
RENATE DE WULF: Okay, the recording has started, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Renate. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is the Cross-Community Working Group call of the 24th of September, 2015. The time is 14:02 UTC. And today let's have a quick roll call. Renate, do you have the list of people on the call, please?

RENATE DE WULF: Yes, I do. We have Avri Doria, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Klaus Stoll, Judith Hellerstein, Juuso Moisander, Rafik Dammak, Lynn St. Amour, Vicky Sheckler, David Maher, and from staff we have myself, Renate De Wulf, and Alexandra Dans.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thank you very much, Renate. Have we missed anyone in the roll call, by any chance?

RENATE DE WULF: And Matthew Shears has just joined the call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Renate. All right, I don't hear anyone else shout their names out, so the roll call list complete. Today's agenda is quite

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.

straightforward. We will be discussing the WSIS+10 submissions. Nigel Hickson, who should be with us – Nigel is not with us yet. He—

RENATE DE WULF: He's having a few difficulties. He hopes to join as quickly as possible. He apologizes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that's fine. Thanks, Renate. Nigel will be joining us to speak to us about the WSIS+10 submissions. And then afterwards we really need to focus on our agendas for Dublin, because there is a deadline looming – I believe it's the end of the week – for us to decide on the agenda of the public session that we will be conducting in Dublin, and also our face-to-face session.

Now let's see if there are any amendments or additions to the agenda. I don't see anyone put their hand up, so the agenda is adopted as it currently is on our screen. The first item on the agenda, agenda item #2, is the action items for the Cross-Community Working Group meeting we had in Buenos Aires. The only action item that's left over is the one for Rafik Dammak to ask [inaudible] to make the CCWG IG more visible on ICANN.org. Rafik, have you had a chance to speak to [inaudible] about this?

Rafik appears to be muted at the moment.

RENATE DE WULF: I have un-muted him.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: No. We didn't have any chance to talk with him. I guess I have to do it after this call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks for this, Rafik. Just drop him a note quickly to get this out of our way. Now, who's just joined?

RENATE DE WULF: Nigel Hickson has joined.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. So we have Nigel Hickson who's joined, and I think that David Maher has also joined the meeting, I believe.

DAVID MAHER: Yes, I joined.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, David. Right. Then since Nigel, you've just arrived on the call, we are reaching agenda item #3, and that's the summary of the WSIS submissions. We as a group had a table where we could be looking at the submissions that were made—

Okay, that's great. Thanks. Could I just ask, Renate, I'm not sure if this thing can be turned off or on and you can just keep track of who's joining?

RENATE DE WULF: I'll have to do it for the next time. I can't change the program now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ah, okay. Because it's a little disruptive. But never mind.

RENATE DE WULF: I'm sorry about that. But I'll make sure it doesn't happen for next time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this. Summary of WSIS+10 submissions, an important part of our agenda. As you know, there is a process going on in New York. I believe it's even started as we speak. So let's just go over directly over to Nigel Hickson, who will be able to speak to us about the preparatory process roadmap and the written comments that were submitted on the non-paper. Nigel, you have the floor.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Good afternoon, everyone. I do apologize for joining late. I have no idea who's on the call. I've had to join by mobile, as the wi-fi where I am has collapsed. I don't know if Veni Markovsky is on the call. If he is, then he will certainly be able to give an updated account of the process in New York. Is he on the call?

RENATE DE WULF: No, he's not.

NIGEL HICKSON: Right, okay. If he joins later, no doubt he can catch up. Just to bring us all up to date on where we are, as you know, the WSIS+10 review process has been ongoing for some time now and will conclude in December at the United Nations General Assembly with a high level meeting. Recently – well, over the sort of latter part of the summer, there was a sort of consultation between late – well, in July, actually, up to the end of July, a consultation on inputs into the so-called non-paper paper that was going to be produced by the UN General Assembly, or UN DESA, whoever the administrative organization producing these drafts. There were a number of contributions, over 100 contributions, to this particular exercise. I circulated a summary of the responses some weeks ago, and indeed this group, as Olivier mentioned, was going to undertake some [inaudible] detailed analysis.

As a result of that consultation, the UN DESA produced a so-called non-paper. This non-paper came out a couple of weeks ago around the sort of third of September. It, a non-paper which I think most of you will have seen, it is not in the form of a UN resolution. It's in the form of a sort of normal sort of background paper, and it identifies a number of specific areas, such as the digital divide, such as human rights, such as Internet governance, and then gives an indication of what could be proposed in the final draft of the paper to be agreed in December by the UN.

