OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance conference call on the 22nd of December 2015. Today we have quite a few Items to go through, but let's first start with a roll call please, Desiree.
DESIREE CABRERA:	Okay. In the room I see Bill Drake, Claire – unfortunately I don't know your last name – Oksana Prykhodko and Marilyn Cade. From staff we've got myself and Veni Markovski. Nigel Hickson has just arrived. For the Chairs I've got Olivier Crépin-Leblond and Rafik Dammak.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Fantastic. Thank you very much. Have we missed anyone in the roll call? I'm not hearing anybody shout their name out. That was the first thing. The roll call is complete. The Agenda at the moment will start with the WSIS+10 review, then the ICANN 55, then the OACD ministerial on the Internet economy, then an update from the Wuzhen Conference, and finally AOB. In discussion with Marilyn Cade a moment ago, she proposed that we move the update on the Wuzhen Conference to the beginning, so immediately after the review of Action Items – so as Agenda Item #3.
	Are there any objections, or are we all okay with this? Seeing no response, I take it that this is fine. The Agenda is adopted with Item #6, moved to between #2 and #3. Therefore our next thing is to review the Action Items. The only Action Item that was in the list was for Veni and

Nigel to circulate the WSIS+10 papers and drafts as they emerged over the next few days, and that of course has been completed.

No other Action Items than that, which means we can now move to immediately Agenda Item #3, and that's the update on the Wuzhen Conference. You will have noticed an email that I forwarded to the mailing list. There has been an Internet governance conference. It's the second year that the Chinese Government is running this conference, and ICANN, it appears – I'm not sure whether it's ICANN that has sent people to that conference, basically Fadi and a number of Board Members, or perhaps they've gone under their own accord, and that's one thing I'm not aware of.

But for this I gather maybe we can start with Nigel Hickson? He'll probably know a little bit more and provide us with the facts of how Board Members and the ICANN CEO ended up in Wuzhen. I'm not even sure I'm saying it correctly.

NIGEL HICKSON: Good evening. Probably Bill Drake is much more expert than I am on this conference. Actually, as you rightly say, Olivier, it's the second year that the Chinese boosted the Internet governance conference. This particular year the conference moved. It was going to be in November, and it was moved to December to allow it to coincide with another event taking place that the President of China was also speaking at. So it allowed a fairly high-browed opening session to this conference, with both the President of China and the Russian Prime Minister.

It was a conference that people were invited to. A number of stakeholders attended. We had an Internet collaboration call earlier, which is our call that we do in the technical community. Mike Nelson reported on the conference. He attended. George Sadowsky went as well, and Fadi went with a couple of Members of the ICANN staff from the Singapore office. Yes, they went as ICANN. I suppose people can go in a personal capacity, but the ICANN Board and the ICANN participants went as ICANN.

I think there were a number of other governments represented and a number of other associations – the IEEE certainly was represented there. I think people have seen the links that have been provided with the statement that was made, the initiative, the Wuzhen Initiative, et cetera. I don't think I need to go over the details of that, but clearly a very well attended event: 120 countries, 2,000+ people, so a fair event, and as I understand the idea is to make it an annual event.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this update, Nigel. I now open the floor for comments and questions on this topic.

MARILYN CADE: Yes, it's Marilyn. I do have comments and questions. The statements that were attributed to the CEO of ICANN do not appear to me to be approved by the ICANN Board. I know people attend in their personal capacity. There seemed to be a statement from the ICANN CEO in his official capacity, and I'd like to understand where the endorsement for that came from.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for that question. Is Nigel or anyone on the call able to respond to this?

NIGEL HICKSON: It's not for me to comment really. As I say, Fadi and other staff and Board Members attended as ICANN in the conference, and whether they cleared their statements with the Board in advance, I don't know. I don't think it's usual practice to clear the conference speeches with the Board, but that's not something that I'm privy to. Clearly if there's any statements that are made in relation to this then we'll make sure that they're immediately circulated. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Nigel for this. I did notice that Bill Drake put his hand up briefly.

BILL DRAKE: Well, I understand the concern that Marilyn is expressing. Just as a general matter, obviously it's never been the expectation that there would be a micro-management of the ways in which people representing ICANN engage in these things. At the same time, we've spent so much time talking about the hope was that one way this group could be useful would be to be a bridge between the organizational leadership and staff on the one hand, and the community on the other hand, with regard to Internet governance events, issues, representations, et cetera.

