what we're doing in Dublin and at the IGF Meeting. If things start to heat up in a way that some sort of intervention would be useful later on, we could revisit. But I wouldn't personally spend too much time worrying about this, given where the process is.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Bill. Any other thoughts on this? Bill is suggesting we shouldn't waste too much time on that. Since I don't see anyone putting their hand up, my view is pretty much aligned with Bill's. It seems to be quite an anodyne, non-paper to start with, and our time would probably be better spent on other things. Let's wait for the zero draft to move forward, and for the forthcoming discussions in October, giving rise to the zero draft.

Nigel, I guess you're steering this process, Nigel and Veni, you guys are steering this process over in New York for ICANN. Is there anything that

you would think at this time sticks out, that you might wish to engage our community on? I haven't seen anything that strikes me as being something that needs to be done then and there.

VENI MARKOVSKI: At this point, I think what Bill suggested makes sense. At the same time, hopefully we'll find out today whether the deadline will be prolonged, although I doubt it, because they need to process the comments and then publish the zero draft. If we can send some comments... Bill, do I understand you correctly that you're saying we shouldn't send comments because there's no time?

BILL DRAKE: I'm saying we shouldn't send comments because there's no time and no content to discuss really. The process is trying to get agreement among all the people here. Any comments we might make would probably be a bit too arduous given our parameters.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Nigel, what do you think?

NIGEL HICKSON: I think it's up to the group whether you provide an input. We'll be having a discussion as staff, internally, on this later today. Personally, I'd think we'd probably want to provide some comment, if indeed the time period was reasonable. We haven't discussed the substance, but the issues raised in the non-paper on Internet governance are potentially

significant, because if they are extrapolated into the zero paper as they stand then although the news on the way the IGF Mandate is positive - it says it should be extended, perhaps some issues to do with the IGF need to be looked at, but then that's ongoing anyway.

But what it says on enhanced cooperation, it actually does say that the UN should set up a mechanism for enhanced cooperation, which means it should set up some kind of mechanism that would look at Internet governance, public policy issues. It goes on to say that that excludes the day-to-day, operational aspects of the Internet, or whatever. Some people to that say, "Well, that's okay then. ICANN is excluded from that."

But actually that's not necessarily the case, because the day-to-date, operational aspects of the internet would not, for instance in the judgment of the staff at least, include introduction of gTLDs, or work on other public policy issues to do with WHOIS or elements to do with IP protection in terms of domain names. It would obviously include the IANA process, but not the actual public policy issues concerning the domain name system. So potentially, those sorts of issues are ones that we might want to flag.

These are just initial thoughts. Certainly I agree with what's been said; that the zero draft is more important, of course. But if we have the opportunity in the next few days to put something on paper to perhaps slightly influence that zero draft, then that perhaps seems appropriate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Nigel. I see in the chat quite a discussion on whether we should be submitting comments or not, or to what extent the community should be involved. What I might suggest then is, I know you have that in hand Nigel. Perhaps if you have any specific comments that you would be suggesting, you could send this in advance of the ICANN submission to the Working Group's mailing list, and I know it's a short amount of time we have - a 24 or 48-hour period - for our community to comment on them.

Not willing to take too much time, since a lot of people are saying, "Look, it's a non-paper. The zero draft is super important too." It's probably more important. So there is interest, but it's not a case of saying, "Let's spend the whole Working Group's time on this." That tells me we probably have to move on in our Agenda as well. Any last words on this before we move onto next steps? Are you okay with that, Nigel? You and Veni, and your colleagues, can flag a few issues, email that to the mailing list, and we can comment on there, and perhaps even add a few more comments and take it from there?

NIGEL HICKSON: Clearly, yes, if we're going to submit something - and as I said, we're having an internal discussion on this - but of course we'll do what we did before, and within the boundaries of the timescale we'll... Yes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Thank you. We're now on Agenda Item #3.b, the WSIS+10 submission analysis. The whole question here was not only looking at

our spreadsheet that we have, which is a Google Doc, but also to discuss any working methodology or collaboration with the Internet Society. As you know, Avri has put us in touch with ISOC, and [unclear 00:34:50] from there has come back to us with the fact that they're working on something at the moment. The question really here is pretty straightforward. To what extent do we wish to exchange information with Internet Society? It's a general discussion on how we wish to perhaps collaborate and share information.