So that non-paper also attracted responses. Organizations were asked if they wanted to respond on comments on the non-paper, and I sent a link around earlier in the week on the responses being submitted so far. I think there's about 50 responses on the UN site, although we know that some responses are still coming in. The deadline for responses was last Friday evening the 18th, so some of the responses are indeed quite late.

We in ICANN, [inaudible] ICANN staff so to speak, are doing an analysis of these responses in terms of what the governments have said, and I will attempt to do a high level summary which I'll also circulate around the list. This is a non-prerogative exercise, if you like. It has no formal status or summary from what I write or what anyone else writes, but it's certainly an indication of the sort of thoughts of passage.

ICANN did not put in a response on the non-paper. Other organizations did, like ISOC and RIPE NCC – sorry, APNIC. But we decided, it was decided not to, in the end. Indeed, there was some dialogue on our thoughts with the UN last week. Fadi Chehadé was in New York and met with the president of the General Assembly. This is the sort of, he's like the chair of the General Assembly, from out in Denmark, and also the co-facilitators. These are the ambassadors that are coordinating this WSIS process as well as someone, a senior official from DESA. We can talk more about that if you wish.

But suffice to say, and I'll finish because other people will have a view, is that the process is ongoing. The next step in the process is that the UN will produce the so-called zero draft, which is supposed to be available at the end of this month, although I think more likely in the first week of

October. And then this zero draft will be subject to consultation as well in the first couple of weeks of October, and then on the 19th of October there's the open consultation session in New York. This is the second session in New York. The first one was back in July, where organizations, WSIS-accredited organizations such as ICANN, ISOC, etc., will be invited to speak at an open consultation format, and ICANN will certainly take advantage of that, although the timing of course clashes with Dublin.

I think that's the process. Just to finish, the Internet governance, as I mentioned, is a paragraph in the non-paper. So whether ICANN thought it might be included or not, certainly Internet governance is included, and also there is a reference to the technical coordination of the Internet. So I think we are in the process, so to speak. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. I open the floor for questions, comments, and generally discussion on this topic.

CHRIS WILSON: Nigel, this is Chris Wilson from 21st Century Fox. Thank you for your summary. It's very helpful. I do have a quick question. Is ICANN planning on doing any side event in October at WSIS?

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you, Chris, for that question. Yes, the UN have offered on their site the ability of organizations to do sort of side-briefings during the 19th or in the couple of days after that when the member states will meet to discuss the zero draft. That's

something which we're discussing with ISOC and the regional Internet registries. Of course, this group might have a view on that. I know some people from the Cross-Community Working Group will be in New York. I value people's opinions on that. Up to now, ICANN in New York has been having a dialogue with a lot of different players. As I said, Fadi Chehadé was in New York. Veni Markovsky, our vice president in New York, has been very diligent in meeting a lot of the governance, a lot of the missions, and updating on what ICANN does, etc. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Nigel. You have a follow-up, David? Oh, Chris, sorry.

CHRIS WILSON:

No, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks. Nigel, on the fact of the meeting that's taking place in New York, that takes place at the same time as an ICANN meeting, doesn't it? Who will be following up on this? Are you going to be both at the ICANN meeting and then traveling off to New York, or is [inaudible] following up, or Veni? Are we having a second Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON:

People would not want that. Yes, there is a clash of dates, which I think is just down purely to dates when the UN was able to have the facilities to hold this open consultation. As you know, the UN are incredibly busy with the summits, the Sustainable Development Summit this week and those other high level meetings in early October. So yes, it does clash. Veni Markovsky, as I said, who's been following the New York process, he will be in New York that week. He will be at the open consultation on the 19th and indeed will be there for the governmental meeting. He has the ability to be ICANN ambassador at the same time, which is always useful in life. He's accredited with the Macedonian and Bulgarian governments, so he can turn up to those sessions. And we'll be at ICANN, of course, doing lots of things at Dublin. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Nigel. Next is Matthew Shears. Very well, Matthew. Go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you, Matthew. As one would expect, a good question from you. This is always a concern one has on negotiations, I'm afraid, where if you're like those favoring the status quo and more likely not to be so passionate as those that are opposing the status quo. But I think what we've seen, and I certainly haven't read every submission but I've certainly read the governmental ones, and there's only so many hours in the day,

so to speak. I've read a couple of the civil society ones, by the way, which are excellent. There was one particular one – I've forgotten the author – but put the governments to shame in terms of the lucidity of the text. But in terms of the governmental contributions, yes. I mean, Saudi Arabia, Russia, called for this notion of enhanced cooperation to take the form of a UN mechanism to work on Internet governance. As we mentioned before, the Russian contribution back in the summer called for the gradual phasing out of ICANN. So we have that on one hand.

