OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. I'm chairing today's call for the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance on the 29th of January 2016. The time is 16:04 UTC. Let's start with a roll call, Desiree, please.

DESIREE CABRERA: In the room we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Alan Greenberg, Gangesh Varma, Greg Shatan, Jim Prendergast, Mathew Shears Bill Drake has just come in. From staff we have Veni Markovski and myself, Desiree Cabrera.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Desiree. Have we missed anybody in the roll call? I don't hear anybody shouting out their names, so the roll call is complete. Today's Agenda is going to be rather shorter than usual, unless somebody has to add something in AOB. We'll start with the follow-up to the proposal for the WSIS Forum that we talked about during our last call. After that we'll have a discussion on the GAC Public Safety Session and the EURODIG Preparation – two meetings that took place in Brussels earlier this week.

Are there any additional orders of business or topics that anyone would like to add to this Agenda? Going once, going twice, seeing no hands and hearing no one, I gather the Agenda is adopted. Our next point is Agenda Item #2 – our AIs last week. There were two. One was to link

both the ICANN timeline from Marilyn Cade on the Wiki. Desiree, I think you've updated some of the links on the Wiki, have you?

DESIREE CABRERA: Yes. They're on the main page of the timeline.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. If you go over to the CCWG's main Wiki page, you'll be able to link up to both of these timelines. We did have some time last week to look through these. We probably will be going through these in the future again so as to focus our work on specific points. Are there any questions or additions to this? Then the second AI was to schedule a call regarding the WSIS proposal, prior to this current call, and indeed that's what's happened, and this is why we're having the next Agenda Item as being a preparation for this proposal.

I see in the chat that Bill Drake has said, "I'm still getting set up. Are we not going to talk about the Internet Governance Public Session in a month?" Yes, since we do have some time, we can have that just before AOB. Let's move on then. We have a link in the Agenda to the CCWG Internet governance proposals for the WSIS Forum. For those who might not be aware, the WSIS Forum is a conference that takes place in Geneva in a few months from now.

It's convened by several UN agencies, including the ITU and others. Last year we had a session that we held over there and that talked about IANA stewardship transition and the process used for IANA stewardship transition. This year, we discussed during our last call whether we

should have something, and on Monday there was a call of the sub-group that put something together and thought, "This is probably the right path forward." We had several different topics that we could have dealt with, but the one that seemed to have gathered the most interest was the one about CCWG accountability.

So effectively, the ICANN accountability process, the process itself is also going into the topic itself, so explaining what the different proposals are. Following up on this, I sent an email, and there was an AI on that call. I sent an email to the Co Chairs of the CCWG on Accountability, and that email you've received a copy of in your mailbox. It sets out a little bit more, and in a more structured manner, what we were looking at doing. That's all effectively there.

Then Nigel Hickson, who has joined the call now, has sent a note not to all of us, but he's sent it to me and we were going to share it on the call – it's a note that we're basically going to file with the Workshop proposal. The problem is I can't see it on my screen. Desiree, have you linked it to the Agenda?

DESIREE CABRERA: Let me add it to the room right now. It's so big.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I did ask that we needed that. That was the main discussion today, to look at whether having read all the emails we're all okay with this – if there are any objections or anything we should amend. Then there's the Workshop proposal text. This is the proposed Workshop proposal text.

The reason we're having to do this all so quickly is because our deadline is tomorrow, so thankfully the group managed to come together quickly and come up with a proposal.

Nigel has been very fast as well in taking the overall discussion and coming up with a proposal there. Shall I hand the floor over to Nigel for him to take us through this? Then we can have a good discussion on this. It's the 6th of May. Thanks Bill, for the date of the WSIS Forum. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much. Good afternoon. I'm not on the screen so I can't see the proposal, but I know what it says. Really I've put together the ideas that were expressed during the call and on the very helpful email exchanges. Essentially I think we don't need too much more than this. We don't need to put in names at this stage, but of course it's open to suggestions on how it should be formatted or whatever. Also, when I submitted it to the ITU I can respect the time requirement.

I don't know whether, Olivier, you've discussed that, but I know that some people wanted it on one day or the other. I'm not sure how much flexibility there is, but we could at least ask for that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Nigel. The floor is open now. I personally don't have any specific points regarding the timing, because I'm not too aware of the ins and outs of the WSIS Forum. But others might have some

EN

specific thoughts on this. The floor is open now. It seems that everything is fine with this then.