The second aspect of this question is how much time do we have, in this community, to start filling those boxes and perform analysis? Last week as a busy week because of the MAG consultations, but I haven't seen anyone fight to be able to put their name in the space and say, "Yes, I want to do some neutral analysis on this." I'm beginning to wonder how much time we have as a community to devote to this, which is significantly time-consuming, to some extent. The floor is open for comments, and I really hope that we have some feedback on this.

I must either be muted or there are no comments on this. Which way can we move forward on that? No one has any views on the possible sharing of information? Or has the ship already sailed and we're too late to start going into this analysis of the actual submissions? Any thoughts? Blank. Perhaps I should say something that's conducive to shocking everyone. Okay. So no specific views on this. Do we have anyone here on the call who wanted to make any suggestions as to how we should move forward on this? Or there are no views?

I guess the alternative is I could discuss it with our other two Co Chairs, Young Eum Lee and Rafik Dammak and see what we do with that. But I

must say I'm a little concerned that we have the paper now, this Google Doc, but we haven't done very much with it, and time is ticking. Judith Hellerstein says the ship might have sailed already. Let me just ask Nigel then, as he's always a reliable person to give answers: what are really the deadlines for this analysis to be needed? Does it need to be done by the next meeting in New York, mid-October, or are we already too late, since the non-paper has been published? Many different things that could happen.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you. This was always an exercise, which, if you like, didn't have a strict obligation to it. I think when the group discussed it at the meeting before last, which I think I did attend, it was seen as a way of understanding better where countries were coming from, where civil society was coming from, governments and business, and try to get a sense of doing the analysis. I think Marilyn contributed to this discussion on what was the sense on this exercise.

Although we're going to now see responses on this non-paper perhaps from the different parts of the community, and then we'll see responses to the zero draft from different parts of the community, these will be responses to essentially what has been written. Whereas the open responses that we saw from July to September were quite free-flowing; they raised a lot of different ideas. In the summary paper that I circulated, I tried to give a bit of a flavor of that. I read nearly every single response. I might have missed the odd one, and there was one in Spanish that I'm afraid I didn't attempt - I apologize for that.

No, but many different issues were raised, and they were quite insightful. I think for anyone following this process, having the opportunity to read a number of these responses and then jotting a quick summary down on a website is quite useful. This will be a document that we can come back to at a later time, when we're in New York or wherever, and say, "Hang on, back in August, Venezuela was saying that they wanted ABC," or, "Russia was saying they wanted... and now they're arguing something different."

I think the analysis is useful for that issue. My take, and I'm sorry for waffling on, is the ship has not really sailed, but of course it's up to the group. The group, I recognize, is doing 101 different things. There are lots of different priorities, not just in the CCWG but of course on the IANA transition, and this does take work; to read things and put it on a website. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Nigel. I take it then that this is still a worthwhile exercise. The question now is really how much resources do we all have on this Working Group, bearing in mind everything that everyone on this group also has to do outside of this group? I don't see anyone wishing to step forward on this. Let's go for another follow up on the mailing list and see if anyone is willing to take the first step and start filing one of these lines, and perhaps have everyone else follow up on that. That's a good way forward.

Now, next we have to look at Agenda Item #4, and that's ICANN 54 in Dublin. We have to prepare for this. 20 minutes ahead of us to discuss the various sessions that we have. Now, first there are two sessions, as per previous meetings. First there is an Internet governance public

session, and there is also a face-to-face working session. In BA we had started with the public session earlier on in the week and had a face-to-face working session afterwards. That didn't work too well. Previously, the previous meeting in Singapore was the working session first and then the public session later in the week, and that worked rather well, or worked better.

Therefore on this occasion the requests for the different slots have been arranged so that we go for a face-to-face working session first and then a public session afterwards. Could I have confirmation of this please? Is it Nigel who's filled those documents, or Renate?