EN

Here you have a meeting that, in my mind, is really quite sensitive, because the Chinese are making a real play to impact the shape of global Internet governance dialogues, and to legitimize certain approaches. Of course they have every right to do so as a sovereign state. But because they are quite an important player in the environment, one would think that in approaching these things there would be a developed strategic idea about how this is being approached and what kind of messaging to convey and all that, and that this could have included some interfacing with the community.

As far as I know, there was none. So it's not surprising then that you'd have people expressing concerns about what was signed onto and on what basis people were operating there, et cetera. I would only request if Nigel, if you were there or not, but if somebody who was there could at least maybe provide some kind a report or something from our standpoint, collectively, that would be useful. It would have been good to do it before the meeting rather than after, but nevertheless, it's never too late.

I think the whole process was conducted in a very stage-managed way, which is how the first one was done. For a while they were saying that attending the meeting meant agreeing to the outcome documents, and there were objections made to that, and they dialed back on that a bit, but still clearly the outputs that came out were generated entirely by the host. Most governments from the OECD countries did not send high-level representation. You saw the handful of heads of state that were there.

So it just seems like this could have been better in the way it's been done, and okay, it's behind it, but let's learn from it and at a minimum try to get some kind of stock-taking going, because this is going to be an ongoing process. They're going to do this every year. Fadi's Co Chair of the preparatory or the advisory group, and various other people that folks know are engaged. I think interfacing with this process is important. Let us hope that something can be done to report out, and then plan going forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Bill for this. I'm quite eager to get moving in our Agenda, which is so packed, but I do realize the sensitivity of ths topic. Are there any other comments from the floor or any response from Nigel, from staff?

NIGEL HICKSON: Very simply, thank you Bill, it sounds very sensible what you said. I certainly wasn't there. I think the relationship that we've established on this group should have facilitated the fact that we would have circulated some information in advance about this. I was not privy to this, which is not an excuse, but certainly we ought to think about how we do it next time, and certainly if there is a report, which I hope there will be, then we'll certainly circulate it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Nigel. I certainly also have rather strong concerns about the way this has been done. This appears to be another Net Mundial all

over again. The concern I have specifically has been very well expressed by Bill in that whilst the intentions of the Brazilians might have been to accept multistakeholder systems in one way, whilst playing on both panels, China has been very clear on its supports.

Certainly the document that's come out of this conference, and the added cherry on the cake appears to point out that Fadi is going to lead this initiative – and I'm not quite sure if I got this right or not – with absolutely no mention of multistakeholder governance and a strong government-led multilateral governance component, is an absolute concern. I'm not really sure whether it might well be that the group that ended up in China got somehow stuck in this position. They were conned. I don't have other ways to say it. No, let's not use "conned". They were trapped somehow, and weren't quite sure what to do.

I find it very concerning that this group here, which is meant to be providing a good bride between the community and the Board and staff was not used in advance. We have people who are based in China, we have a lot of experts in Internet governance out there that might have been able to provide further information before the group went there, and I'm just baffled as to why this has not taken place. Anyway, that's the bottom line. Any other responses?

Then I think we have to move on, because we've already spent a good ten minutes on this. I don't see any hands up. Marilyn, are you still on the call? Marilyn appears to have dropped off as well. I think then we can move on. As an Action Item, let's record that Nigel Hickson will come back to the Working Group with… I guess there will be a report on

this, and we can discuss it in our next call. I note that Greg said here, "Fadi is trying to define post-ICANN Fadi."

I certainly hope that's not the case, because that would be in direct conflict with his current position. This might not be what we want. Nigel, you're okay with coming back to it?

NIGEL HICKSON: Indeed. Of course. I think I'll also recirculate the links. I think Bill had already done so, but I'll do so after the call. It sets out the initiative statement and also the membership of this initiative steering committee, which is organizing the next conference.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Nigel. Let's now go to Agenda Item #3. It's the WSIS+10 review. You have all seen regular updates on the mailing list. Thanks to both Veni and Nigel. Thank you gentlemen for having kept us up-to-date with the latest information. We've also had some forwards from other mailing lists that have treated the matter. What matters is the outcome. What is the outcome of all of this hubbub? I'll hand the floor over to either Veni or Nigel, or whoever else wishes to speak to this?