BILL DRAKE: I'm speaking into a new speaker that I bought. This is the first time, so I hope this sounds good. I personally am – unfortunately it's late in the afternoon on Friday and I'm very maxed out, so I don't really have the bandwidth to work-craft right now. I have to go out pretty soon, and the thing is due tomorrow. We can send this in as a placeholder, but I suspect that when we go back later on and add names, we might want to have a description that is a little less process-oriented and a little bit more grabby and sexy to an audience that doesn't live and breathe ICANN.

What's fundamentally at stake here in the accountability process is that the US Government is relinquishing its stewardship role, ICANN is going to be more independent, who's it going to be accountability to? How will accountability work in a global multistakeholder setting? The community has worked to define a model… Blah blah blah, the challenges have included X and Y… Something that gives some sense of the stakes, the complexity and why this is important to come to, I think might be more helpful than if we just say, "We're going to talk about how we did something that we haven't defined very much."

Right now we're saying, "It was a big undertaking and there was face-to-face and virtual dialogue, and a final recommendation was made." But to a lot of people who want [unclear 00:11:44] WSIS… [unclear]. I'm just saying it might not be entirely obvious to people what we proposed

to talk about and why it's important. So when we circle back to this later on, we could perhaps tweak the language a little bit to add a bit of that flavor in. That's all I'm suggesting.

I think it's fine for now as a placeholder, and I can't imagine the ITU telling the ICANN community that it can't have thought. So we'll have time to work on it later. I was just expressing a general concern that going forward we might want to do that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Bill. I think you're entirely correct. This really is a placeholder to describe the overall theme. Obviously something that's going to be public-facing and will go on the website itself will need to have more of an enticing part, and hopefully by then we will know a little bit more on the overall success of this whole mission. I just wanted to add, before I pass the floor over to Mathew Shears that I did get a response from both Thomas Rickert and from Mathieu Weill and also from Leon Sanchez. Leon wouldn't be able to make it because he's obviously pretty far away, but Mathieu Weill and Thomas Rickert both replied very positively and said they'd be happy to take part in this. That's the kind of feedback. Mathew Shears, you're next.

MATHEW SHEARS: I completely agree with Bill. To put this crudely or bluntly, I think we've now lived through two processes that are effectively multistakeholderism in action. I would like to see this session reinforce that model. There's a lot of talk in the WSIS resolutions from December

that talk about the multistakeholder model and the value and everything else. Let's talk about that. Let's talk about the value of that model, how it worked, and I think we can talk a little bit about how it didn't work and what are the lessons learnt.

This is an important endeavor from that perspective, because at the end of the day this is one of the few multistakeholder processes that actually does deliver policy decisions – both in the ICANN process itself. But we're actually also delivering changes to a governance of an organization, and that's fundamentally changing and delivering on very concrete actions that are being implemented and have long-term consequences. I think we need to play that up. I would really like to see us talking about what we've learnt and how those lessons can be used in other fora. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Mathew. I note that Bill said we did a very similar thing with IANA last time. I gather the big difference between this process and the IANA stewardship transition process is that one, we're much further down the line, so we have learnt even further lessons than when we were on this a year ago, but also I'd imagine that the actual proposal itself is quite novel. Having an organization to be accountable to itself and its stakeholders and a balance of stakeholder involvement, et cetera – I think it's quite novel in two ways; how we've reached that point, and what point we are in.

So I think, as Bill said, we might wish to do less on the history, more on where we are. Basically I think we will have more time, in any case,

because last year there was also the overall discussion on how things were done in the IETF and how things were done in the RIRs, whilst in here we really are looking primarily at ICANN accountability. Whilst I do understand that it's really accountability not only to the direct ICANN stakeholders, but also accountability to the rest of the world, maybe they're some of the questions that will be asked, and some of the tough questions that we'd have to answer.

I guess this is just a placeholder to start with. We're probably going to have to develop this a little further, and as Bill said, we'll definitely have to have a better spiel when this goes up on the web page of the WSIS Forum. But until then, I also believe that that probably is good enough for our purposes, and I don't see anyone here speaking against the idea of bringing that topic to the WSIS Forum.

