
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's start the recording please Renate. [CROSSTALK]

RENATE DE WULF: Okay. I will do the roll call. In the room we have Joerg Schweiger, Mark Buell, Narine Khachatryan. We have David Maher and Marilyn Cade on audio only.

From staff we have Nigel Hickson, Desiree Cabrera, and myself Renate De Wulf. And from the chairs, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond and [Yung Ang Lee].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Renate. Olivier speaking. And this is the cross community working group on Internet governance call on the 10th of December. Have we missed anyone in the roll call? I know someone has just joined the meeting, just a second ago. If you could please identify yourself, or have we already counted them in?

Okay. Well I'll take it the roll call is complete. Welcome everyone. This call comes after a few weeks of a lot of Internet governance related discussions. Today we'll be discussing the IGF, the WSIS plus 10. We'll also have an update about the ICANN joint submissions with the ISTAR organization, and if we have some time at the end of this call, we will be looking at planning for ICANN 55 in Marrakesh.

Is there any other business to add to this?

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.

I don't hear anyone, so the agenda is adopted. And let's go straight to the report for the Internet governance forum that took place in Brazil. I'll go through my own notes, and then I will call upon everyone or anyone who has attended to fill in and add a few points of things that they have attended or any points that I might have missed in my short report.

I personally felt there was a very interesting IGF, and much more active than previous IGFs as far as the range of topics are concerned, with very good in-depth discussions taking place. The attendance from the attendance figures show that it was mostly attended by Civil Society and governments. So much still remains to do to attract the private sector in particular.

But ICC Basis have done morning breakfast meeting every day, specifically to help private sector participants network with each other and get to grips with the different sessions that were all taking place in parallel at IGF. And my goodness, there were a lot of sessions taking place together.

The top topics, whilst there was a high level government meeting on day zero, I didn't attend that so I will ask any others to say a few words on this. Then there was, of course, the topic of WSIS plus 10 review. The IGF mandate renewal, and it looks as though that mandate will be indeed, reviewed for another, I believe it was 10 years, and the next contender on the line for the next IGF will be Mexico.

There were several sessions, of course, on the Internet economy and sustainable development. Also, sessions, main sessions on enhancing

cyber security and building digital trust, that is very well attended as well. [Zero] rating and network neutrality was a hot topic, that suddenly got some people heated up in the room, both for, in support of zero networks and also against the concept of zero rated networks.

This being the first base by Facebook being in the accused corner in many of those sessions. Human rights on the Internet, obviously a topic that has continued quite strongly. And then there was also a big discussion on the Netmundial statement and the evolution of the Internet governance ecosystem. There was also, I think, some focus on the IGF intersessional work.

And that focused on the best practice forums for connecting the next billion. Just to remind you all, there were six of these intersectional working groups, regulation and mitigation of unwanted communications is one of them. The second one, establishing and supporting computer security incident response teams, so CSIRTs. The third one was on developing meaningful multistakeholder participation mechanisms.

The fourth, on practices on countering abuse against women online. The fifth one was creating and enabling an environment for IPv6 adoption. And finally, one international working group on enabling environments to establish successful Internet exchange points, ISPs.

The work actually that these groups have done is particularly good, I would say. And certainly encouraging, and they've all presented their papers which were under discussion and under a public comment. I believe that now they're all complete, and that these documents are available for everyone to read.

And I personally think that it's an excellent thing when one keeps on hearing the IGF is just a talking shop, this intersessional work is really brought home the fact that it could also could produce very high quality documents.

But finally, there was also a number of public sessions, two sessions about the dynamic coalitions. And there are quite a few dynamic coalitions out there, and I think it's the first time they were able to present the work that they have done. And the range from the dynamic coalition on accessibility and visibility, there is one on accountability, one on block chain technologies.

There is one on child online safety, on core Internet values, on freedom of expression and freedom on the Internet, on gender and Internet governance, on Internet and climate change, on Internet rights and principles, on network neutrality, on platform responsibility, on public access in libraries, one on the Internet of things, and finally, a very recent one, a youth coalition on Internet governance.

