
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay. The recording has started.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Desiree. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the cross community working group on Internet governance. Today we have the 9th of February 2016, and the time is 17:05 UTC.

Let's start with a roll call please, Desiree.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay. In the room we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, David Maher, Gangesh Varma, Iren Borissova, Mark Buell, Matthew Shears, Marilyn Cade.

And from staff we have Ergys Ramaj, Nigel Hickson, Veni Markovski and myself, Desiree Cabrera.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. I believe Ergys Ramaj is also staff as well, you might not have... And have we missed any names by any chance?

I'm not hearing anybody say their name out, so the roll call is complete, and this agenda is going to be, primarily going to be looking at the

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.

preparation for our two Marrakesh sessions. The face to face session and the public session. So we have a number of links in front of us, on the agenda, and I've also sent an email to the mailing list just a short while ago.

Is there any additional or other business to add to this agenda at this point in time?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Olivier, just if I may. At the end under any other business, just to update the group just very briefly on the preparations for the OECD ministerial. It will only take 30 seconds. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks Nigel. We will do that. I will make note of it. And if I do forget, please remind us. So the agenda is adopted with this small addition. And we can now go into reviewing the action item, and the action items from the last time were first, for the last call, the 29th of January, was for Nigel Hickson to submit a working group proposal placeholder text for the WSIS forum for the ITU.

Now I understand Nigel has sent this, [inaudible] the text, to the ITU. Can you please confirm this?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thanks very much. Nigel Hickson for the record. So the, I have indeed submitted the placeholder text I circulated to the group as part of an overall submission that one has to do for the WSIS open forum.

One has to complete, essentially write two or three essays really on what one would like out of the WSIS forum before one can just propose a workshop. So I'll circulate the whole document in due course, but indeed, I spoke to the ITU as well, and in due course, we can discuss with them and obviously discuss with this group, what the sort of timing is.

And of course we can update it in terms of the different panelists and contributors and things like that. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. And I note the second action item was to bring the discussion of the Marrakesh agenda to the mailing list for everyone's feedback. That has been done as well. Or there any comments or questions, I do believe probably to Nigel regarding the input for the WSIS forum?

I don't see any hands being put up. I believe that we will, as you said, have plenty of time to revisit this and actually pass the proposal of our work in Marrakesh during our face to face meeting, will be to work more to prepare for that workshop. And perhaps at that point, we will be able to focus a lot more on what we want.

But at least Nigel, thank you for filing this, and certainly please let us know when there are more documents available. Please do share them with the working group, and perhaps we will be able to comment on these as they are produced.

With no hands up in the room, let's then move to agenda item number three, and that's an update on the CSDD working group on enhanced cooperation. And for this, we have Nigel Hickson again.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thanks very much. I think this can be brief. Nigel Hickson. We've discussed this before. Just really wanted to bring the group up to date. So the CSDD secretariat posted a notice on their website, on the process for setting up this working group on enhanced cooperation, for those, for the new, new to the call but to this particular issue on the call. The WSIS, the year end General Assembly resolution, the output document, the had called in a resolution for a resumption of this working group on enhanced cooperation, looking at essentially how governments could contribute to the Internet public policy processes.

This working group is being set up by CSTD, which is a commission under [inaudible], that the UN here in Geneva, and Peter Major who is a Hungarian diplomat and currently the chair of CSTD, is proposing to chair this working group and set out a process under which it will be set up.

He will have 20 government members, five members from international governmental organizations such as the ITU, etc. It will have five members from Civil Society, five from the technical community, and five from business. And there is going to be a sort of nomination process put in train over the next few weeks for nominations to be made, probably by the middle of March for this working group.

And of course, our discussions here just on the technical community, but of course, business people as well, feed into that process. There was the working group, sorry the call on the CSTD website asked for comments by the 8th of October, and well, I did draft something on behalf of ICANN, but not, I haven't put it in yet.

But I mean essentially, as I said, the composition of the working group is as I outlined, I think Marilyn Cade is on the call, she should have historical knowledge on this and can no doubt comment on this as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Nigel. Olivier speaking. And I note that Matthew Shears has very kindly put the links to the CSTD announcement in the Adobe Connect chat, for anyone who is interested in having a look at the actual document. So thank you for this. Marilyn Cade, are you wishing to comment a bit more on this?