Primarily I wanted to make sure that it wasn't jus tan idea of the five or six or seven people that were on the call last Monday and that each exchanged a fair number of emails to reach this point. I wanted to make sure that the rest of the group was happy about this. Bearing in mind that this is a CCWG, I tried to look at what we did last year, and whether we actually needed the agreement of our SOs and ACs, and it looks as though we didn't. However, what we will probably have to do is advise them of this. That's one of the things we do need to do.

But I can't imagine any of them will have objected. If there would have been an objection, it would have probably come from the Co Chairs of the CCWG on Accountability. As I mentioned, the response was very positive. In fact, I had some email troubles on our side, so as soon as I get those worked out I will forward the responses, if they weren't

EN

forwarded to everyone. That's pretty much it for this topic. Any other points then on this topic?

Nigel, if you're still on the line, I gather that this appears to be a green light from those who are on the call and absent a last-ditch effort to stop this by anyone on the mailing list, we can probably file this with the ITU or whoever's in charge of that?

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you for the comment. Indeed it could be made more enticing. One of the difficulties is that the proposal hasn't been submitted yet, so we're in a bit of a difficult situation. But certainly I'll speak to the ITU and make sure we have the ability to enhance and improve it before it goes on the website. We'll certainly do that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. Thanks very much for this Nigel. We can therefore move to our next AI. I wanted to check with you Nigel, prior to that, whether you were in a position to be able to provide us input on the discussion of the GAC Public Safety Session this week and the EURODIG Preparation? If you're not yet at your destination then perhaps we can go into the discussion for the Public Forum topic, which Bill had mentioned earlier. Are you already in a stable location?

NIGEL HICKSON: I always thought the number eight bus was very stable, but if we could do the WSIS first, that would be helpful. Sorry, if we could do the Marrakech first, that would be helpful.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's do that then. As Bill mentioned earlier, we have a month now until Marrakech, and we still need to discuss the topic of our Public Session in Marrakech. Bill, you have come up with a number of suggestions, including the one about the internet fragmentation and how that relates to ICANN and to have a discussion there. I unfortunately haven't got my notes on any of this, so shall I let you have the floor to explain what you were suggesting, and then see what the group makes up with it?

BILL DRAKE: All right. Again, there's been a bit of email exchanged about this, and I'm not religiously wedded to anything – I was only making a suggestion that we might consider doing what we always do at every session for the past year and a half, which is talk about WSIS. The one thing, because WSIS is over, there will be follow-up meetings, there will be opportunities for some governments to monkey around and try to cause trouble.

Fundamentally, we did get through the December Review, and it would be useful to lift their heads up, look around the horizon and say, "Okay, what else is happening out there in the global Internet governance environment that's potentially of importance and relevance to the ICANN community, and which might be interesting to people?" Because we have these sessions where we pull into other people, and a lot of times I feel like it's all the policy [unclear 00:23:41] who come to these sessions, so we end up having this sort of conversation.

EN

I think broadening that to more of the ICANN community would be good. I was trying to think about what topics might grab some people's attention as being a little bit more provocative and lending themselves to debate and so on, and so it was in that context that I was suggesting the OECD has this session they're going to have around openness. There's been discussion on [unclear 00:24:18] going on in various places. There is the Wuzhen Summit process, which while it does not enjoy widespread buy-in in the international community, it does enjoy the buy-in of two very major countries that have a shared orientation vis-à-vis how the net should be policed, architected and so on.

So I thought maybe that would be a fertile ground for enticing some people into the conversation. But I'd like to hear from other people, because I made some suggestions, Marilyn replied and said, "Mmhmm," and nobody else has really said much of anything. So I've no idea what people are really interested in doing. I'm not going to try and convince anybody to do anything they're not excited about. I only would like us to maybe do something different from what we have been doing recently. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Bill. I was also looking at my notes here, and there was also a suggestion that Thomas Shneider, the Chair of the GAC, could speak at the GAC high-level event that will have taken place earlier in the week – just providing an update, if you want. I can't imagine this taking a significant amount of time in that Public Session. I have spoken to Thomas about this, and he said that the Public Session takes place on Thursday, and he would not be able to make it, but he'd definitely be able to have one of his Vice Chair speak about the high-level event and provide us an update.