I personally felt it was great to see them and being able to actually present their work and gain some feedback. And I really hope that more people will be inclined to join those dynamic coalitions, because once again, this provides good intersessional work for the IGF to, the IGF community to focus on.

And finally, the public forum with its usual batch of [inaudible] announcements, apart from our very own Nigel Hickson, who made an impassioned intervention that should serve as a benchmark for public forum interventions. I think that's what I remembered from the IETF,

just dropping it down now. And I open the floor for any other additional updates on the IGF.

MARILYN CADE: Thanks. Olivier, it's Marilyn. I'd like to speak on three topics quickly please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes please, go ahead Marilyn. You're first in the queue, and then Veni Markovski immediately afterwards.

MARILYN CADE: Okay. So first of all, I want to speak about the WSIS plus 10 session on day one. I was one of the co-organizers, along with the Civil Society and technical community and the Brazilian government. That, let me preface this by saying, if you have not yet had a chance to have viewed the really excellent chair's report, provided by the secretariat, I do urge that everyone reviews that and takes that as a baseline document.

It's an excellent report and it documents everything that you covered, but provides more color and detail I think. The WSIS plus 10 session was an innovation that was introduced, I suppose to the MAG. There were MAG members who initially were very skeptical, to my amazement, with the strong support of the Brazilian government and a few others, we were able to achieve bringing the two co-facilitators from UMGA to the IGF in Brazil.

They were designated by the PGA, the UN also is a representative, they were there with their staff and we had a really unique opportunity at the IGF for New York to come to the IGF. I say that because I want to introduce a topic for any of you who are not aware of this, and that is that on the 14th, next Monday, there is a side event, which will be a follow on.

And if you are coming to New York and you didn't register for that side event, if you can let me know today that you need a badge, the Brazilian ambassador is helping out with anyone who did not get badged for that event, which is from 1:15 until 2:45 on Monday in New York. Most people did already register for the side event, but I noticed that some did not.

So if you're on the call and you still need a badge for that side event, if you could let me know today, I will see if we can help out on that. I would be absolutely great to have additional attendance at that session. The second thing that I want to talk about is the session, the substantive session, for the national and regional IGFS, which are coordinated at the request of the MAG chair, and in that session, I believe just note that the national and regional IGFs are growing dynamic space that are focused on how Internet governance is effecting their own countries.

They are also in this meeting, which is the fifth meeting that they have held sequentially, they took some decisions, including doubling for the number of national IGFs by 2016 in Mexico, and also asking the secretariat to help them with creating a new approach to how they can document and share information from national IGF to national IGF.

The regional IGF, of course, are also heavily involved, but the number of regional IGFs will be limited by the number of regions there are in the world, while the number of national IGFs can really grow very substantially. So I mention that because I know there are people on this call who are very interested in the national IGF, and maybe interested in helping to contribute as the work of expanding the number of national IGFs goes forward.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well thank you very much for these updates Marilyn. Very interesting indeed. It's Olivier speaking. You mention the badge for the side section on the 14th, have you sent a note to the working group mailing list on this as well? Or is it just for the people on the call today?

MARILYN CADE: Well, it's a little late for people, if they haven't already planned to be in New York, I was just taking advantage of those who are on the call, since most people, I think would have already decided whether or not they're coming to New York. It's a little late for people to be scheduling to come to New York. So I was mostly just trying to update those who are on this call, if there was anyone who hadn't already registered for the side event.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this Marilyn. Olivier speaking. And I gather if there are people who are on this call, and know of colleagues that are

going to New York, they could just send them over to you, today, I gather, if they wish to be on the list.

Okay, thanks for this update. Now Veni Markovski is next. Veni, you have the floor.

Is Veni still with us? Can't hear him.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you. Go ahead Veni. You have the floor.

VENI MARKOVSKI: I'm sorry, the connection here is terrible. So if it drops, it has been dropping on and off, but I'm underground at the UN and it's on the Internet connection. So the negotiations continue as we speak. There is a lot of, a lot of text which we haven't agreed upon on, mainly about Internet governance and enhanced cooperation. So all of the things that we care about.

Clearly, no agreement on whether the management of the Internet should be only [inaudible] but also multistakeholder. And a lot of emotions going on between the countries. So I stepped out actually to join the call for a few minutes, but I'll go back and see what's happening and I'll keep you posted.