I see her on the Adobe Connect, but it looks as though she might not be able to speak at the moment. I'm unable to hear her. I know that there is always a little time that it takes for the dial out to go in effect. Okay, so Marilyn is typing. Any other comments or questions to Nigel on this topic?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up. My own comments, of course, it's very important follow up to what we have seen in New York, and I think we should keep a very close eye on this, probably the reason why the suggestion was made for us to have a discussion specifically on this in Marrakesh, to inform the wider ICANN audiences on this.

But we will touch on this in a moment in agenda item four. In the meantime, are there any further comments or questions on this? Update on CSTD working group? Going once, going twice.

And no Marilyn, unfortunately we're not able to hear you at the moment. So Desiree, if I could ask you to work this one out with Marilyn please, and in the meantime, let's then move to agenda item number four, the preparation for the Marrakesh meeting.

Now you will notice several links in the agenda. The first two links, the link to the GAC high level meeting and the Marrakesh meeting schedule are just there for your information. But then we had a discussion on the mailing lists regarding the proposed agenda of the two sessions that we have.

The first session that we have is taking place on the Wednesday, that's the face to face working group session, Wednesday at 10:45 AM. And we still have much work to do on this one. We haven't really discussed, well spent much time discussing what we're going to be discussing there.

There was one proposal about the WSIS forum workshop preparation, obviously that's our next target, which will be later on this year. But the input that we've received so far has been about the public meeting, which takes place on the Thursday morning at 9:00.

And a first draft was sent a while ago and shared in the previous call. We received some feedback. Further discussions have taken place, and I just sent about an hour ago, a second draft which you must have all seen, because I've seen a flurry of activity on the mailing list in response

to this. And what I was going to do was to take you through the process, through the different parts, one by one, and see if we could have consensus on how we should move forward on this.

Are there any first overarching questions or comments before we start going on a step by step basis? And Desiree, is it possible to perhaps have that email put on the screen to be shared for those people who haven't got the ability to both be on the screen and also look at the agenda?

There is a link to the agenda that is also in the chat, and the document which has the email is actually linked to proposed agenda on CCWG IG public meeting in Marrakesh.

DESIREE CABRERA:

Let me try to put it up there if I can.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, I'll keep on moving whilst you try that. So, the first... Well the three major parts in that public session in Marrakesh. The first one is a GAC high level meeting takeaway, and that's just going to be a quick summary of the results of the GAC high level meeting that would have taken place on the Monday of that week, because of course, I know that there will be some people that will have attended the GAC high level meeting, but that takes place in parallel with other sessions.

So many people will admit that, and will sound or feel as though it is a good idea, especially when it comes down to Internet governance, it would be a good idea to get some feedback from the GAC, or at least a

little summary with maybe the GAC vice-chair coming and explaining what happened.

I know that, Farzaneh has asked, but why should we have this? It just feels like a good idea, a good opening to the sessions as to be able to get the discussions going. And feeling that the GAC will probably not only deal with ICANN matters, but obviously there is a lot more that the high level meeting is going to deal with.

We actually have a link to the GAC high level meeting agenda, and you can see how complex and long it is. Are there any comments or questions on this? I mean, is there any support for not having this GAC update?

MARILYN CADE: Actually, it's Marilyn. Can I speak in support of having it for just a minute?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes Marilyn, please. You have the floor.

MARILYN CADE: Thanks. Thank you. We only have a high level GAC meeting once a year, at the ICANN meetings. And this is the first high level meeting after the conclusion of the six month WSIS plus 10 process. And many of the governments who will be attending, were keen allies in helping to support the continuation of the multistakeholder role, both to support ICANN and the IGF, but really helping to ensure that the focus at the

WSIS plus 10 review was on the appropriate items and not on [inaudible] takeover by ICANN.

However, having said that, I think having a brief readout from what was discussed at the high level GAC meeting is of interest to all of the attendees at ICANN. It should be short. Thomas is noted for his brevity. But it also helps to reinforce the message to the governments, to think to stay around and to attend these meetings where they hear the rest of the messages.

And I think, in and of itself, is a really important outcome for us, so that the governments are able to say to their, something that many of us don't understand is that when the government representatives get travel funding from their government to come, it often ends as soon as the communique is over.

So having this other event, that is on their radar screen and it is important to attend, can help us in the long run to keep the government in the room, acting with us and not separate from us.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this explanation Marilyn. Very helpful. Any comments or questions?