RENATE DE WULF:

We have no confirmation for the moment, because the schedule has not been finalized. I hope it will be done in the next 7-10 days, because there is a deadline to meet. As soon as I have confirmation of time and dates, I will let you know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Renate. What I meant was what day? Perhaps we can say the day? Is it on Monday for the face-to-face, and Wednesday or Thursday for the public session?

RENATE DE WULF:

No. I had requested the Wednesday for the face-to-face, and I believe Nigel has requested Thursday for the public session.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. These are just rough ideas. Thank you for this. What we have to look at is the actual draft Agenda for this. It's never too early to start working on this. Let's start with the public session, since it's there, on #4.a. Bill Drake, having run or co-moderated the public session with Peter Dengate Thrush in Buenos Aires, regarding the format and the type of topics to be discussed, did you feel that it went the right way in Buenos Aires?

BILL DRAKE: No. As I said on the list, I moderated the session in Singapore, and we were in a U-shaped room. We had maybe five, six people lined up as conversation starters. They did not give presentation as they did so much put some ideas on the table and then stimulate discussion and we had a much more interactive dialogue, a much more dynamic discussion. That is certainly the model I'd like to go back to. In Buenos Aires we fell back into a model that used to apply when these were done in the past by staff, which was an enormous panel of talking heads, seated facing an audience and giving two long presentations, even though I'd asked everyone keep to a couple of minutes. Everyone went over.

It's hard when you're seated in that configuration to wave at people and get them to stop. In consequence, I thought the discussion on the WGIG went on too long, simply by virtue of the number of people who headed in later in the day. In my view, without a collective decision process, there were people put on the panel who I'd never heard were going to be on the panel. Then by the time we got to the second part that Peter chaired, there was very little time left that Peter wanted to have a conversation. I don't blame him. So we needed up going over time, and

afterwards quite a number of people told me that they found the whole enterprise to be a little much.

So I think we don't want to have a session where people walk off feeling that they've been lectured at for two hours, or where it was overly formalistic and so on. We want to do everything we can to return to a more dynamic, interactive format. I'd really say in my view, U-shaped, and maybe even keep it with four people starting the conversation. We want the community involved in the discussion and we want it to move along crisply. I think the Singapore model is good for that. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this feedback Bill. I'd take it then a smaller panel is a definite requirement, a U-shaped table is the second thing, and Nigel Hickson, I think you have asked for a U-shaped table on this occasion, have you?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. As Renate mentioned, she put in the request for the face-to-face session as the Secretariat for this Working Group. I put in the request for the public session, and as you know we had an exchange on the email list about the best day for that. I got the sense from that dialogue that it would be helpful to have it after the face-to-face. So we've asked for it on the Thursday morning, which some people I think have noticed might clash with an accountability session. I don't think anything is set in stone yet.

At the moment we've asked for the Thursday morning session, for 90 minutes. I've requested it's of a horseshoe nature. No one's been approached in terms of numbers. I fully agree with Bill that we need it interactive. It was quite difficult. Just going back to BA, and this isn't a post-script on BA, but I'm pretty sure that both Bill, as the Chair, and us as the facilitators, did as the contributors to stick to 2-3 minutes, but they didn't do so. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Nigel. Next, the number of topics in BA. Did we just have too many topics? Perhaps Bill, you could comment on this?

BILL DRAKE: Well, not in principle. We followed the model of first we were going to do a main chunk on the WSIS+10, and then we were going to do a miscellaneous. The miscellaneous I had understood was going to be a quick touching base on a number of events that would be of potential interest to the ICANN community, from the WSIS Forum to the Global Conference on Cyberspace, to NMI, et cetera. I thought it was going to be a quick go-through some of those, but what we ended up doing was drilling down on certain points, and in a way that not everybody in the panel was teed up to speak to all those points.

By that point, it seemed to me people were getting tired or restless, so not all the points were crisply articulated. I'm not sure it was a matter that we had too many. The biggest problem was the number of people

and the fact we didn't have a U-shape, so that the moderators could easily signal to people to move it along and wrap it up. if we were again to do WSIS as a main chunk, I don't know of another international process that we might want do a separate main chunk on, other than perhaps the IGF.