But the chances are, not chances are, we'll definitely continue the negotiations with member states who continue negotiating tomorrow as well, and most probably on Monday. So there is no great text as of now. Any questions?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this update from the floor of the WSIS plus 10 negotiations in New York. So that... Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Yes, I do have a question. I'm really disappointed that we're still in this state, and I really appreciate everything that you've done, Veni. It has been fantastic. But it's very disappointing to see that these issues are still so vulnerable. Is there anything that you can, is there anything that you suggest from contracts that any of us might have with other governments that we could be helpful with?

Or is it just kind of standing by?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Marilyn. Veni?

Have we lost Veni?

RENATE DE WULF: He may have dropped off.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: He may have dropped off. Okay. We'll bank this question Marilyn, and if Veni comes back on, then we'll let you ask the question again.

Okay. We don't have Veni, right. I gather, we can in the meantime, just finish up on report from the IGF. Is there anything else on reporting on the IGF? And then we can continue the update on WSIS plus 10.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Good evening. This is Nigel. I'm not sure you can hear me, I hope you can.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you Nigel. Go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thanks very much Olivier. No I mean, I just wanted to be very brief and to really echo what you said about the value of the IGF. I think for ICANN we thought it was a very positive conference. We are very grateful to Brazil for hosting it, despite some of the logistical, you know, issues that there were.

It clearly went very well. The sessions were of a high quality, and as Marilyn said, we got off on the Monday morning with this really excellent session on the WSIS plus 10, which I think, you know, set the tone. The intersessional work that ISOC and others took forward, I think really did show that the IGF is a serious vehicle.

And although these things are difficult to quantify, I think what happened at the IGF clearly will have a bearing on the discussions in New York in terms of the role of stakeholders in the whole Internet governance process. So I think everyone is to, you know, to be congratulated and you know, we look forward to the work going forward.

And yeah, so thanks all for attending.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Nigel. Olivier speaking. Any other thoughts or feedback from the IGF?

I don't see anyone putting their hands up, so let's then now move into the update about WSIS plus 10. And you've all heard Veni Markovski from the floor of the United Nations building, letting us know about the latest. Is there anything else that we need to discuss on this?

The feedback that I have from a meeting that I've had with the UK government a couple of days ago was that they were going to stick to their guns, which effectively means that there are specific number of redlines that the government is seeing. And they will just be not ready to accept compromises on some of these redlines.

I can't go into details, into the redlines, because they're all imbedded in the overall discussions of WSIS plus 10 and the different proposals that were made by the different countries, but it certainly seems to be still very much in the depths of negotiations and some other countries are

also obviously sticking to their guns and not willing to move an inch towards a resolution for the time being.

And certainly the big question mark is all to do with the multistakeholder versus multilateral discussions. The Internet Societies has launched a petition online, asking for people to sign and organizations to sign to ask that the discussions be multistakeholder in scope, but I'm not quite sure of the weight of these petitions when it comes down to countries discussing these things. Marilyn Cade, go ahead.

MARILYN CADE:

Thanks. You know, I want to try maybe to identify five different areas of concern, because I think we, for the most part, are focused on the extension of the IGF, the treatment of CIR, the Critical Internet Resources, the idea of whether ICANN is a target in the negotiations. I mean, this working group has a particular focus, I don't want to overextend that.

But I just might highlight that, so some of the areas of concern do involve the, not a dispute about the continuation of the IGF for 10 years, but perhaps a concern about how the IGF will be governed, or how the IGF will report back. So that's one. Another one is this issue of where enhanced cooperation will be further debated.

Right now, the language calls for this debate to continue at the [CSTD] perhaps for some modifications of who the participants are. There was a proposal to create intergovernmental only working group at the UN, but I believe that has lost, lost support in favor of continuation of the

[CSTD]. Some of the other issues, one of the main issues, I think, is the discussion about where should and how should cyber security be addressed.