Seeing no hands and no objection or no counterpoint on this at present. So let's take it that we can proceed forward. Now I'm reluctant to make decisions on the call, and say, okay, fine, this is cast in stone, but we can certainly note that the people who were present here, don't appear to have a problem with that and relate this to the mailing list, and then we

will continue the discussion on the mailing list. Now, oh, I do see Matthew Shears having put his hand up. Matthew, you have the floor.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Olivier, can you hear me all right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes we can indeed.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Okay perfect. Thanks. I'm just wondering about the balance of time between the WSIS plus 10 process and fragmentation versus openness discussion, because what we really want is, we really wanted to generate a robust discussion, and I'm just wondering how that's going to work if we only have 20 minutes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a good point Matthew. Olivier speaking. It's a good point. You will notice that we have 75 minutes total time. At the moment, 30 plus 20 plus five doesn't come up to 75 minutes. So these are just rough timings, and I think that we can indeed change the timing and we could add another 10 minutes, so we can have an equal amount of time on WSIS plus 10, and on the debate about fragmentation versus openness.

So that would be 65 minutes with the GAC high level meeting, which gives us another 10 minutes or so, if we have a little bit of leeway for

the usual mumblings that I do at the beginning of a call or the closing off of a session. Would 30 minutes feel more balanced?

Yeah, okay, excellent, thanks.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Veni Markovski, you have the floor.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Thank you. Just to add to this, I think the WSIS plus 10 [inaudible] is important, but do we have an opportunity to say in the way forward? Because what's happening, what will be happening at the UN, in the UN system, postal system, is equally, it's not even more important because the WSIS plus 10 is now over.

It's good for people to hear what happened, but it's also good to hear what will happen based on that. So that people have better awareness of the facts on the UN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this question slash comment Veni. It's Olivier speaking. So now we're discussing the WSIS process. Yes, there are two projected ideas here, or proposed ideas. First part, or first thing, speak about the main outcomes, and then what to look out for in the future, which effectively is the way forward in the discussion on the way forward.

And I suppose the discussion will not be mostly about the past. I hope that the discussion will be mostly about the future. And since we are on this, for those who are not, who are just on the call and not in the Adobe Connect room, there are three proposed panelists to take us through the main outcomes.

First, Hannah [inaudible] speaking about the sustainable development goals, the SDGs, then Peter Major speaking about the CSTDs enhanced cooperation, well focusing specifically on enhanced cooperation on the CSTD. And thirdly, [inaudible] speaking about the Internet governance forums abstention. And then I guess we can turn the things to say, well, what to look up for the future, and have the discussion focused primarily on the future based on this.

So several questions here. First about the proposed panelists. These are just suggested panelists by the way, I don't believe that they have been contacted yet. And I certainly haven't contacted them yet. I don't even know whether they will be available. I do hope that they will be in Marrakesh at the time.

But then also about the structuring of saying, well first start with the main outcomes, and then move with what to look out for in the future. And I realize that with 30 minutes, it's not very much time, but the main outcomes can just take a couple of minutes per person, and the future can monopolize most of those 30 minutes.

The floor is open for comments, questions, suggestions, deletions, etc.

I note there is some discussion in the chat about Nigel's name in the Adobe Connect, which is irrelevant to what we're discussing at the moment. But never mind...

VENI MARKOVSKI: So what...? Sorry, Olivier this is Veni again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Veni Markovski, you have the floor.

VENI MARKOVSKI: What is your plan in case, because one, or two, or three of them, I know that they're all...?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a very good question Veni. Oh, someone else wanted to comment?

MARILYN CADE: Yes, Marilyn. Actually, yeah I believe Peter Major is confirmed, and I believe [inaudible] is planning on attending. So why don't we, as plan A, think about sending invitations, and then having the plan B? I agree with Veni having a plan B, but I think our first step would be the invitations.

If we agree, [inaudible] is the, I think, it would be good to just mention again, that [inaudible] is the senior staff person who supported the ambassador from UAE, that was one of the two co-facilitators.