On Wednesday, on the other hand, it would be totally impossible for anyone from the GAC to step out of the room, because that's the day they prepare their communicae. So no doubt that's a busy day for them. As you said, I'd be

interested in hearing more input or feedback from others on the call here. so far it's only been Marilyn and Bill, and it's a little difficult to make decisions on what topics we're going to have. Traditionally they're quite well-attended, these sessions.

There is some interest in Internet governance and it brings a bit of fresh air into the room. The topics are sometimes so focused on one or two different named things, that it does get people to think there's something else happening outside our walls as well. What we had from our previous notes – and perhaps something from the WSIS outcome – then there was the [unclear 00:27:20] presentation, which is the report that Bill has worked on, and then an update on the GAC high-level event. On the format, I think that the format that we had last time, where we had this roundtable, is probably best.

Maybe not such a large table as we had last time – I thought it was a little bit difficult. Moderating-wise we could have the usual great moderators that we've had. I think they've held the session each time very well. We only have 75 minutes on this occasion. Okay. So it's a good point, Bill. We shouldn't have too many people there. That's always one of the concerns – having panels of 10-15 people, and then the audience is just sitting there. We really want the audience to participate. We want them as full participants.

So perhaps a small number, just a handful of people, to say things. Then really have a moderator that goes out to the audience, to the participants, and gets their input and feedback on this. Any thoughts on this? Anyone wish to add to this? Are there any objections to this? Or is anybody in support of this? Mathew Shears, you have the floor.

MATHEW SHEARS: I realize we're running on 75 minutes, and that's not a huge amount of time. I think in a couple of the last times we've done this, we've belabored some of the

subject a little bit too much. I think there is value in having a recap of the WSIS – not what happened, but more what we still have to pay attention to. I think that's important, because we can become complacent about the WSIS and there's still opportunity for mischief there, as others have said on prior calls. So I think there's value in having that, and just to refresh people's memory of why it's important.

But I do like the idea of perhaps teeing up maybe two new issues that are of immediate concern to this community. Bill's suggestion of fragmentation may be a great one. If we tee up new ideas, hopefully that will bring a greater level of audience engagement as well. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Anybody else in the queue? If we look at timings then, one could look at if we only have 75 minutes, having roughly 20 minutes on just a WSIS update and what things to look out for. 30 minutes on the fragmentation paper on the [WES 00:30:50] and how that might affect ICANN and domain names. I think looking in particular on how that might affect a lot of things on the Internet, and then just ten minutes on the GAC high-level meeting update, perhaps? Just a suggestion for first numbers here. Bill Drake?

BILL DRAKE: I don't want to sound like I'm trying to blow off the WSIS. As an informational thing, certainly having a couple of things highlight, as Matt suggests, a quick update on what were the main outcomes and a reminder of why we spent the latter of the last year worrying about this, and taking note of what's significant, and then about the outcome and why it matters, and then move on. So yes, I think 15-20 minutes on that.

Then do a second thing. The second thing – I'm sure you're speaking loosely, Olivier – but it's not about the fragmentation paper. The topic would be

EN

broader. It would be the debate about fragmentation versus [others 00:32:20]. Then the description could mention Wuzhen and some of the other… Maybe one or two bullet points to illustrate what's being referred to there, and taking note that the OECD Ministerial will be debating this somewhat in June, and will adopt, as the OECD Ministerials do, some sort of text afterwards.

That would presumably have language on this, and I know that Eddie Pritzker, the US Secretary of Commerce, and [Ant] from the European Commission, they're both discussing that, and [WSIS views 00:33:10] and a whole bunch of other things going on as well, like the US [unclear] negotiations. If we do, as I think Matt said, 20/30 and then open. But the only thing I would say is that the time to discuss should be built into those two chunks, and make sure that we don't end up overloading again. We had one session where we went a good half-hour over our time slot. We really don't want to do that.

If we've got 75 minutes, let's concisely do the set-up, let's have one or two people who were involved in WSIS do a quick summary of the main outcomes and why they matter. Let's open it to the floor, take ten minutes of discussion, 15, whatever, turn to the next topic, spend a half-hour on that – boom, we're out. That's just what I would do.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Bill. I'm putting notes together at the moment, so just to repeat: first part, 20 minutes on WSIS, its main outcomes, what to look out for in the future; and the second part was about 30 minutes on [WES 00:34:40] that doesn't look solely at fragmentation, with the debate about fragmentation versus openness. You mentioned the OECD debate on this. is that a debate that's linked to the [WES]?