But we also have a very detailed and comprehensive submission from the United States which sketches out a fairly open version, open multi-stakeholder scenario for Internet governance and is fairly comprehensive. So think the draft is, if you like, the zero draft, the [inaudible] zero draft, will have at their fingertips a number of different views, not least [inaudible] civil society and business. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Nigel. Follow up, Matthew? Probably not. Okay. Any other questions or comments? Nigel, I had a question regarding the stakeholder categories. They are listed next to each other on the WSIS+10 page that the United Nations is running. Are they all having the same weight? Because we see obviously government, civil society, technical, academia, private sector, and inter-governmental organizations. Or are they actually going to be taken on in the drafting of the zero paper

with a different weight depending on who the actual originator of these comments is, or the type of stakeholder?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you. Others would have – Matthew and others might have a view on this. Clearly one would hope so. I mean, we're in, if you like, we're still in the multi-stakeholder phase, just, if you like. It's like we're hanging on to a multi-stakeholder approach here at the moment in terms of this open consultation, this ability for all the different parts of the community to put in views. And then we have the zero draft. And then the zero draft will be commented on, but then it will be negotiated by governments only. But one would hope in the production of the zero draft that the UN DESA and the consultants would take note of all the contributions, not just from governments. Obviously the ones from governments will be looked at, but hopefully one would hope that they'll take notice of the contributions from all the different categories. Let's hope they do. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Nigel. The floor is open for more questions. In the meantime, I might ask another question. The UN is starting its summit on the sustainable development goals tomorrow, I believe. I think I've got it in my calendar as tomorrow in New York. How does this relate to the process, the WSIS+10 process,

and are there any chances that there might be some interest from the SDG goals process?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Olivier, thank you. Again, others will have views on this. But yes, we think there will be at least a political influence, of course, in that although the sustainable development goals themselves have been heavily negotiated and will be adopted without change, we understand, on Saturday or Sunday of this week, there will be accompanying text which will obviously be negotiated to an extent or has been negotiated and will have to be agreed at the summit. The direction of this accompanying text in terms of the global south vs. the global north sort of thing is a dimension, the funding associated with these goals is an issue at the Addis Ababa summit earlier this summer. So I think, yes, you're right, there is this linkage. And indeed, if the developing countries or the [inaudible] were to come out of this summit thinking like their concerns weren't being listened to or the Western powers weren't really paying enough attention to the developmental goals, then that could be potentially damaging then to the WSIS process. We'll have to see how that fares. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Nigel. I have a follow-up on this. Is ICANN planning to attend any of the sessions for the SDG summit? Or are they actually able to attend any?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Well, no. We're not attending. I'm not sure whether we would have been able to. We weren't invited. ISOC, Kathy Brown, the chief executive, is attending one of the sessions I think on Sunday. But that's in the fringe of the actual summit itself. Of course, this is a major summit where there'll be sessions with just the governments, just the presidents and prime ministers, agreeing the sustainable development goals, and then there'll be a number of side events. And ISOC, as I said, are one of those, but ICANN are not taking part.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Nigel. Floor is open for more questions or comments on the summary of WSIS+10 submissions. I'm not sure how many of you have managed to go through the long list of submissions that were sent there. Nigel, was there anything – I think that Matthew somehow alluded to this earlier, Matthew Shears. Was there anything of note apart from the usual suspects whom we have spoken about a moment ago, that would effectively affect or have something to do with ICANN in particular? I'm looking here at maybe some civil society submissions or submissions from the private sector, for example.