And the reason I proposed [inaudible] is because of the region, the regional location. It doesn't have to be [inaudible] but I was thinking because of the regional location. But Peter is a GAC member and scheduled to attend, and [inaudible] is also planning to attend. So perhaps we could nail that down, and then develop our plan B after that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this information Marilyn. Indeed, it's Olivier speaking, indeed, Hannah [inaudible] is an expert on sustainable developments, based in New York on the permanent mission of the UAE to the United Nations. So most qualified to talk about sustainable development.

If we have a green light, I do know that it is highly likely that Peter will be there, and [inaudible] will be there, they usually are standard attendees for ICANN meetings. So it would be just in case of finding out and sending an invitation to Hannah [inaudible], if we can agree on sending an invitation, let's proceed forward.

If we can't get her, and I guess the earlier we do this, the earlier we send it in, the faster we'll get an answer, if we have a negative reply, we can find someone else. And perhaps I can ask everyone to think of alternative people who can speak about the sustainable development goals.

Any other comments or questions on this?

You will have noticed that the idea here somehow is to have different faces on our panels, rather than our usual suspects, who we all know and hopefully that will attract more people and certainly attract a wider audience, if we have people that we don't usually see on any of the other panels or discussions that take place in the ICANN meeting rooms.

So I don't see any further hands at the moment. Bill mentioned that Peter and [inaudible] have been on the panel a dozen times. Yeah, they might have been... Have they been on past panels at the CCWG IGF? I can't quite... They might have been, yeah. There is a chance.

I note [inaudible] has not been on a panel. Okay. Any other comments on this? So are we okay with the topic? I don't see anyone speaking against it, and I see Nigel Hickson's hand. And Nigel, your name being Ni, really, really concerns me because I keep on thinking of Ni [inaudible]. But no, it's Nigel Hickson. Nigel, you have the floor.

NIGEL HICKSON:

I don't think I'm that distinguished at all. This is Nigel, yeah. Have we got on to the other points on the agenda? I just wanted to raise a point on the OECD, just to clarify that I think the idea was to, was not to look back to solve, but to look forward to what will be discussed in Cancun in June.

But it's just a clarification on what was written. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. I do get the hint that we can then put the WSIS process part of the discussion behind us. And then move on with the second part of this face to face session, or the third part I guess, the debate about fragmentation versus openness, with very various different inputs.

First the input from the World Economic Forum, the paper which Bill Drake has drafted and has presented. But also the input of the OECD debate on this topic, and perhaps other input. And by the way, I did just catch the [inaudible] thing, and so Nigel, thanks for mentioning that this should be maybe looking forward towards the next meeting, which is that Lisbon that you say?

NIGEL HICKSON: So this is the Cancun ministerial...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Cancun, okay, sorry. I don't know how that transferred from Cancun to Lisbon. So, yeah, so there would be this. And to keep the context and the focus in the, primarily in the names and numbers side of things. So that was a suggestion. I have noticed that Bill Drake has responded on the mailing list and now he believes maybe it was not a good idea to look at fragmentation.

But I note that Bill has put his hand up. So perhaps I should hand the floor over to Bill Drake.

BILL DRAKE:

Hi. It was not that I don't think it's a good thing to talk about. It's that I don't think we can talk about it here. So, I don't see the point of having this conversation any further. 20 minutes talking about fragmentation is absurd. And there is just, I have not understood the way you're framing this anyway.

You said repeatedly Olivier, that I never said I wanted to talk about the paper I wrote, and you keep on popping out here [inaudible], but that doesn't matter. We're not going to have any kind of real conversation about fragmentation in 20 minutes.

So again, my suggestion is drop it. And as I said in the email, you can just do the usual review of this is going on in this place, and this is going on in that place, and this is going on in that place, and in that context you can do the OCED. And as I said in the email, NetMundial initiative, [inaudible] council will meet just prior to Marrakesh, and may have something to talk about that will be of interest or amusement to some people.

And there will be other developments as well to be reported about in other environments. So I'm just saying, do what we always do, and don't try to stretch. I don't think it's the place to do it. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thanks for this Bill. It's Olivier speaking. So a couple of things. You might have missed that earlier, Matthew was saying about 20 minutes is a bit too short, so we would have 30 minutes on each part of that session. I know 10 minutes might not be a lot more, but now you're saying so fragmentation paper doesn't, would not fit here. And

we would have plenty discussion on the OECD and of the rest of the context. So I open the floor for other comments on this, because right now, if we take the fragmentation discussion out, I need to be told a little more.