And whether a new mechanism, or strengthened mechanism, is needed to deal with cyber security slash cybercrime slash cyber risk. I was trying to think about, maybe there was one other, and I think it mostly has to do with financing and the link to the SGG. Not that those are debated, but the whole idea of whether there should be some kind of mandate about a financing mechanism still seems to be sort of up in the air, not supported by the technical community, by the [inaudible] countries, by the business community, but still sort of a debate about whether there needs to be a financing mechanism or whether the language that was agreed to in out of the box financing for [inaudible] could be inserted.

And you know, Veni is much, much closer to this, but I've been trying to follow where the fault lines were in these other areas. In addition to the Internet governance and the enhanced cooperation, and those are some of the areas that, in particular, the G 77 and China and India... India has been actually very helpful in calling for language, any time multilateral is proposed, India has been helpful in also supporting the words multistakeholder, but there is still some confusion about what the ultimate language will be in certain paragraphs and whether stakeholders will be identified as acting on an equal footing, or there will be some special roles called out for governments in certain circumstances.

At the same time, I just do think that right now, unless things have changed, the language on human rights is much, much improved than the original draft.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. Does anybody else wish to add to the current update and current discussions on WSIS plus 10?

So I would like to ask one question specifically which was, in what way, since we are here in an ICANN setting. In what ways or some of the [closes] or some of the documents currently on the table, likely to affect ICANN? Because the feedback that I have received some quarters has been that, ICANN's activities have been largely left, not even looked at.

The spotlight, if you want, is not on that, and so the question really has been well, to what extent should ICANN be involved in both discussions, or should they just remain in the corner and make itself somehow forgotten about? I'm saying this quite colloquially. Are there any thoughts on this?

Let's start with Nigel and then over to Marilyn afterwards. Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Just very briefly, it's up to others to really speak on this. I mean, the strategy of ICANN on this has been that we felt the whole WSIS review discussion really was on the outcomes on the WSIS process, and they largely concentrated on issues which, as Marilyn has outlined, which have got nothing to do with the ICANN's mission.

Clearly Internet governance is an issue that's discussed and as such, we take part in the discussions. But we certainly hope that ICANN wouldn't become a debating point, which I don't think it has been. But clearly the G 77 in the latest text they've put forward this afternoon, as I understand it, are still wanting to debate about whether the UN should have some sort of a greater, sort of mandate over public policy issues.

And here is where one has the problem in what ICANN does is not clearly technical. It gets involved in public policy, to the extent that it, you know, domain names and registries and registrars and the conditions that they must meet in terms of data protection, etc. So I think, you know, I think there is a need for us to be there, but clearly others have a more significant role. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: What about the debates over critical Internet resources? Which might touch on the allocation of, well first I guess, there is the root on the one hand and there is the top level domains, and the IP addressing. We have heard for many years, this request that there should be allocated on a per country basis. Does ICANN have anything to say on this?

MARILYN CADE: Olivier, it's Marilyn. Well that discussion may have come up within the ITU raised by one or two governments. That's a level of technical detail that has not emerged into the WSIS review, and in my view should not be brought in. It requires a really in-depth understanding of the plumbing of the Internet, that diplomats are engaged in other kinds of issues.

The overall governance of who should have a say, and whether the role of governments is adequate in Internet public policy, that is coming from certain governments, and it is about much more than about ICANN. It's a reflection of the works that exist in the, put forward by Russia, by Saudi Arabia, by a few other governments, but it is a few other governments.

The other issue for the G 77 is participation. It is funding and adequate resources to insure that all governments, particularly those from developing countries, are able to adequately participate in [inaudible] as ICANN, the IGF, etc. And I think we need to bifurcate these issues, and not encourage the idea that a UN organization brings the expertise.

Right now, there is a lot of support for focusing on mechanisms to enhance participation in existing forums. And I think my own view on that is, we've seen within ICANN an example of how ICANN has supported the ICANN community, the ICANN Board has supported funding to ensure that participation of governments in the GAC, and also through the Fellowship program.

And that has really strengthened ICANN, but it has also really broadened the understanding of governments about what ICANN does and what it does not do. So my own view about this is, I think we really need to understand what's being asked in the discussion, and not overreact.