Then you could have a third bit that's miscellaneous, where you pick up on other things; the Global Commission, whatever else. As long as there's effective time management, I don't think there too much there for us to talk about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Bill. What I take then is that we could look at a format where the time for the session deals with two topics; a main topic and secondary topic. That seemed to work. It's just the big problem was the panel itself; the number of people on the panel. You could have less people, four, let's say - I think I've heard you say four - and no more, and be very strict on this. Anybody else who wishes to intervene would intervene from the floor - but it's not even the floor, since this would be a horseshoe setup so people can intervene from around the table as and when they wish to do so.

If there are no objections to this, and I think that we have consensus or an understanding on this, are we okay with having two topics? I'm reading the chat as well at the same time. I note that everyone says the Singapore format worked much better. I take it we have consensus on that. I haven't heard anyone go against two topics, so we can continue with the two topics. Next question is what should be our main two

topics for the public meeting? Floor is open. I note from Bill Drake, he mentions in the chat the small group should be conversation starters, not speakers. Very good point. Good idea forward. Bill Drake?

BILL DRAKE:

Again, just to restate, I think WSIS+10 and the IGF, both the meeting itself and the larger politics around the IGF, would be very suitable as two main points to talk about. If you wanted to link between the WSIS and the larger sustainable development process in the UN, that Marilia is mentioning in the chat, we could do that as well. I'm going to guess not a lot of people who work in the domain name industry are following the sustainable development process. There are some bits there that are relevant. That's part of a framing issue, and certainly we could bring that in. How much time do we have on this one again? It's going to be a shorter one, right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

I don't know the length. I thought it was 90 minutes. Might this be shorter? Nigel would know, since he filed the request?

NIGEL HICKSON:

On the request form we have to give details of things like agenda and time. We asked for 90 minutes, and the agenda topics I put down, which is only a draft, was the WSIS process and the IGF, but of course we can change that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Nigel. That looks like we can perhaps even move forward on this. I've heard Bill say that's a good topic. I can read Marilia's point in the chat, which Bill has alluded to just now; the sustainable development. There's always a question on whether this is off the radar for this community or not, or whether it's something that's of interest in the naming community, as such. Nigel has already put a placeholder agenda. Let's discuss the agenda on the mailing list and say a few words on this, and see what the wider group thinks about the two topics.

I certainly think the WSIS+10 and the IGF are very important. This Working Group has been focusing on this now for quite some time, and is likely to focus on this for quite some time. That definitely is one of the topics. If we need another topic then maybe we can put our minds together and suggest one. Marilia?

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you very much. Just to clarify, I think participating in the WSIS Review process and meetings in the UN, one thing that was interesting, at least to me, is how far there is a separation between those discussing Information Society and Internet governance, and a community that's worried about development and discussing the issues relating to sustainable, in terms of e-waves and all these issues that are important that never percolated inside the community.

I think there are people in the ICANN community that operate servers, that operate Internet infrastructure, and there's a clear relation with issues relating to sustainable development and environment. My

suggestion was not to hold a session on it. I think it's off radar of most to the community, but to frame it in way that we raise awareness that there's a correlation with that too, and maybe the first step to sensitize and have the community involved in this side of the discussion.

For me, it was very enlightening, and it might be for others too. There is an excellent paper produced by [Bill 00:58:00] for the UN Expert Meeting, and we can circulate that on the list. He does the work of correlating significant development goals and discussions on WSIS and Information Society, and he does a pretty good job on that. So it's available for us. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Marilia. Perhaps this could be raised then in AOB on that public meeting? Just wondering since we're looking at spending a suggestion of 40 minutes on each of the two topics and then AOB, I can't see the sustainable topic to be a 40-minute topic if we're just going to enlighten the community on it. But certainly an AOB would be a good point from the person or persons who would be moderating in AOB: "We point you to the following number of papers." In fact, it would be not only this paper, but there could be other papers on other topics as well; reading matters for people who are interested.

Any other thoughts on this? I realize we're past the top of the hour, and we're 59 minutes into this call. Look, we've already made some progress on this. Let's follow up by email, and Dublin is not that far away, so we have to start agreeing on things, and let's start thinking also, next time we speak, on our face-to-face discussions. I note, "Need

new moderators”. Does that mean, Bill, that you’ll be unwilling to moderate the discussions in Dublin?