I hope we would have more discussions or suggestions on how to fill this part of the session. I note, Bill, you've mentioned the NetMundial initiative update could be something to add to this. But that would not bring a debate, would it?

Is there any feedback to this?

BILL DRAKE: It might bring some amusement.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we're there for the amusement, the show part. Fair enough. Just a little interlude. I think that these are important issues, so we do have to bring them up. Does anyone else have a comment or...? And rather than type it in, you know, we do have the ability to speak face to face when we will be there, but we have the ability to speak on the phone right now.

So Matthew, you think we should stick to fragmentation. Well, Matthew Shears, you have the floor.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yeah. I don't want to beat a dead horse here if there is a huge amount of support for it, but I think the topic of fragmentation, and obviously we can refer in passing in the session to the [inaudible] paper, but the topic of fragmentation is particular relevant now.

And I think we're seeing it at all different levels from policy fragmentation, addressing fragmentation, business practice fragmentation, fragmentation on all kinds of things. So I think there is a great opportunity for us to have a wide ranging discussion, and to engage the audience on this.

So I think it's a good topic. I hate to see us drop it for a set of updates which aren't particularly compelling, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Matthew. Next is Farzaneh Badii.

FARZANEH BADI: Hi. Farzaneh Badii speaking. As I totally agree with Matthew, and as I said on the mailing list, I don't think [inaudible] attend a process update is very wise when a topic like fragmentation to discuss. And we have given it now 20 minutes. To be honest, WSIS plus 10 process is just kind of like [inaudible]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Farzaneh, I'm just sorry to interrupt you. It's Olivier speaking. We have the amount of 30 minutes, we're having the equivalent amount on both

topics. That point was brought in earlier. The numbers that we have at the moment are just very approximate.

FARAZNEH BADI:

Okay. That's okay. I think if you have 30 minutes for WSIS, it's too much. To be honest, people, the feedback that we get after our [inaudible] is that it's totally repetitive, and there are no new insights to it. How can we bring insights to it when we keep inviting the same people, and I don't mean the same people based on a new perspective and new topic.

So you can't bring the same people, but when you don't bring any new perspective, of course everyone goes to [inaudible], because they don't really get invited out of the session. So I would say that if you want to brief them on WSIS plus 10, you want to have...

And I also think some of the ICANN community should brief on [inaudible]. Why do we always have to have people who are in charge of those organizations that can just talk on the format and like nonstop [inaudible] things to talk about. Okay, thank you, that was just my point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this point Farzaneh. It's Olivier speaking. Are there any of the points we've now heard from Matthew and Farzaneh. Matthew, your hand is still up, do you wish to speak further?

It's another, okay, the hand has been put down. Any other thoughts?
Bill Drake.

BILL DRAKE:

Well, look I mean, you know, [inaudible] and Peter are doing important things. We all like them, we all think it's good to have updates or mentions that these things are happening, but you know, I have to agree with Farzaneh that you know, we have done this, multiple times.

And a lot of it is process, process, process. And there is a small number of policy wonks who participate in ICANN, who also participate in these other spaces, who are interested in what's happening with the latest committee meeting, draft, zero draft... A lot of the ICANN community, as far as I can tell, just doesn't care about this stuff that much.

And the feedback I have gotten, as far as [inaudible], repeatedly from colleagues was that, you know, they were rather bored during long recaps of that kind of stuff. And so if we're proposing to spend another 30 minutes on that, saying okay, CSTD, the [inaudible] will be rebooted, and the [inaudible] the WSIS is over, it actually is over, I mean, there is [inaudible], if you want to talk about the action lines and stuff like that.

But it's just not, I think, what a lot of people in this community are really jazzed about. Well, it is over Marilyn. I mean, yes, there is a process. Of course, there is a process, and somebody can always complain and raise a thing and...

But in terms of the big outcome, you know, the main deliverable, the thing that everybody worried about all last year, didn't happen. It's good to tell people that. It's good to tell people why that happened. And it's good to say what to expect going forward, and what to keep an eye on. But I think that can be done fairly concisely.

I don't understand spending the first 30 minutes of the session about it. But if, you know, I'm also not interested in [inaudible] the point. Does somebody else really feel strongly, this is what we ought to do, I'm not going to sit here and butt heads over it. To me, it's just not that interesting, and I'll probably be on Facebook like everybody else.