ICANN, to me, needs to maintain a light presence, a constant presence, but a light presence alongside others from the technical community, and enable its stakeholders to, including the friendly governments who

are involved in the GAC to do a lot of the speaking for it, while it also clearly articulates what it does and doesn't do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. I'll turn to Nigel. I mean, is there much discussion, I guess, between ICANN and those friendly governments? Certainly on the GAC and within ICANN.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you Olivier. Nigel here. Yes, I mean obviously we have discussions with the missions here in Geneva and with the European governments. We're plugged into the high level Internet governance issues that are discussed in the community in Brussels. And you know, where it's appropriate, we lend our views.

But I think, you know, I think we're all in violent agreement here. I mean, this shouldn't be about the management of critical Internet resources. It should be about broader issues, which I think the resolution already covers. But clearly, there are political tensions still. And you know, this is linked to the IANA transition.

Some of us were saying six to nine months ago that this might come back, and if it wasn't agreed at this particular moment in time, this could come back and bite us. I'm not saying it has, but it's always there. This political dimension. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Nigel. Olivier speaking. And I'm glad you mentioned this potential link with the IANA stewardship transition. Have you seen, or has anyone following the New York discussions closely, seen any attempt by any country to bring this into play?

MARILYN CADE: It's Marilyn. I have to say that being in the room for the 19, 20, 21, 22 that was not a topic. That the broader issue, the broader issue of equal distribution of Internet resources was mentioned once or twice, but not a deep dive.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Marilyn. Did it gain any traction in any way?

MARILYN CADE: I know this is being transcribed, so I'm being a little careful in how I try to characterize this. I did not see the specific issue gaining traction. I think the broader issue put forward by certain governments to still want to have what they call an equal distribution of Internet resources, sometimes without acknowledging the architectural limitation, perhaps envisioning a new kind of Internet that is more nationalistic.

One or two of the governments have mentioned that, but I don't see that as being broadly supported at this point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Marilyn. The floor is open for any other comments on this issue. I wish that Veni was able to come back and be able to answer any questions that we have for him, but obviously he said the telecommunications were a little changing from where he was.

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, this is Nigel. I mean, I think what, I'm not trying to say what Veni would have said, but perhaps just very briefly, to put the process in context. So I think Veni mentioned that their negotiating the text, or still going through the text that was released on Monday.

Those discussions will perhaps go on obviously tomorrow, perhaps during the weekend, perhaps on Monday. The final resolution will then hopefully be adopted by the ministers and diplomats and the missions during the actual General Assembly session on the Wednesday.

On the Monday, as I think has been sort of distributed on the chat, so to speak, and on the list, there is a number of side events. Fadi Chehadé is going to be there on Monday and Tuesday morning. He's doing various bilateral and speaking at side events, including a NTIU event in the afternoon on Monday.

And Marilyn has mentioned the WSIS event with Brazil. So there is a number of different events going on [CROSSTALK] [Inaudible]...

I don't know what that was. So I'll be very brief. So there is a number of side events going on which people are contributing to. So I think, yeah, I mean obviously, if Veni was on the call, he could update us on some of the proposals. I understand there is a new G 77 text that tries

to delineate the fact that governments are responsible for public policy issues as well, stakeholders like ourselves are responsible for critical Internet resources, which is of course, as I said before, it just doesn't work as a construction.

But no doubt, it will be debated. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Nigel. Olivier speaking. And let me just here admit my lack of knowledge in the process. You mentioned a G 77 text that's come out. Where has that come out from and how was that put together? Because it seems to have been surprising from what I hear, right here.

I mean, is this something that has been cooked within the UN General Assembly? Or how does this work?

NIGEL HICKSON: Well I think, as you know Olivier, various countries put together various proposals. And we saw various proposals, perhaps, three or four weeks ago being made. So proposals essentially fall to adjustments to paragraphs can be made at any time. And because as Veni explained, I think on a previous call, the paragraphs concerning Internet governance and this issue of multilateral and the Tunis agenda have been up for discussion.