NIGEL HICKSON:

I haven't read every single one. I think the answer is probably no. A number of contributions call, if you like, for the

globalization of ICANN. This is the word that was – well, in fact, in the non-paper, the authors put the internationalization of ICANN, which is wording which doesn't trip off the tongue, but other people have talked about the globalization of ICANN. There's an implicit assumption – and this is actually important, not necessarily for this group but certainly important in the context of the discussions in Los Angeles – is that there is an implicit understanding, an assumption, that ICANN is going through this globalization process. If this globalization process does not happen, or collapses, or is delayed, vis-à-vis the IANA transition, then that will have a major impact in December. I mean a significant impact where the likelihood of wording supporting new UN mechanisms for Internet governance will be much more likely to be adopted if it's felt that the multi-stakeholder process is incapable of putting forward proposals on the transition of the NTIA responsibilities.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Nigel. Having been in the other two groups and have some wonderful times on the CWG IANA and CCWG Accountability, and still am, one concern I have is that at the moment the jurisdiction issues have been pushed to work stream 2 of the CCWG Accountability. That is not likely – the work on this is not likely to happen before December. It's certainly not part of the proposal for the NTIA stewardship transition. So I'm a little concerned of the appearance that we're dealing here with a globalization process of ICANN when, if you look at the actual proposal, that doesn't appear to be a

globalization aspect to it. There is just a transition from one type of structure – well, effectively, the US government stepping back and letting a process take place that will replace its own position. Is there a misunderstanding here somewhere? I see Lynn St. Amour. Let's give the floor to Lynn and then we'll get back to you afterwards, Nigel. Lynn St. Amour.

Have we lost Lynn St. Amour? [inaudible] You're cutting in and out. Or at least on my phone you're cutting in and out. Can you hear me? Okay. I can hear you again. So you were just coming in and out. Back to you, Lynn. Apologies.

Thank you very much for this update, Lynn. Very helpful, certainly, in the context of Internet governance and the discussions that will take place in this forum and with regards to WSIS+10 process. Anything to add, Nigel, on this?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you, Olivier. No. I think that Lynn covered it absolutely. Yeah. We have to do what we have to do. But I think, one thing you might want to consider, Olivier, is asking – well, I mean, I'm not suggesting what you do, but before this group were going to look at the submissions before the non-paper, we've now just been discussing the submissions that go to make up the [inaudible] paper for the zero draft. [inaudible] there's a question of whether it will be useful to have some analysis of those submissions [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this, Nigel. I was thinking the same thing, but having seen the sort of poor response we've had for the review by working group members of the first set of contributions, I'm a little concerned. And having spoken to quite a number of people, actually, both my e-mail and also face-to-face, everyone appears to be so extremely incredibly busy at the moment, it seems to be a bit of a hard thing for the working group itself or working group members to focus or do a full review of all of the submissions.

What might be interesting is – and I'm sure many of us here are reading the contributions – but perhaps to flag anything that we see in contributions outside the usual suspects whom we know are going to be particularly important because of their content. But try to flag, if there's anything we should be aware of in any of the lesser, if you want, sort of less-usual suspects. I'm not looking at suspect or anything like that of course. Just to make sure that we haven't missed anything and that something that could be helpful, if there are any weak signals out there that could be exploited or that could be used in a good way. I don't know how everyone feels on this call about this or in the working group about this.

Of course, always the concern I have is we have an ICANN meeting that's coming up very soon. Everyone seems to be very busy. I'm not sure whether anybody has the time or the will, the interest to engage in going through this and basically flagging things. I do realize that it does take time to read those

contribution, and this is not time that's very well paid in this environment of volunteer engagement, to say the least.

Are there any thoughts or comments about this? I don't see anyone putting their hand up on there. I would suggest, yes, if anybody sees something that should be pointed out, we could either create another table which effectively would be a copy of the first table that we had but with the submissions on the non-paper, and then we'll just – the facility will be there for anyone in the group to be able to go on the wiki and to add their comments to the submissions if they wish to do so. I definitely don't think any of my colleague chairs are in a position to say, "Well, do this or else." I'll just say that's a voluntary thing. Any comments? Are we okay with that? This is it.

A large part of this process – and Matthew is commenting on the process of the CCWG meeting in Los Angeles this weekend. It might well be that we need to look out for specific things depending on how well or constructively the folks that are going to L.A. on the CCWG are going to be able to reach some consensus which will then, in turn, feed into the CWG, which will then, in turn, feed into the ICG, which will then, in turn, feed into having something that will move forward with the transition of stewardship. It's a long pipeline here and a lot of "ifs" and "whens" and "how" and "perhaps."

I don't see very much response at the moment, so I take it that we can – Renate, we can... let's just have a table done in exactly the same way as we've done for the other submissions, a table

that will list the submissions. I think that's probably quite straightforward. We can probably import it from the UN table that has the links there. And I guess the questions would probably be the same next to it, and if anyone on the group feels like they could contribute, they have time to contribute in between flights and meetings and whatever, then they can go and add their comments or their views on the submissions that we might wish to concentrate on and flag out.