If that means that we end up with, you know, 30 minutes maybe we could say something about fragmentation, and openness, and what's going on in the larger environment, maybe so. But it somehow strikes me that the sense of balance is not quite there. We're a little bit [inaudible] in my view, but whatever keeps peace in the house, I'm ready to roll.

Last point, Olivier, I don't know why you think [inaudible] cannot be talked about. But if I'm anywhere near a microphone, I very well may say something about [inaudible], because the fact of the matter is, that two of the largest countries in the world are actively pursuing policy orientation that are fragmentary in their implementations, and this is an emerging reality that people are going to have to get their heads around what it means.

And to pretend that we can't say something about it because Fadi got himself in a controversy, you know, let's talk about Fadi and the council of the [inaudible], who cares? The point is what the Chinese and the Russians and others are doing, in the world, now, that impacts the Internet.

I think that people, in ICANN, might want to talk about that because it is kind of the means... Anyway, I've rambled on. I've had a very long day.

My father-in-law died and I'm a little bit distraught and confused. So I'll stop. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this intervention Bill. Are there any comments or responses on any of the points that Bill has made?

MARILYN CADE: It's Marilyn. Can I, and Robin may want to come in as well. The [inaudible] conference, I think there is two aspects to the [inaudible] conference. One is what the conference is about and what it proposes. And two, the controversy that has been raised within the ICANN community about actions taken by the present and outgoing CEO.

And Matthew [inaudible] myself, a few others on this list were just recently in a meeting, an intercessional meeting where concerns were raised about Fadi's actions. Rather than talking about Fadi's actions, if we're talking about the intent of the conference, or the intent of the initiative, perhaps I would say, and the intent of other similar initiatives that those are going in other directions, I think that could be a very important discussion, but yes, I fully agree.

What Fadi did or said is not the topic. The topic of the conference and whether it and other conferences like it, initiatives I would say, like it are raising concerns, I think that is a part of a fragmentation session.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. So several points have been mentioned here. First the point that Bill made regarding the WSIS plus 10 part of the proposed agenda, being the same people and the repetition and not being particularly exciting for people in ICANN.

And then secondly, I think there was quite a discussion on the [inaudible] conference topic itself. I'd be inclined... First on the [inaudible] thing, I note in the chat that Robin Gross mentions that it sounds a bit like censorship, I'm saying well, we're not going to be talking about the [inaudible] conference because of its sensitivity.

And I think the concern is that if we end up in a discussion just about what Fadi is doing, I don't see this as being constructive at all, especially since this will take place on a Thursday, which is, isn't it the last day that Fadi will be the CEO of ICANN? I mean, talking about the past rather than looking at the future.

I just have a concern that we end up in this hole, if you want, that would waste everyone's time. Now that said, if we have good moderation, we can always come out of that and say, "Well look. We're interested in the topics, and what we need to do for the future. We're not interested in what individuals do and whatever mistakes, or errors, or how they run their life and stuff."

So that, you know, I'm open to having the [inaudible] conference, and of course, if that's an important part of the fragmentation debate, then yes please, we need to include this in there. But that's all fine. Bill, you have raised your hand. Is that a new hand?

And I totally agree with what you said Bill. The issue is not Fadi, the issue is what's going on in the policy environment that effects fragmentation. So fair enough. So I think we've got an understanding here. I haven't seen anyone speak against that. I note that Matthew Shears agrees also, or also points in that direction.

And Marilyn Cade also is agreeing that we need to be looking at, well, that it is important to speak about the [inaudible] conference. So look, in the interest of, I do know that, fine. We've got these two topics. Some are saying, there is really interest in the first one, others are saying there is no interest in the first topic. Some are saying there is a lot of interest in the second topic.

I think that everyone agrees that there is a lot of interest in the second topic. So we will certainly be keeping the fragmentation discussions. And as far as the WSIS plus 10 process is concerned, what I would suggest for this, for the Marrakesh meeting then, is that we do give an equal amount of time to both, but we leave it to the moderator to certainly...

Or maybe we even have a timekeeper that after the first 20, 25 minutes or so, mark if they see the audience dozing off and things not really being particularly exciting, get them to move on to the second topic, so as to give a bit more time to the second topic than what's allocated and play it by ear basically.