VENI MARKOVSKI: First of all, thank you to everyone who's been participating in the WSIS. When you were saying thank you for the information, I was thinking, "Welcome, come back in ten years again." But the reality is that the WSIS+10 outcome document is a very good document on the

perspective of the global Internet community, and somehow a smaller group as well. However, it does not mean this is an end to the process. The WSIS process was started almost ten years go and ended up in 2003 and 2005 as an ongoing process. It's one of those topics that seems will never end.

The outcome document you have seen has a lot of items related to the development of the Internet Society, what's important in our environment. A couple of points. First, while the Tunis Agenda was talking about international management of the Internet, that it should be multilateral, transparent and democratic, this one talks about just management – the word "international" is removed, and it says that it should be multistakeholder, multilateral, transparent and democratic.

These are the two big changes. When I say big, I mean that the words in this document matter a lot at the UN, so having the words multilateral and multistakeholder in the same sentence is a big deal. Now,   the second big deal is that's the only place that you see the word "multilateral". Everywhere else in the document they're talking about multistakeholder. That's also something that is worth noticing.

The other thing which may be of interest – and by the way, I think "multistakeholder" is mentioned eight times in the whole document. I saw somewhere in the list a two-digit number, but it's not a two-digit number. The other important issue from the final document is that the member states couldn't really figure out what to do with enhanced cooperation, so they decided to continue with a creation of a Working Group to the CSTD, and that will have to be formed by mid next year, by July 2016.

The first meeting of the CSTD is in January in Budapest. My guess is they will try to have the same Chair of the CSTD Working Group, which is the Hungarian representative, [unclear 00:21:54]. Some of you may have seen him in the last few years around CSTD, IGF, et cetera. The next thing about IGF is the continuation of the IGF, ten years. That was unanimous. So that was good.

The next thing which some of the folks on the call might be really interested in is there are some Items in the text talking about human rights. There is a whole chapter, but also one of the recognition is that human rights online should not be [separated 00:22:39] from the human rights offline. That was one of the things that was… The whole chapter of human rights was very difficult to negotiate, as well as the one on cyber security, or as it's called "building confidence and security in the use of ICT".

I spent a lot of time at the UN in the last six months, and I have to tell you that the most difficult job was to stay quiet, because some of the conversations in the rooms were clearly based on lack of enough knowledge about the way the Internet is working. The slogan we used was very short and very to-the-point that WSIS is not about ICANN. That's why we were not driving the attention towards ICANN, but at the end of the day the bilateral meetings and the conversations that we had in the hallways ended up in our document, which is widely recognized by every party as a successful document.

The whole meeting ended with a general assembly. [unclear 00:24:07] on behalf of ICANN. We also had ISOC and some civil society organizations. We had Avri Doria speaking also. It was a great moment

of showing respect to the other organizations. I'm happy to report that we publicly, in terms of the GA, think ISOC, the regional Internet registries, the broader Internet community, and some of the staff who were not mentioned in other speeches – mainly as UN [unclear 00:24:45] who actually spent [unclear]…

Can you hear me? People were spending 20+ hours every day working on this document. That's a five-minute cover of the WSIS+10 review. One more item is it's important to note that the countries that were very active were India… Somebody is talking. The countries that were worth noting, there's participation in the negotiations of [unclear 00:25:33], India, China, Russia, the European Union, obviously US, but also Canada and Australia, Cuba and Ecuador. I'm speaking from memory. I may have missed a couple of them.

But these were the ones that were really active and contributed to the discussions. Maybe I forgot China, but they were also very active, and G77 as well. The group countries were really strong, like the European Union and G77. They were great negotiators. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Veni. I have a quick question, and waiting of course, having opened the floor, if anyone else has questions. I have a question on the process and how many changes were needed to the document. Because before the last week started there was a starting draft that had been put together based on previous negotiations. How much of the draft was changed during that week? Was there that much? Because

having seen the prior document and the document there, I didn't see that many differences.

VENI MARKOVSKI: The difference is actually in the process of negotiations. Sometimes it might be a word in a paragraph. There was a difference in the number of paragraphs, if you count the paragraph numbers, but there was also a lot of negotiations on concrete work in the text. I don't remember now whether there was the facility, but there were some interim draft texts with square brackets and different coloring. It looked really messy before the final draft was published. Then the final draft one accepted, there was also one or two more edits because of editorial minor edits. It was a work in progress, until almost the very last moment.