Okay. I see we've reached the – we're past the half hour mark. We now have to also look at our forthcoming meetings in Dublin. Before that, Nigel, is there anything else you'd like to mention or alert us to regarding WSIS+10?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you very much. I'm online now, I think, so I can see the chat. No, just to reinforce I think what you said, Olivier, in that no doubt various people on the call will read some of the submissions because they're associated with some of the organizations or whatever. If anyone has any views on those submissions at all, whether it's on the table or off the table, then by all means please let us know, because it's always nice to have different views on the different submissions.

I suppose the other thing to say is that we'll circulate details on the 19th of October when we know more. We were told the other day by the UN, or someone was told by the UN, that for the 19th of October meeting, there's open consultation. There

will be a call for speakers, etc., as there was before for the July session. So we'll be able to circulate that and keep this group up to date on what's going on. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this, Nigel. So now let's move on to ICANN 54. We have two sessions that are going to take place at ICANN 54. The face-to-face session is going to take place earlier on in – sorry, later on in the week, I believe. The date and timing are to be confirmed. And our face-to-face session will be the first session, which I believe will probably be on Monday or earlier around in the week.

So far, let's start by the public session. Unfortunately, I note that Bill Drake is not with us. He had much input for the last time we actually discussed this. The idea, I guess, for the public session, was to concentrate – and the link, by the way, is in the agenda, so you can link to that, but it's just a page with three things on it – concentrate on the WSIS+10. That really seems to be at the moment the star topic, the main topic to address. So WSIS+10 for about 40 minutes. The second topic was the IGF meeting and the larger politics around the IGF. As you know, the IGF is taking place in November, so it's just one month after the ICANN meeting. That will certainly be a hot topic. I don't think there's any other session during ICANN that's going to deal with this. So alerting everyone in the room about the IGF meeting and discussing the larger politics around it with everyone would be maybe a good way forward.

As to the format of the public session, I think that we had decided on something like a U-shaped room, not something with a stage and participants. One of the things that we have learned from the last meeting that we had was that we had too many speakers and not enough time, and certainly not enough time to have full interaction with the room. So having less speakers, having perhaps even subject/topic leaders who can just say a few words and then throw it to everyone out there is probably the way forward. And then U-shaped seemed to work a lot better in Singapore than the setup that we had in Buenos Aires.

So far, I don't see any reaction, so that sounds like it's okay with everyone. I guess we need to focus a little bit maybe on sort of how we want to conduct this. If anybody has suggestions on that. I felt that maybe just having one moderator might be enough. Having two moderators often first makes for a slightly different pace. If you have a full 90 minutes with one moderator, people might get used to the pace at which things are going. Having two moderators sometimes helps out, so we could have a first moderator for the WSIS+10 and then another moderator – or convener, I think maybe would be the word – for the IGF discussions, and really stick to these two topics and not start going even further and try to then also have NETmundial and have a lot of other topics out there, which I know are important. But the real concern is if we try and do too much, we're just going to not address anything enough.

So are there any comments or suggestions to be made here? Nigel, I know that again, you are putting in the hot seat, I'm afraid, because I guess you're the person who has to file that documentation with ICANN. I believe we have until the end of the week to do so, which doesn't give us much time at all. What else would you need on there? I guess do you need a list of speakers, or has the description that I've given so far, is that enough already or do we need more?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thank you very much, Olivier. You're absolutely right. We're being asked as staff to finalize the agenda and speakers, etc., by the end of this week, and then the timetable for Dublin, if you like, the schedule for Dublin [inaudible] schedule will be published on Monday. We have the draft internally, which I've seen this morning. As I've said, the IG session is as we discussed before, down for 9:30 to 11:00 on Thursday. It's in the main room, it's in the big room. But we'll certainly ask for a horseshoe arrangement as discussed.