No doubt, other people are coming forward with text. I haven't seen this proposal as a formal proposal, I've just been sent by various people extracts from it. But it was put forward, as I understand, in the session

earlier today, as a contribution to the debate. But yes, it has no more status than any other people's proposals. But of course, the G 77 is important because it represents a large array of countries.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Nigel. Olivier speaking. That's exactly the point. My concern being, it seems to be quite a number of countries that are pushing in one direction. Right, the time is ticking. Any other thoughts on this? So that somehow brings us to the next part of our agenda, that's the update about the ICANN joint submissions with the ISTAR organizations, and I was going to ask, to what extent is ICANN collaborating with the other ISTARs and other...

I know, of course, of ISOC being quite involved with the discussions taking place in New York, but are there any others that are present? And could we just have an update about the joint submissions? For this, is it Nigel who is going to take the floor?

NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry, yes. This is Nigel. I wasn't sure whether I was muted or not. Well, I think what's being referred to here was a submission that ISOC originated during the Internet governance forum in Brazil, and was signed up to by a number of the technical community including RIPE NCC and some other bodies, and also be some various Civil Society organizations as well.

So in the end, it was a fairly substantial, well substantial proposal. It was a document that was signed by a substantial number of

organizations. And essentially it was saying that we expected to negotiations to the UN should be done in a relatively open and transparent way. Then we had hoped that there would be further dialogue, and further opportunities to discuss the text as they went forward.

I mean, it was a document that was sent to the co-facilitators, etc. And sent to missions. I'm not suggesting this has a major effect. I think that was one of your questions earlier, but I think it's helpful to put on the record, you know, the sort of environment we want these discussions to be discussed in.

And you know, sometimes we obviously feel the co-facilitators, as Marilyn mentioned earlier, went out of their way to encourage dialogue, to encourage interaction at the IGF. We had this excellent section, the co-facilitators spend day and night discussing the resolution with all sorts of people.

But then you get to New York, and you get calls by individual governments to essentially ignore Civil Society, to ignore the technical community. We had this briefing that was called yesterday morning, which was called for a briefing for stakeholders by the co-facilitators. Stakeholders were queuing outside in the rain, I exaggerate. I don't suppose it was raining. But were queuing outside the UN building in New York, and were told that this briefing was purely online, and it was online but only the last 15 minutes of it because technically most of it wasn't broadcast at all.

So I think there are some failings as well as some good points.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Nigel. Olivier speaking. Any other update on this from anyone?

Okay. I don't see any hands up from anybody. Just one question from me, what's the next step with regards to those joint submissions? Are there others that are coming in the pipeline? Is there anything that this community here should be watching out for?

Nigel, you might be muted.

NIGEL HICKSON: No, no sorry, no. I was just waiting. Other people might have a view on this. I think, Olivier, to be honest, the time for statements is probably over. I mean, the discussions that are taking place as of now, that Veni is involved in, as a representative of the Bulgarian government and others are involved in, are intergovernmental.

And so whatever we find out is only at the behest of governments. Those discussions, as I've said, will probably go on until Monday or something. So formally, I don't, I wouldn't expect that we, as stakeholders, would formally know what the final text is until it's either distributed or put online, perhaps on Tuesday morning or Monday evening or whatever, the General Assembly session.

So I don't think we'll be in a position to be able to formally hard and fast views on this in advance. I mean, I could be wrong, of course, we could be in a situation where the text is published tomorrow night or something, and then we'll have some time to formulate views on it, and

we can circulate it to the list and you know, collect these on the final text. But we'll have to see what happens.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. I'm not sure about having enough time to review documents. Having seen a previous document that was published late at night and that was to be discussed the next morning. I think earlier this week. But anyway, we wish Veni luck and you know, the hard work that is taken place at the United Nations, is there something that needs to be done, and I look forward to having more feedback as soon as we have the documents published.

I could just remind both Veni and you to forward the document, whatever can be forwarded at the time when it's published, so that we all have a good, quick source by which we can read and find out what's going on.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up on this, so I suggest that we might just then continue with planning for ICANN 55 in Marrakesh. Much more mundane task, since it might seem to be far away, but we have to prepare for this. And one thing that we can look out for is, I gather we will have two sessions again.

One which will be the public forum type session, and the other one being our own working groups session. I'm less concerned about the working group session since we usually focus on this a bit closer to the date itself, but as far as the public forum session is concerned, I was going to ask first Nigel whether the format was going to be, or the proposed format could be the same what has been asked for, because I

know that you've filed already, you had to file some paperwork within the ICANN planning process to get the session.