But the real negotiation text was agreed on Saturday early morning. So we had the whole Sunday to get the text, and once it was published very late in the evening then the next edit was done, I think, on Monday. The interim text… It's impossible even to understand what the negotiations were. Some of them would say which countries suggested what, but then everything is in square brackets, so it was all discussion until the very last moment. The whole thing was decided in a really small group of countries, which had key items to negotiate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Veni. I don't see any other hands up at the moment. The other question I had was what the next steps are from here. First noting there was a question from Oksana Prykhodko on the chat asking whether this was a binding document. Nigel very kindly replied and said

it's a UN resolution, so it has no legal force, and therefore no implementation or requirement to implement, per se. But where do we go from here? What's happening next?

VENI MARKOVSKI: Next of course is the fact that at the UN every year there will be negotiations of different IP-related and Internet-related resolutions. That means we'll be watching what's happening there, and we'll see how it develops. Of course, in February we also have the ITU Council Working Group, which is meeting in Geneva, which will be deciding what to do with regards to [unclear 00:30:07] in the implementation of the WSIS+10. The ITU is mentioned several times, and UNESCO as well. They will continue with the WSIS Forum in the next ten years, and the IGF will continue. So there will be a lot of discussions taking place.

Also, one thing to remember is the fact that the government has agreed on the language in New York doesn't mean that they don't have the right to deal with their own national policies. So we'll be watching what's happening, and what Oksana is asking could be that whilst it's not a binding document, there is a way to use this document to point to the authorities in every country, "This is how the global development of the Information Society is envisioned in New York."

So that's my take of it. We'll know more sometime in the beginning of January once people start getting back from vacation at the UN, and seeing what the agenda will be there. Maybe Nigel can add a couple of lines to that. Oksana, the discussion in Geneva is mid-February.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Veni. I have a question, but I see Bill has had his hand up, so let's hand the floor to Bill Drake.

BILL DRAKE: Hi. Just a couple of comments. While it's true that the WSIS is legally non-binding, I wouldn't dismiss its significance in terms of how it frames agendas and institutionalizes activities, both in the UN system and to some extent at the regional and national level as well. Certainly a lot of the UN agencies that are touching these issues will now go off and follow up on work programs and things like that, that they will cite as being informed by, legitimated by, called for by what was on here, et cetera.

So the document has to be viewed in the context of an ongoing stream of positionings and activities and things like that. So I think it is significant. But at the same time I think it's also interesting that at the same time that this was going on in New York and the thrust of the discussions and the outcome of the document moved in the direction that we find congenial. Some actors that have different preferences were organizing other things at the same time that they could control.

I think what you could start to see here, if you're not already seeing it, is something that's parallel to what's already happened in international trade, where the efforts to do everything on a broad, global, multi-lateral basis have, to a large extent, the scope within which one can reach agreements like that has narrowed. If you look at what just came out of the WTO Meeting in Nairobi, they managed to do some stuff in

agriculture, but a lot of other stuff really now has moved into plurilateral, regional, bilateral deals, et cetera.

I think in Internet governance the reality is that there simply is not the possibility of a global agreement on principles, or the big things that people talk about – the need for a security treaty or things like that. So [unclear 00:34:00] like-minded. You're going to see actors going off and pushing particular agendas. We see right now, post-WSIS, both Russia and China positioning and collaborating together around the notions of digital sovereignty, of national Internet segments – making the Internet more responsive to territorial jurisdiction and control in the ways that traditional telecommunication arrangements historically work.

I think that's an interesting thing, and I think that's going to be going on for a while. It's something we might want to consider talking about. If we want to do something different and new when we get to talking about the Internet governance session, this could be an element of it. then at the same time you might also think about looking forward to May, if we want to do something again at the WSIS Forum in Geneva. We could propose a workshop again like we did last time.

We had a quite good turnout last time, I thought. I thought it was quite useful to have the conversation that we did about the IANA transition in front of 100 ITU-related people. I'm putting on the Agenda that A) we should keep an eye on what's happening at this broad, multi-lateral level, because I think it ripple-effects in a lot of ways, but B) there will be a lot of activity that moves out of that kind of context, and we have to be prepared to engage it, even if those processes, as per Wuzhen, are

not transparent, inclusive, and so on, which is more difficult and more challenging.