But then what we can have is to have a feedback sheet at the end of the, or even a question regarding feedback from the audience at the end of the session and say, "Well which part did you feel more

interested in? Did you feel more interested in an update, or did you feel more interested in the debate?” Not that we’re giving marks to the two, you know, out of 10 or anything, but just for us to get a better feeling of what our audience are interested in, and our participants are interested in.

We certainly have been traditionally providing updates to people in the room, who otherwise might not have had updates, but I guess most people who would be in the room are interested in those things, so they might even know what we’re talking about, but we certainly have not had a big part of debates and discussions on topics like the fragmentation and openness in the past.

So that, I think, would be a new thing that we could introduce. So keeping the mix of the two for this Marrakesh meeting, and then taking lessons learned from Marrakesh in designing the session we’ll have in the next ICANN meeting, and if there is no interest, or low interest in the update, then maybe we can provide the updates in writing to people who come in the face to face, in the session, in the public session, by having a handout or something, and focusing on a debate.

We’ll see. How does that fly with everyone?

Dead silence.

I hope that’s not what we’re going to have in the main room. It’s not flying, says Bill. It’s all right from Farzaneh. It’s crawling. Engine failure. Great. I really feel so impressed with this working group. Look, we can’t just, the problem that I have at the moment is that we are, we have no consensus in our group as to whether we want the WSIS

process or not. I think we have consensus on whether we want to have a debate on fragmentation, because I've seen interest from everyone here. And I haven't heard anyone speak against it.

So why not have the substantive discussion first and then the update second? That's a good point Bill. Maybe we could have that. Maybe we could start... The only reason why I thought we would start perhaps with the updates is because we do have these three panelists who might not, well who might have to run out afterwards, if they're not interested in the topic of fragmentation versus openness.

The other concern being that if we have the debate first, we will have to cut the debate short at some point, and say, "Oh, now we're going to have some updates."

MARILYN CADE:

Yeah, actually, look even if we cut... It's Marilyn. My observation is it always takes us five to 10 minutes to get settled, introductions done. So let's say we allocate 20 minutes on the first session of getting the updates out of the way, instead of 30 minutes, recognizing that the, you know, I can't remember what time we're starting, but my experience with all of us is that people don't get settled down.

So then, so do the updates first, then do the substantive discussion. This idea that you're going to have a debate, I think you really have got to have a discussion rather than a debate. Debate puts many people from developing countries, who perhaps might not be authorized as some of you individually are, in a difficult situation.

If you use the term discussion, they're more able to express their points of view. And while I respect the fact that some of you carry a portfolio that says, go to the microphone and punch, punch, punch, that's not where most of the community is. Most of the community is still trying to learn about fragmentation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. So point taken. Let's call this discussion about fragmentation versus openness. Let's have the various inputs, including... So Nigel, I will have to ask you on this, the only discussion on this topic, is that past or is that coming up in Cancun?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. I'll just clarify now because we're running out of time. So I mean, it's simply, I think, the way that Bill Drake had helped me framed it before, the only CD ministerial is in June this year in Cancun. It will be looking at the economics of the Internet society. It will be looking at such issues as openness and the use of the Internet for innovation, growth, prosperity, jobs, etc.

Not without controversy on certain issues, but I think it is worth flagging. I mean, I can provide the right wording for the agenda eventually. It's not [inaudible] in 2008.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thanks for this Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. So let's frame it with the Cancun meeting. Let's keep it in the context of the names and

numbers. Bill, I don't even know if I should ask Bill. On this thing, I mean, I see that the various inputs that we have here, including the [inaudible] conference, I'm not an absolute expert on the input from OECD and the context, well I do know about the context of the Asian numbers here.

We just need to have a small group that would be focusing on how to conduct that discussion so as to give it a better shape. And the way that I was seeing it was that we could just have a quick two minutes presentation of what the different inputs are, what the different things are, and then launch the debate on this, sorry, launch the discussion on this.

I should tap myself on the hand for this. Anyone else on the call, that's a good point Bill. Anybody else on the call has a view on what we have currently on the screen? So reduction of the WSIS plus 10 process to 20 minutes, would give us more time on the discussion on fragmentation and openness.

This is a 9 AM session. We will try and start as early as 9 AM, which does mean that in a way the GAC high level meeting takeaway, which is five minutes, might be in a room that is not fully loaded with people yet, but hopefully as time passes, we will have more people coming in the room, or maybe there will be tons of people in the room. Who knows?