I think, if I may, at the moment the draft agenda we put forward, which [inaudible] been changed, has three topics. It has the WSIS, the IGF, and sort of other things, but of course we can just make it the two, depending on what this group thinks. Or we can just leave the third one there and not use it or whatever. But I think we do need to put some names forward. We can call them respondents, as we did I think for the Singapore session, and moderators, like Bill, or whoever's going

to moderate the two different parts. I think we need to put some names down. I mean, we can always add on the day, but it's nice to put something on the – I mean, this is a high interest topic. It's going to be publicized as a high interest topic. And therefore I think we need to have some names so that people coming to it can, looking at the timetable before they come to Dublin, can understand [inaudible]. So thanks for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Nigel. As far as the names are concerned, in his absence, and bearing in mind he had admitted the interest of doing this in previous ICANN meetings, I think Bill Drake could be one of the conveners for the day. In regards to having a second person, I don't know which one of the two topics Bill would feel most agreeable with, whether it's WSIS+10 or the IGF meeting. Do we have any volunteers on the call here to convene and to moderate, if you want, one or the other part of the session itself? We're looking here at the public session. Please, don't all put your hands up at once. It's fine. There will be space for everyone.

Okay, it seems to be a bit – everyone's shy, obviously, here. Nigel, I'm not sure that we can today get the actual names of people. I guess there will be some who will wish to be the topic experts or say a few words. I wonder if we can have a couple of – perhaps –

RENATE DE WULF: Olivier, my apologies. There are some responses in the chat room.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There are some responses. I'm reading the chat room at the moment, but it seems to be a bit lagging.

RENATE DE WULF: [inaudible] said that Bill mentioned the IGF session, so he would be the most appropriate person for the IGF.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Thanks for this.

RENATE DE WULF: Klaus Stoll has just –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, that's just appearing now, slowly. So Klaus Stoll has said, "In case of emergency, I'm available." Okay. So Klaus could be – and Klaus, are you well-versed with the WSIS+10 process? Because if we then have Bill for the IGF part, we need someone who's pretty strong on the WSIS+10. I see Chris Wilson is leaving on Thursday morning or else would be happy to help, too.

RENATE DE WULF:

Judith is also volunteering.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Judith is also there – yeah, can also moderate if necessary. I think we need somebody who’s well-versed in WSIS+10 and knows their way around. Matthew Shears, I wonder, how’s your background in WSIS+10? I know you’ve been following this quite closely. You can talk on WSIS+10. Okay. So we could have you on the panel as such, or as the topic leader. I think you mentioned earlier, Matthew, that you would suggest the folks speaking for a couple of minutes to introduce the topic and then the discussion to start taking place.

I would imagine that we would need also – I’m sure, actually, we would need a staff member on any of the panels or the people that are sort of going to be a bit of a topic lead on this as well. So I don’t know, Nigel, whether it would be you or Tarek or Veni or anyone else for that matter. I guess it will be down to who is going to be in Dublin at that time, and who is going to be in New York.

Judith, okay, familiar with [inaudible]. So I think it’s very difficult for us to choose right now, names of the people that will be there. What I suggest then is that we follow up on the mailing list. We’ve got a list of people who now have volunteered in the chat. Bring this to the mailing list, discuss this. We don’t want ten people to be listed. I would probably even say the smallest number is just to have the two people who will be moderating

being listed, and then the rest is – the most important thing is the actual topics rather than the people. I don't think people are going to be, the audience is going to come to listen to people. They'll be more like there to discuss topics, no matter who the person actually introducing the topic.

Certainly, any questions on CCWG and IC or ICG or IANA transition or ICANN accountability will have to be punted elsewhere, that's absolutely correct, Lynn. Indeed.

Okay. So that's the first session, the IG public session. Nigel, I'm really sorry I haven't got any more names to give you for the page, but I guess if immediately after this call we can have an e-mail sent out to the mailing list and asking for the people to volunteer and have – well, with the list of the people that have already put their names up in the chat today, that will be easy to get. Then within – I think is it by tomorrow, sort of 48 hours, we need, or 24 hours?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, sorry. Two points. Yes, really we do need it tomorrow. My assistant in Geneva is at the moment holding the pen on this session because the login is in her name, although I could theoretically do it much later in the day. I think if we could have something tomorrow, that would be good. I mean, obviously we're in your hands, Olivier and colleagues. We can just put down the two moderators. That would work. And then I could put down "plus subject experts from across the community" or

something like that. I'm in your hands. I think we need at least the names of the two moderators.