But we should think about how the community might be engaged there. I hope that made sense. I'm a little tired.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Bill. That absolutely made sense. I don't see any other hands. The point that you made with regards to those two parallel tracks taking place is particularly interesting. Certainly the thing I've seen with… it just seems to be forum shopping in some way. It's like if you don't get the answers that you want to get somewhere then you might as well start a different parallel track and see if we can get those answers where you are. Let's have Nigel next.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much. Just to really be very brief and just to touch on what was being discussed before, I've got so many windows open I keep losing my paragraphs, but in terms of next steps, as Veni has said, the resolution sets out what's going to happen. What's going to happen is very similar to what's been happening in the past. Every year the CSTD – this is the committee on science and technology development – works on the so-called WSIS resolution, which it then passes through ECOSOC and goes to the second committee.

Then, as Veni said, it's discussed as a resolution on ICT for development, which includes various paragraphs on WSIS. This is a yearly exercise, and that continues. It's spelt out in paragraph 71 to 77 in the resolution. In

addition to that, we have the annual WSIS Forum, which doesn't have a status. It's welcomed in the resolution, but the WSIS Forum that's hosted by the ITU but also in cooperation with a number of other agencies such as UNCTAD and UNICEF and WHO.

The various agencies come along and talk about the action lines that they're responsible for. As Bill said, that's the forum that last year we did a side event at, and no doubt that could be on the agenda again, depending on what people think. In addition to that, as Veni has mentioned, specifically this year the CSTD is asked in the resolution to set up a Working Group on enhanced cooperation, which has to be multistakeholder, so we'd hope to have representation on that. In the past, Marilyn was on that Working Group, and so was ICANN. That Working Group went into abeyance, but it's clearly going to be reactivated in some guise at the CSTD plenary in May. I'll stop there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for that Nigel. I was going to touch on the CSTD re-enabling of that Working Group. That's good. I think we need to move on, but what I was going to suggest then is for Bill to send his suggestion regarding the WSIS Forum to the mailing list, so we can have a wider audience for this. I think it would be an excellent idea. I agree with Bill that it was a real success. We had quite a few people in the room at the time. Perhaps it was to do with the topic, but perhaps at the same time there could be an interest in a follow up regarding that topic, or other topics.

I would suggest that others in the Working Group would make their suggestions on the mailing list on this. Nigel, just a quick question regarding the process to be able to stage an event or a side event at WSIS forum – is this something that you will be handling? There must be deadlines and so on for this.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, I'd be very happy to try and facilitate it. ICANN are partners again of ITU at the WSIS Forum. It means we cooperate together and discuss things from time to time, so we can certainly see if we can have a… I can't see there being a problem, but yes, we can investigate that once some ideas are being exchanged on the list or whatever. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's great Nigel. Thank you. I note that Veni has also put a link to the ITU schedule that will provide us with some details on this. Let's move on then and go to Agenda Item #4 – ICANN 55 high-level meeting and Internet governance session. A few things to first learn about. What is the high-level meeting about? Who will be there? We've heard earlier the possibility of this Working Group meeting with some participants of the high-level meeting. I'm not sure who can provide us with the update on this. Is it Nigel again?

NIGEL HICKSON: I wouldn't say I'm an expert necessarily on this. The high-level meeting, what generally takes place is that annually at one of the three ICANN Meetings in a year we try and encourage the host to hold a high-level

meeting. The last one took place in London. This one is in Marrakech, as you rightly point out. It's a meeting hosted by Morocco, in this case. It will take place on the Monday afternoon. There will be a traditional opening on the Monday morning, and in the afternoon there will be this high-level meeting, which is completely open to all participants.

If you recall, in London there were a number of speeches and panel sessions. I understand that's the idea of the session in Marrakech on the Monday afternoon.   There will be panel sessions at which various ministers are asked to speak; GAC Members, et cetera, and various discussions. I can certainly endeavor to circulate an agenda when one is developed. I think there are drat agendas, but I'm just not sure what stage it's at. Essentially it's something that's arranged between the host, Morocco and the GAC Chair Thomas Schneider, with obviously ICANN doing some of the legwork.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Nigel. The question I guess comes as to whether this Working Group would be interested in doing something, or relating somehow to the discussions that will be held there. Are there any thoughts or suggestions on this call about this? One step would be to actually get in touch with the GAC Chair and find out from the GAC Chair what the program is about. As Bill said, we need more information.