And then secondly I was going to open the floor for any early suggestions as to what we should be focusing on during that session. So first Nigel, what's the format then and what have you asked for on behalf of the working group so far?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Olivier, thank you very much. So essentially what we did, and we communicated on the list on this a bit, we've submitted a proposal for a high interest topic session on Internet governance in the same way as we had in Dublin and elsewhere. And this would be a 75 minute or a 90 minute session on Internet governance issue.

We put down as a sample agenda sort of looking back at the WSIS process, to see what lessons can be learned, to see what actions needed to be taken in terms of the ICANN involvement in Internet governance issues as a result of WSIS. And then looking forward to other issues during the year.

So I mean, that's just a placeholder and of course, on this call, or on subsequent calls, you know will decide what should take place in terms of the agenda. But we've asked for a horseshoe session, not horseshoe session. A horseshoe room format, an interactive session as we've had before. The timing is when we have it. It looks like the choices can be Monday, Wednesday, or Thursday.

So we haven't finally, I mean, it's obviously up to the group to decide what day it was. I think there was a preference for later in the week rather than on Monday. So that's what it is at the moment for the other session on the working group, there is a deadline also for putting in a proposal for that, which I think is in the next couple of week.

Ariel or Renate might be able to confirm the date for that one. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah thanks for this Nigel. Renate has typed the details over on the chat, that the scheduling system will be open from the 15th of December to the 18th of January. So we do have a little bit of time to work this one out. And I heard Marilyn Cade wanting to come in.

MARILYN CADE: I would ask us to do our best to schedule the public meeting when the GAC can participate. It really is important, and I believe Wednesday it's just not possible. So perhaps I could just ask for verification, you know, I know you might not like Monday as the date, but if that means the governments can participate, and then I would also suggest that, you know, I sort of like the idea that this would be taking stock in the way forward, implications of WSIS plus 10 for ICANN.

I'm saying something that justifies, are taking the community's time, but also focusing the community on the aspects that are agreed to in December that have significant implications. Just a couple of thoughts, and I'm going to go back on mute.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. I think you pretty much hit the nail on the head. Sounds like a very good topic to focus on, certainly as a follow up to what has been going, or what will have been going on until then. And the idea that we need to have the GAC involved is also something that I would personally completely support as well.

So Nigel, you're going to have to work this one out as far as the preferred day is concerned. I think that in the past, we have had our face to face session before the public session, but then we've also had the public session before the face to face session. And my feeling on it is that it doesn't really make any difference, as long as we actually get the GAC involved in the public session, and GAC representatives to come to the public session.

So we can always work around the scheduling of whether we want it early in the week, later on in the week, but this involvement of GAC representatives is particularly important, especially in light of what Gary Hunt has put in the chat and he mentions that there is also the GAC high level meeting to consider.

I believe that takes place, that would take place, is it on the Thursday or day minus one? I'm not sure. Gary, are you able to speak and to explain to us when that is?

Gary might be on listening only mode. But Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. Thank you. I'm sure Gary will be able to outline that, but the high level meeting, and this rather does affect the sessions on the Monday, so I'm no expert at meeting scheduling. So the Monday of this particular Marrakesh meeting is, has a traditional opening in the morning, you know, with the opening session. There is then a high level interest topic directly following the opening session.

And then the afternoon is the high level meeting, which is the ministers. So it's very similar to London, for those that were at London. The London session, I think, kicked off with a sort of lunch and then an afternoon session. So it means that if we, it means that we're somewhat limited in terms of our Internet governance session for the Monday.

Not ruling out entirely, it's not up to me at all. But certainly the, I've seen the agenda for the high level meeting, and the high level meeting goes from sort of midday right through until 6:30, and the GAC will obviously be at that high level meeting. So that's on the Monday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks for this Nigel. Let's just keep this in mind and I'm also a bit unaware of the overall structure of the meeting, since I know that this is the first time we now have an A meeting taking place, and I frankly haven't dug enough to find out whether this means different structure to the constituency day etc. etc.

But I notice Gary has put his hand up, so Gary you have the floor.