BILL DRAKE: No. The OECD Ministerial Meeting in Mexico in June is a follow-up to the Ministerial Meeting held in Saul in 2008, which adopted a Declaration of

Principles and other stuff, if you remember, and also inaugurated the OECD shift towards a form of multistakeholderism by having the technical community and civil society recognized as groupings to participate in their Internet discussions in the way that business and labor unions historically have in the other parts of the OECD. So this will be a significant event, and even though much of it will be pre-cooked, I've read the OECD's got a draft report on the open Internet – what that means and how we preserve it.

That goes also directly to the questions that we raised in the [clarification 00:36:03] paper. So there's two levels to this. There's the broader level of challenges [unclear] to preservation of a relatively open Internet, on the one hand, and then the second level is the specific items that come up in the context of names and numbers, and particularly in the names space. So it would be nice to have somebody on the podium, or at the table, who has a good handle on things like blocking in the DNS, and other types of fragmentation, and open other discussion about how the ICANN community should view this issue and engage with this issue, and help support the international community's efforts.

There are a lot of people out there – and I don't mean to talk to them – there are a lot of people out there talking about these issues who really would not know very much about what happens within the ICANN sphere, which is a direct relative to the discussions they're having. So we could, I think, contribute in the way that we contributed at New Mundial. I don't mean drafting a text, but at least by having some discussion that leads to some reported output. That might be useful.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Bill. You mentioned the Wuzhen Conference. How does that fit in with this discussion?

BILL DRAKE: Wuzhen, as you know, the governments of China and Russia both articulated a strong view that, as they said, the global governance of the Internet does not serve their interests, and needs to be reformed on the basis of national sovereignty as an overarching baseline, and that they want international arrangements that recognize the ability of nation states, i.e. governments, to have full scope, to take whatever actions they deem necessary in any context [unclear 00:38:45].   This is to include such things as blocking data, data localization, locking domain names, talking about alternative ways of managing numbers at an international level, [unclear] entity.   There's a number of different things.

The Chinese are an advanced government. They have their concern, and it's a legitimate concern, but it's part of the mix. I think for a lot of people in the ICANN community, they'd have views on this. It's quite important. I won't [mute again 00:39:33].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Bill. The way I've heard it, the topic itself would be a debate about fragmentation versus openness, and there would be three or four inputs to this – one being input as a [WES] fragmentation, the other one the OECD debate on this topic, and thirdly the context specifically in the names and numbers, and fourthly the Wuzhen input on this. The only concern I have about this is that it seems to be a lot of input for just 30 minutes. I wonder whether we will be pressed for time at that point.

Just explaining all this might take 30 minutes before the floor is even open for discussions. That's my feedback on this. We obviously don't need to focus and have a firm agenda today, but that's a good start that we can share with the mailing list. Bill?

BILL DRAKE: Obviously there's a lot of issues here, and you can do this at length or you can do it very concisely, and it just depends on the context. Our challenge here is to make things fit into a [unclear 00:40:55]. Therefore the set-up has to be something that was planned, rather than ad-hoc, off the cuff kind of thing, where time is used well. The discussion highlighted two or three points, after a bit of set-up, that are of direct relevance to the ICANN community, and then solicited community thoughts and concerns about those.

You don't have to cover everything, you don't have to go into the details of all the different ways in which fragmentation occurs, or the ways in which different people might conceptualize openness. Hopefully the OECD will have shared its paper by then, because right now it's still on [unclear 00:41:45] background. But in any event, I think what we can do is frame the issue and then bring it down to a small set of items that we want to illicit discussion on. I think it's valuable.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. Finally the other suggestion to close off that face-to-face meeting in Marrakech was to have that ten-minute update on the GAC high-level meeting. Is that something people on this call feel would be helpful? I can see Mathew Shears saying five minute. Okay, we can do it in five minutes, that's fine. Just a brief summary of what's happened in the GAC high-level and what their takeaway is from it, I think is probably the best way to call it – GAC high-level meeting takeaway. We'll move forward on this.