If I could just make one other point before we go on to the face-to-face, and that is this. We've been, as you know, this ICANN meeting [inaudible] meeting, we're having remote hubs. So this is a number – I don't know how many, 10 or 12 – these are remote hubs in either ISOC chapter offices or other offices around the globe, so to speak, where a number of people are going to come together and listen to sessions and have the ability to ask questions. There will be – the idea is to have a remote hub for this session because it was thought to be of probable interest. I don't think it affects the – it doesn't affect the subject [inaudible] of the session. Of course, that's up to us. But it just makes the – it means that there will be potentially some really interesting questions coming in from these remote hubs. If that's okay. If people are opposed to this, then we can say we don't want it, but it has been suggested this is a good session for it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this, Nigel. Is anybody opposed to the hubs? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I don't see any response on the chat. So I believe there is no opposition to the hubs. I'm certainly fine with it. In fact, I quite welcome the fact that we are opening the doors to make sure that the debate doesn't only take place in the room but will take place outside

the room and worldwide. That's absolutely great. I think it's excellent news.

We'll just have to make sure that the moderators are aware and very much aware of the remote discussions taking place, and the remote hubs being there to comment.

One last thing on this topic, Nigel. I think that in describing the topic, we might need to expand a little bit on the agenda on the WSIS+10 and the IGF topics. Perhaps having a link to the WSIS+10 pages would show the contributions, and also a link to the relevant IGF meeting and perhaps a few words about the potential politics around the IGF. It's just a case of, if people are not coming to see specific interveners, they might be – well, they'll definitely be interested in the topics, and having a good description of a topic with some links would be a good idea.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Olivier, that's absolutely fine and we'll make sure that the agenda has the appropriate links and add some more words to those two topics. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Fantastic. Thanks for this, Nigel. The next thing is the face-to-face session. The face-to-face session is a little bit different because that takes place earlier in the week. We have a few question marks there. It's not fully built-up. Obviously there will be a welcome. There's going to be preparation of the ICANN

workshop at IGF Brazil. I remind you that ICANN has a slot for a workshop and the topic of the workshop is “Transition of IANA Stewardship.” Not discussion the actual transition and the topic of IANA stewardship, because that’s outside the limit of this cross-community working group, but looking at the process by which the plans were all put together and by which the report and the proposal was put together, looking at the three operational communities, filing the proposal at the ICG, putting it all together, and perhaps even looking at the process by which the ICANN accountability track comes into this.

Of course, when we originally filed this request for a workshop, there was a hope that everything would be finished by then and that the whole document would have been firmly in the hands of NTIA and NTIA would have been able to give it a green light, and this was just going to be a wonderful party at the IGF.

It might not be the same thing, but certainly the process in itself is laudable, and I guess we’re really in the hands of the people who are in those working groups when they meet in L.A. and when the other groups meet later on and perhaps also during ICANN Dublin. We’ll definitely need to be just doing a prep meeting to see how are we going to structure that workshop. There has been a dry run, or there have been a couple of dry runs done earlier in the year. They happened to work rather well. But this is, of course, the global IGF, so we might be faced with other types of questions rather than the ones that we were asked in a more friendly environment. I’m saying friendly with

no pointing in a direction whatsoever, but it really will depend on what the political atmosphere will be then in Brazil.

Now we need to – we're not going to speak for the whole length of time just about that Brazil workshop. What else should this working group be discussing face-to-face? Should we be discussing WSIS+10, for example? Should we be discussing any other topics? NETmundial? This sort of thing, bearing in mind this is a working group face-to-face meeting.

Anyone? I know [inaudible] some questions. Very few answers on this working group. So Lynn is asking IGF. Yes, well, we are discussing the IGF, but we're discussing this, just the preparation of the ICANN workshop at IGF. Are you meaning that we could perhaps discuss other matters that relate to the Internet Governance Forum?

Okay, thanks for this, Lynn. I'm sorry – [inaudible] at the moment is speaking. It's Judith. I think that Judith needs to mute if she wishes to – yeah, thanks, Judith.

RENATE DE WULF:

I will put her on mute. She's muted.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

No, that's fine. She's muted herself. That's fine. Anything else? Okay, IGF. Good point. So we could have – so we'll have a preparation of the actual workshop, and then any discussion points or topics that we might wish or sort of have better clarity

about in going to the IGF. That's a good point. Let's put this down as with a question mark next to it. Again, Nigel, this is also something that you need to have by tomorrow evening, is that correct? UTC time?

RENATE DE WULF: Yes, this one is for me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: This one is for you, Renate. Okay. So you're filing that one. Well that's equally as helpful. And we're running out of time on this. There's not very much coming in at the moment on the call. I would say certainly IGF, then, we can add as topic #2. I would say topic #3 we would probably also need to discuss our next steps, because this is a working group meeting, our next steps from Dublin to Marrakech. There is – is it a few months' time? Because it's October, and then – it's five months, I believe.