BILL DRAKE: No. Just that probably people would welcome a new face. If nobody else wants to, I could do it, but there are probably plenty of people here who could.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay Bill. Thank you for this. Let’s go into AOB, ladies and gentlemen, since it’s already the top of the hour. I don’t see anyone putting their hand up. One item to discuss is when will our next call be. I see Bill has put his hand up. Bill?

BILL DRAKE: I wanted to talk about the face-to-face.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have to discuss the face-to-face, but we’re running out of time and I was going to suggest we discuss it in our next call. Are we okay for another five minutes, perhaps? Let’s extend for another five minutes.

BILL DRAKE: As I said in the email, I really want to talk in Dublin about what we’re doing in Brazil. I just sent the link in the chat again. We have this big workshop we’re going to do to explain the IANA stewardship transition process to a potentially large, globalized group of people who are not

ICANN insiders. That requires a certain deftness of how you're going to tee things up. We did it at the WSIS Forum but with a smaller panel.

Here we're going to have 15-16 people, so it will be a bit of a challenge to make this work and decide how we want to do it. You guys asked me to moderate this as well. I'd like clear guidance on what people would like to happen. I'd ask we spend at least a little bit of time at the Dublin Meeting talking about how we're going to do this.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks Bill. I'm entirely in agreement with you. I do know that although we have a large number of panelists currently listed, I have received emails from a number of them who will not be able to make it to [unclear 01:03:00], so there will be some spaces there. The question will be, do we want to replace them and have more people on the panel? Or do we just want to leave those seats empty and therefore reduce the panel size? I personally feel that perhaps since we did manage to do a good update in Geneva with a smaller panel, we don't really need that large a panel.

It was more of a representation part; saying, "We need a representative from this community or that community." As long as we have at least one member of each one of the operational communities to be able to explain their part of the work, and also at least one person from the ICG who'd be able to let us know how that worked on the ICG, then we're pretty much set. I count this as being four rather than 15.

But of course there are questions on the IGF regarding representability and gender balance and geographical balance, so that might grow the

panel back. If we have specific people missing from the current listed panel that would bring an imbalance, we might need to look at that and start moving. Bill Drake, if you could please explain your chat?

BILL DRAKE:

I said A) if people have told you that they're not coming, you should please tell me as the moderator, and Cc Nigel, who's the submitter and can edit the document on the website. There are people I can suggest we might consider adding, but it depends on who's missing. The other thing was responding to your suggestion we go to a smaller panel, we submitted a roundtable proposal, which the MAG expected to be 15 people. I don't think they're going to take us off the program if we then turn around and say, "Actually, we're going to have eight people."

There was an expectation when we were approved that we were doing a roundtable format, so we should bear that in mind. If it becomes more like a regular, panel workshop, then some eyebrows might be raised.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this Bill. I don't think the format would change. It would be a roundtable. It's just looking at the balance of it. What I'll do is I'll check my emails - I have alerted Nigel on anyone who's said they won't be able to make it to the IGF in person. Of course, we could have them intervene remotely as well, although I did notice that in our Geneva presentation it was very hard to have that remote participant intervene in any meaningful way. It was a lot harder to do so. I guess in a roundtable it's hard to have someone that's virtually in the roundtable too.

That's really the way forward. We can certainly discuss this and finalize everything when we meet in Dublin. Prior to that, it would be indeed good to already start preparing the topics and list the topics, as you've said, by using our mailing list. Anyone else wishing to comment on this topic? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. People are starting to drop off the call. We are 11 minutes past the top of the hour. I'd like to thank you all for having participated in today's call. Our next call is in two weeks' time. We've now agreed we're not going to have a weekly meeting but a bi-weekly meeting. Please, let's try and follow up on the mailing list and be engaged on the mailing list.

If we just engage in our conference calls, first we don't always have the same people on the calls, as you know it's sometimes impossible to make a call until we have apologies, but also it's difficult to take decisions when there's a small set of people from the Working Group. If we could follow up on the mailing list, that would be absolutely great. With this, I'd like to thank you and adjourn this call. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]