As I said, we're not going to finalize this agenda on this call today, but I think we've moved it a little bit further today. Let's share it with the mailing list, obtain some feedback, and then continue on this next week. I'm mindful of the time at this at the moment. Bill, you wanted to say a few more things?

EN

BILL DRAKE: No, I didn't.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Nigel, go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: I'll be very brief. It would be a good idea, in the next couple of weeks, to put some sort of broad outline on the ICANN timeline so people can see what this session is about. We don't have to go into detail, we don't have to put people's names down. But it might be a good idea to put the broad topics of Internet fragmentation as a topic, because I think it's very relevant, it's very political, it's very strong, and I think it would be useful to have that down.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Nigel. I'm typing it into one of the note pods that we have so we've got this captured.   Then we'll follow it up on the mailing list, and hopefully by the end of next week we can then have an overall outline that we can add to the Marrakech timeline, or Marrakech Agenda.   We've moved forward on this. Now we have ten more minutes left for the discussion on the GAC Public Safety Session and the EURODIG Preparation. Nigel, have you now reached a place more conducive to you providing an update than when you were before?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. I'm still in a rather noisy environment but I think I can be fairly brief. What we can promise to do is circulate notes. What I'm going to give you an update on, because I don't have an update on the EURODIG Meeting, unfortunately, but I have an update on the RIPE Meeting that took place. This was a meeting

EN

of RIPE NCC and governments, and I can go over the topics of that, and the GAC Public Safety Working Group, which [unclear 00:45:50] as well. On the RIPE Meeting, there might be someone on the call that can give us an update, but this is a fairly regular, excellent initiative of RIPE.

They do it in Brussels. They update the attachés in Brussels from the permanent representatives on various Internet governance issues. This week, on the 26th, they had 65 representatives from missions, or permanent representatives present. There was a long discussion on IANA, as you might expect; on the IANA transition process and the associated accountability proposal and where that was. There were inputs from various people in that meeting, including some of the ccTLD representatives that were also present. There was a discussion around the timing of that; how critical the timing of the delivery of the documents were to the overall transition process.

There was also a discussion on the Internet of Things. This is an emerging theme we'll probably return to in due course on this group. It's beginning to dominate a number of agendas for various fora, whether it be the IGF, the EU, or whatever. At the meeting it touched on the Internet of Things. It also looked at the WHOIS – the registry/registrar provisions for displaying data concerning the ownership of domain names, and the extent to which that information is available or not available. It debated some of the ICANN issues surrounding that.

This is a closed meeting for governments. As I say, we will report, but obviously we won't be able to go into detail about who said what or things like that, because it's not an open meeting. The GAC Public Safety Working Group is more open. The Public Safety Working Group is one of the Working Groups of GAC. They often meet during ICANN Meetings, and they are going to meet in Marrakech again in March, but they took the advantage of many folks being in Brussels this week on the Internet governance front, to have a session there.

EN

They discussed a number of issues. They had a number of presentations. They had a presentation from EurID, which is the .eu registry, a very successful registry on cyber attacks, cyber security issues. They had a briefing from EUROPOL, the European Police Coordination Network. They had a discussion with the European Commission on data protection, and perhaps on the data protection regulation as well, which is coming in. Whether they touched on [safe harbor 00:49:41] I don't know, but I'll try and find out. That would have been something I'd think they would have discussed.

They also had a presentation from RIPE on their work. I understand it was a very successful meeting with a lot of references from governments there. As I say, we will certainly circulate something. I physically wasn't in Brussels this week, and Rochelle was there for some of the meetings. I think there were others from the ICANN community there as well, so we'll try and assemble some information concerning those sessions. Thank you for the opportunity.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Nigel. The floor is open for any questions or comments, or anything else really. I don't see anyone putting their hands up. It sounds like a very busy week in Brussels. Whilst people think of any questions they might have, I can provide a brief feedback on the EURODIG Preparation. I was also in Brussels, but at the beginning of the week, and left on Wednesday while everyone else was coming for the rest of the week. It was rather interesting. The Monday and Tuesday were very busy for EURODIG. That's the European Dialogue on Internet Governance. It's widely understood to be the European IGF. It's the moment when most participants in IGFs and local IGFs go and meet in a location.