And we're unable to hear Gary at the moment, yup.

I can't hear him. He might be in listening mode only, at the moment. But okay, let's then go back. So Nigel, we'll just leave this in your hands, I guess. And so we know that we need to find a slot to be able to allow for GAC members to participate, and it would be interesting, of course, in light of the high level meeting that took place, that would have taken place earlier in the week.

And certainly topic of WSIS plus 10 and follow up is likely to be the hot topic then, with hopefully some good feedback. Gary Hunt, your hand is up again.

Gary, you might be muted, okay.

Now, seems that we have a few technical problems. Okay. I think that's good progress on this. Any other things? I guess we can go into any other business now.

For some reason, Gary is unable to get through. Muted, unmuted. Gary you can also ask for a dial out if you wish from the Adobe Connect, the means to do that and it will dial over to you to a fixed phone, this is what I'm using.

Anyway, ladies and gentlemen, it's the top of the hour. We are now into any other business.

I don't see anyone mentioning anything. Just a quick follow up. Last week I was in New York, and attended the number of sessions from the World Economic Forum on the future of the Internet initiative global challenge. And it was a [inaudible] working meeting. We spoke of a

number of things, none of which related directly to ICANN, although there was one on the...

That was coming to, related to ICANN, and that was governance on the Internet fragmentation discussion and the concerns about Internet fragmentation at all sorts of levels, and obviously fragmentation of the root was one of the topics that was touched on. There were discussions on digital trade, national and regional digital strategies, and various other discussions. The important point, I think to just point out is that on, I would say, all of the documents which have been both produced for consultation, but which will then be strengthened and then presented next year, the concept of multistakeholder present and is supported, and was supported by everyone around the table.

It wasn't a large meeting, but there were a number of people there, mostly, of course, private sector. Since you're well aware that the World Economic Forum is mostly supported by the private sector. So it was certainly for me, refreshing to see that multistakeholder processes are supported in that forum. And it's supported by industry in general. That's my feedback on this.

Is there any other, other business?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I see a little bit more going on in the chat at the moment, speaking about the high level government meeting. And that there was video out for ICANN 50 in London, so hopefully there will be a way, or I might be taken this in completely the wrong context.

Anyway, ladies and gentlemen, it's three minutes past the top of the hour. I thank you for being all on this call, and it has been, I think, very helpful. I certainly have learned a lot of things, and our best wishes to Veni on the floor in New York.

Next call, should we have one next week? If we wait a couple of weeks, then we're reaching the holiday season and that will probably be a little bit difficult. I would suggest that we could have a call towards the middle of next week, or middle to end of next week? That might provide us with a bit more chance to have a clearer view of what's happened at WSIS plus 10.

What's the overall schedule for WSIS? [CROSSTALK]

MARILYN CADE:

I would prefer we move it at least to the 21st. Because the committee on misuse of ICT or counter terrorism that I'm staying at for Thursday, so Friday would be the first possibility, but maybe Monday would be better to digest what's happened.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

We can certainly give it a few days for us to have a little breather. So on the week of the 21st of December, 21, 22, 23? Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, any time in those three days? Just before Christmas hits us. Are we okay with that?

MARILYN CADE: Monday is the only day I could do it, and I think people start traveling. So maybe, actually maybe we have a Doodle for the Friday the 19th and the Monday the 21st and see if it's possible.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's do that Marilyn, yeah. And you make me laugh when people start traveling, because I think people have never stopped traveling. But I'm traveling on Monday, but I know there are people who are traveling every single day. We seem to be, at this point of time at the moment. So let's do a Doodle yes, for the 19th, the 21st, and let's have just one, just in case for the 22nd as well to open up our three days like this.

Any other points before we close the call? Nigel, you were about to say something?

NIGEL HICKSON: No. Olivier, it has gone time. It has been a very good call. Thank you very much. I was going to say something on the OECD, but that can wait to the New Year or whatever, so just thank you again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Well thanks for this Nigel. Maybe we can table just an update on the OECD for the next call. And with this, I'd like to thank everyone and to adjourn the call. Thank you and have a very good upcoming weekend, although we're still a couple of days away from it. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]