 I'm not sure, having actually spoken to the GAC Chair informally a few weeks ago, that there is so much cast in stone yet. It's a pipeline of things, and certainly the GAC at the moment is still very heavily involved with the ICANN accountability and IANA stewardship process. So that's

something that's maybe coming up next. Maybe in January one could get in touch with the GAC Chair and find out what's going on; a little bit more information. Perhaps as an Action item for the Co Chairs of this Working Group is to get in touch with the GAC Chair in January and ask for more information about the high-level meeting.

When it comes down to the Internet governance public session, I have a feeling we haven't got very much time to discuss this right now. Are there any additional suggestions from our last call, or since our last call? Has anyone given any thought on what we'd like to touch on in the Internet governance session? That's a good point, Bill: "What was said on the last call." I don't think very much was said on the Internet governance session. We looked at the format and we were going to keep the format the same.

As far as the actual dates of the session were concerned, we were going to make sure that it was not going to clash with any of the GAC involvements, and we needed to find out a little bit more about the overall structure of the meeting, since this is the first time we are now in a tight A Meeting. It could be slightly different in its scheduling than the meetings we've been used to so far, where the first day is the opening session and the high-interest topics, and then the second day is Constituency Day and the third day is something else, et cetera. We might need a bit more information on that too. Bill Drake, you have the floor.

BILL DRAKE: Okay. I'm looking at the schedule and I see that the Internet governance session is on Thursday from 9:00 until 10:15. I assume that's the public Internet governance session, because it's in the ATLAS room – before an IANA transition session, and before the Public Forum. We will have a shortened session this time – [55/65 minutes 00:47:47] – which means the chairing has to be concise, the number of people who are serving conversation-starting roles needs to be fairly limited, and we need to at this point have a different substantive focus than we've been having for a while.

During 2015 we spent a lot of time going over WSIS+10, over and over, and I couldn't tell, aside from the usual suspects – the Internet governance mavens that we all know and see every month at different meetings around the world – I couldn't really tell how much we were actually engaging the audience. I think we might want to think about doing something that's a little bit more provocative and a little bit more outside the bounds of what we've been doing before.

I would suggest thinking about some of the issues I mentioned previously. This ties in with Wuzhen as a process, but it's also the substantive point that I've raised in a couple of email messages about the growing desire of some governments to view the Internet as something that needs to be amended or adapted to territoriality. What that might mean – and going forward the ICANN community can interface with that issue – as you know, Olivier, I've been doing this big project on Internet fragmentation for the WEF, and we'll be putting out a paper [unclear] on that.

There will be a bunch of other activity that's related, coming from the Russian and the Chinese sides. So that's one topic that we might consider teeing up as something for the ICANN community to think about. Because I think it does tie in with a lot of issues related to the DNS and IP addressing as well. So that was just a general point. The other thing is to maybe look forward to the OECD Ministerial, which will be focused on the notion of an open Internet, which is the obverse of a fragmented net.

I think the thematic spin could be from Wuzhen to Mexico – like the Marrakech Meeting will be midway between the Wuzhen Meeting and the OECD Ministerial Meeting, which should be having a very different flavor. Perhaps that's a way of framing that could be interesting to people. Anyway, I'll just stop there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Bill. Bill, I have a question: how would you focus this so that it's actually within the bounds of the ICANN Mission? The wider Internet governance issues are fine, but it has to do with the overall mission of ICANN and how it affects ICANN one way or another.

BILL DRAKE: As I understand ICANN's Mission, it's ensuring a stable, integrated Internet based on the [unclear 00:52:03] maintained under the existing arrangements, and that the possibilities of that being toyed with and altered in significant ways does have implications for ICANN. It has implications for the DNS and it has implications for how numbers are done, as proposals change the way numbers are allocated, and there are

questions about the interplay between the narrow remit of ICANN and the context within it is nested.

Personally, I think these questions are of enough relevance to the ICANN community that connecting the dots between Wuzhen and Mexico at least is plausible as a topic to talk about in our [unclear 00:53:03] as any other topic I can imagine. I think if we do another thing on WSIS+10 or something like that, we're going to all fall asleep. I'll stop there. As Peter says, we'll thrash this out online.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Bill. It's a good start, so thanks for this. As Peter said, let's discuss the agenda ideas online. I quite like your suggestions here. I don't see any hands up. Let's go to #5, because you have touched on this – the OECD Ministerial on the Internet economy. Can we have a five-minute rundown of what this wil consist of?