This year it's going to take place in Brussels. On Monday there was a meeting of the organizing team, with the host team, the main host is EurID, and there's also the European Commission being one of the main hosts. There are several

EURODIG partners who were also there – the Council of Europe, the Swiss OFCOM, the European Broadcasting Union, RIPE FCC, ISOC, ICANN, and also EURALO – that's in the capacity that I attended the meeting. The funding all seems to be worked out quite well. There's obviously a lot of work to be done with the communication strategy for all partners.

I think everybody wants this to be a very large meeting. So due to the fact that it is in Brussels and there are so many policy makers and decision takers in Brussels, including the European Commission, European parliament, Council of Europe and others, that's going to be quite high-level, and it's good to see that the work is progressing well on this. The second day there was a public planning meeting that took place in the center of the town. The moment at the time was not at actually selecting any workshops in particular, but actually going through the more than 100 workshops that have been proposed, and seeing if they can be put together.

If some workshops are similar to each other, there can be some merging of workshops, or at least merging of themes. Merging of workshops will take place a bit later. So that's how it went forward and because there were a lot of people that were present, some people had workshops in play, and they were actually quite pleased with the way the workshops were somehow merged, or the topics were put together. We want to avoid what happened last year, where sometimes there were several sessions that treated pretty much the same topic. So some sessions ended up being very poorly attended.

Then finally, in the evening the drafting team worked on the EURODIG Statutes. It's still a very [old 00:54:12] organization and the statutes need rewriting in order to be able to allow for a growth of members and the overall growth of the organization itself. If I can remind you, originally the EURODIG was a very small affair – maybe 100-150 people that attended the meeting. Now we're looking at several hundred people attending the meeting. All of this has to be taken into account. That's all the feedback on EURODIG. Questions on the GAC week,

or the EURODIG Preparation of whichever. I did see Andreas from ICANN there. Someone from ICANN was there. Jean-Jacques Sahel was also present. Any questions or comments?

NIGEL HICKSON: Just one question. On the EURODIG in Brussels, is there a specific date? Perhaps you said and I missed it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I didn't say the date, no, not yet. I wish I'd written it down somewhere. I haven't got it unfortunately so I'll have to come back to you on this, Nigel. Sorry. It isn't on the website yet, and unfortunately I haven't got my notes from EURODIG. I was doing all this from memory somehow. It's likely to be in June sometime, which it usually is. Any other questions or comments? Then I guess we can end this call. For next week, we need a Doodle. Are there any dates or times to avoid? June 9th and 10th, the next EURODIG – thanks for this Bill Drake. Are there any dates next week which people cannot make, and we need to avoid specifically? The NCPH inter-sessional is 3rd, 4th, 5th of February, so the end of the week. Desiree, please?

DESIREE CABRERA: It was at the end of the week. Do we want to change the usual call?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It really depends on the timings. Let's do a Doodle with our usual timings and then we'll see. I'm a bit concerned with having things so close together at the moment. We're going to run out of topics. Thursday perhaps would be a good time. Mathew Shears and Greg Shatan would be busy at the NCPH. If we have extended timings you might be able to find an hour here or there and see if we

can have the call during that hour. I'm also traveling sometime that week as well. Monday and Tuesday are very full for me. Monday is basically out of the question, so it would have to be Tuesday or more. Bill Drake?

BILL DRAKE: Can we try progressing things online a bit? We do a lot of these phone calls with five to seven/eight people and try to plan these things, and finding a time that works for everybody is always difficult. Meanwhile, many of the people who've subscribed to the list and are Members of the CCWG are not engaged. I think if we can try to shift the balance to doing a little bit more asynchronies and relying a little bit less on these one-hour meetings to get everything done, it might be useful. Just a thought.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Bill. Absolutely agreed, but short of paying people for being on this call, I'm not sure how we'll manage to get more things done on the mailing list itself. One thing I will do, you'll see on the pod, on the top right-hand corner, I've put the proposed Public Session in Marrakech. I will send the email immediately after this call to the mailing list and hopefully generate some feedback on this. I'll also advise everyone that Nigel has received a green light to proceed forward with sending that proposal for the WSIS Forum.

With this, it's four minutes past the top of the hour. Desiree, a Doodle as per the usual dates. Apart from this, I'd like to thank you all for coming on the call, and adjourn the call until next week. Thank you all, and have a good weekend.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]