RENATE DE WULF: March. It's in March.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is it March? Yes. So it's about five months until the next meeting. It would be the last chance we have in five months, then, to be able to discuss our planning for the next few months, what are we going to focus on. I guess at the moment

it's pretty darn obvious WSIS+10 is our main focus, but there might be other things to focus on as well.

I note that Bill Drake has just arrived, and I was going to – and I'm not sure whether you are able to speak, Bill. But we were looking at the public session, the IG public session in Dublin. You have been volunteered to be one of the two conveners. There wasn't any objection to having two conveners, but we've had a number of other people who have [inaudible] forward and said, "I'm fine with helping on this or being a convener as well." We'll follow up on the mailing list with the list of the people that have put themselves forward, and then we can make a decision on who can be a panelist and who can be a topic leader and who can moderate as such.

Are you okay, by the way, with being one of the two moderators? We don't know, Bill, at the moment. But we know that you are one of them, and that's what you get for being late, basically. Next time you'll be on time, you'll be able to say no. Okay. That's fine. I'll [inaudible] afterwards.

Okay. Now – this session will – we don't know yet, because we're still planning this and the agenda has not been finalized. The ICANN week has not been finalized. So the public session that will take place later on in the week, maybe Wednesday or Thursday. The face-to-face meeting will take place earlier, probably Monday.

Okay. So I note in the chat that there is a suggestion from Matthew Shears saying when the CCWG and IG will start to lay out an engagement plan for how ICANN should engage going forward. I think that's exactly what I think I was mentioning there, the third topic in the face-to-face working session. We need to really plan with ICANN staff, what's coming up and how we can engage, as we as the community can engage with staff to be present there and for staff to be able to tap into our resources, or tap into this working group to find out what the feel of this community is, so they can then respond accordingly with involvement from the community on this.

Okay. "I can repeat my pleas from last time that the face-to-face discussion in the IGF session." Yes, we will have that, Bill. The listing, if you look at your agenda, we are going to have. So the first thing is IGF, planning for the IGF session. Second is IGF matters. Third is going to be our own planning for other matters and engagement with everyone else.

Okay. I note that it is seven minutes past the top of the hour and we are starting to [inaudible] finish late on this. I do apologize to everyone, but we did start a few minutes after the top of the hour. I don't see anybody else wishing to add anything to this. As I said, I'll follow up by e-mail with Renate and with Nigel, and on the mailing list quickly after this call to list the number of people who have put their hand up to moderate the public session in Dublin. I think we're in "any other business." Is there anything else that anybody would like to add to this call before we close it? No?

I'd like to thank all of you for being on the call. Thanks very much, Nigel, for having brought us up to date with what's going on at the moment in WSIS land. And as I said, we'll follow up by e-mail. Our next call, let's see, next week or two weeks. I'm just looking at the calendars. I think that we have – this group now meets on a bi-weekly schedule. The only concern I have is the next, so next week would be possible. The week after I would be traveling a lot of the time, and that's just one week before Dublin. So we're looking at the week of the 5th. How are we all looking for the week of the 5th of October?

RENATE DE WULF:

Olivier, could I intervene?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Please, Renate. You have the floor.

RENATE DE WULF:

I apologize for putting my agenda on top of everybody else. It's just that I am taking vacation from the 7th to the 9th of October included. So if you would like a call that week, could you please schedule it either Monday or Tuesday?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for that. That would actually work very well with me as well. In fact, as it looks at the moment, due to my travels, the only day that would probably work is the Monday, which is a

little tight for some people. But that actually moves it a bit further from the ICANN meeting on the one side and a bit closer to us now. How are we feeling for the Monday? We can send a Doodle out for various days, but I guess without Renate, we're not going to be able to run this call. Or could someone be able to run this on your behalf? Perhaps Alex?

RENATE DE WULF:

I will check with Alex to see. I'll get back to you on the e-mail list.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thanks. And you'll have to also speak to Bill, because he says that staff vacations are not allowed, apparently. So I'm not sure of that rule, but check with him directly. Let's then have Monday – let's have a Doodle for that week. Check with Alex if she can run the call on any other day. I would certainly prefer Monday, and let's have a Doodle with a few sprinkled dates and a few sprinkled timings there.

With this, I'd like to thank you all for being on this call. We've made a little bit of progress, but it's always – we've had good feedback on WSIS+10, so that's a good thing forward. Thanks to everyone, and this call is now adjourned. Goodbye and have a good week.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Goodbye, Olivier.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]