NIGEL HICKSON: I'll be very brief, because we can certainly touch on this again. As was mentioned earlier, from time to time the OECD have ministerials on ICT and economic issues. Notably there's been two. In 1998 in Ottawa there was as ministerial on the Internet economy, and then in Seoul in 2008 there was a ministerial on Internet issues. Now we are in 2016 and we're having a ministerial on the Internet economy. The actual title of the ministerial is "Meeting the policy challenges of tomorrow's digital economy" and it's broken down into a number of forums that are looking at such issues of economic and social benefit.

There's the Internet openness, which I think should be "an open Internet", consumer trust and market growth, stimulating digital innovation across the economy, improving networks and services through conversion, the Internet of things, new markets and new jobs in the digital economy. I'll put the draft agenda on a link so you can see it. This is a ministerial which will be presided by by the President of Mexico. It's taking place in Cancun between the 21st and the 23rd of June. ICANN's involvement is through the technical community.

In 2008 in Seoul OECD set up a technical community, and also a civil society representation at their meetings, and also a business representation. When we attend these OECD meetings – and this ministerial is being organized by the Committee on Economic Development – ICANN are part of the technical community and take part in these meetings. Therefore we are involved, along with ISOC, in providing input into the OECD on potential speakers for sessions and issues like that. Of course, the governments themselves have the controlling hand on this.

It all goes through the OECD Council, which is made up of the 32 governments or whatever. In addition, on the first day of the ministerial – so the ministerial is three days – or on day zero, as you would term it, the technical community, civil society and the business community will stage various events. The technical community will be having sessions on things like the Internet of things. We're working up an agenda for that, which I can also circulate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Nigel. Bill indeed has put the agenda on the AC chat. That's fine. Any other comments on this or anything to add from anyone in the room? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I note that it is the top of the hour, so we probably need to end this conference. It's in Any Other Business now that we are in. I was going to add two things in AOB: first, a repeat of the Action Items for Desiree to make note of. The first one I've recorded is for Nigel Hickson to come back to the CCWG on Internet Governance with details of the report on the Wuzhen Conference.

Bill, please step n to let me know if I'm saying this wrong. It's "Wuzhen", isn't it? I have no idea. That was one. The second Action Item is for Bill Drake to make his suggestions on the mailing list about having a session at the WSIS Forum. So Bill, if you could please email the list, that would be great. We can then follow up by email. Have I missed any other Action Items? Desiree, did you record anything else than these two?

DESIREE CABRERA: I also have the Co Chairs talking to the GAC Chair in January?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct, yes, fantastic. Yes please. That would have a January timeline, because I'm well aware that Thomas Shneider is particularly busy at the moment, so January timeline – at some point in January the Co Chairs would be getting in touch with the GAC, regarding the high-level meeting in Marrakech. The question then is when do we want our next call? I gather we have the holiday period and then some time in January we should start our work again. Are there any preferences? I would say

either the week of the 4th of January, or the week of the 11th of January for us to have our first call of the year.

It really depends on how people are taking holidays. I note Bill Drake is putting the week of the 11th, so I don't think that there is anything happening specifically before. I know that the WEF is taking place in the fourth week of January, the World Economic Forum, in Davos – the week starting the 18th. So maybe we can have the call on the week starting the 11th? Perhaps then… 11th and 3rd, yes. Let's have a call for the week starting the 11th, and Desiree, if you can send a Doodle out with the usual timing? I don't know, some time in the week, so either Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday.

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, if I just may – those days are the CSTD inter-sessional – not that that is that relevant – but if we have the call on, say, the Thursday, then we could at least report on what's happened at that meeting. That meeting is on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Nigel. I was hoping for such an intervention. I wasn't aware of the CSTD. Maybe we need to also update that calendar. Let's add an additional Action Item, which is to update the calendar of event, which I know Marilyn Cade has been working on with Alex Dans. We probably need an update on that as well for 2016. So the Doodle would be for the 14th of January. Doodle several timings. Excellent.

Thanks very much for this everyone. We're only four minutes behind the official end time of this call. It's been very informative, and I'd like to wish you a happy holiday and a happy New Year. Have a good break, and see you all next year for another wonderful year of Internet governance in the ICANN world. Thank you. Goodbye everyone.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]