But it is 75 minutes, so that takes us well past 10 AM, and that will be right in the middle of the discussion on fragmentation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this suggestion. We'll add it to the list. Anybody else? Are there any other topics to add to this?

So I note that for the time being, these are two topics of primarily just working group arrangement, I guess, not actually policy discussions but more like how are we going to work. Is there any policy discussions that we should have face to face within the working group?

MARILYN CADE: Olivier, it's Marilyn again. I'm not just suggesting how we're going to work, but how we are effective in providing input. And so I'll just give an example that although the NetMundial was decided by Fadi in his individual capacity, we the CCWG IG, went to the, went to work and provided a Town Hall to provide some input that was reflected then.

I think we need to be asking ourselves, what's the purpose of this cross community working group on Internet governance? And particularly as we have a new CEO coming in, how do we see of our role of at least providing principles, or directional statement, or you know, why are we spending our time? And how is what we're doing being reflected into the actions and directions that ICANN is taking?

I learned, after the fact, that two Board members accompanied Fadi to the [inaudible] conference. I'm kind of interested in what's the, since that conference was all about IG, I'm interested in what the messages are that come out of this working group that help to guide and inform the Board and the senior staff when they engage in Internet governance.

Not to dictate it, but to guide it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. Should we ask for Tarek to be in the room on this? Or do you wish to have...? I certainly see support in the chat for your suggestion, or perhaps have some members of the Board in the room and invite them to be in the face to face meeting so as to be able to discuss this?

And the reason why I'm saying this is because we have already had this discussion among ourselves in the past, and I'm just trying to see, I think we are past the stage of discussing this among ourselves. Really first, I would like to get an idea of how staff sees this, and how the Board sees the working group, because if we are, well we're going to do this, and we aren't going to do that, and yet there is no discuss, there is no pushback, sorry.

And then there is no discussion with the interested parties, we really are wasting our time. So perhaps we need to move a bit further on this in our next call. But that's a worthy discussion that we can add to the WSIS forum workshop preparation topic. And that would certainly be able to fill the, I don't know what is the amount of time we have in our face to face working group session.

We'll still fill this. I'm a bit [inaudible] to have three or four or five topics in our face to face meeting. And with this, noting we are three minutes beyond the end of the official time, we go into any other business, and a quick update on the OECD meeting preparation from Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Olivier, this is Nigel. I think, really, I did that when I just mentioned that the ministerial is taking place. There will be representation from the technical community, the business community, Civil Society, and the unions. We sit around the table and discuss the preparation for this together. There will be a ministerial statement that's being prepared and agreed at the moment.

We will hope that our new CEO might possibly be able to speak at the ministerial, depending on timing and things like that. And obviously I can provide updates to the group, and as we go along, and when we get to the stage of writing speeches or anything, we can obviously, you know, concur as we've done before.

But I think that was the gist of it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Nigel for this. And seeing that there is some discussion in the chat, we will probably have to continue this discussion, debate on the face to face session in the next call. And in the meantime, in the interest of the fact that everyone has to go to other calls as well, I would like to thank you all for being on this call.

We have made some progress on this. I'll try and see with the recording and maybe a few notes, where we are and follow-up on the mailing list, where we are on our Marrakesh meeting agendas. Any other, other business from anyone?

Indeed, I note that Marilyn mentions, we need to hear all of the views from the other CCWG IG members, and I hope that they will provide some input on the mailing list if they're unable to make it to the call.

In the meantime, it's five minutes past 18:00 UTC, so I would like to thank all of you for being on this all. And this call is now adjourned. Next call, by the way, is going to be next week. We'll have a Doodle again, same sort of timing this week.

I might have spoken a bit too early. Do we have any days that an event is taking place when nobody can make it?

MARILYN CADE: Are you talking about next week?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next week, yeah.

MARILYN CADE: Yeah. Nigel and [inaudible] and I and, I'm just looking at the list. The WSIS plus 10, the ITU WSIS plus 10 working group I think is going to be extremely sensitive. There are other dates next week where there is availability, but the WSIS plus 10 ITU meeting, I think, is the one that is most important.

But I see that maybe Bill and Judith are not available. To me, [inaudible] is not that critical, but that's Tuesday. And I see Bill and Judith are not

available then. So I guess we just have to do a, we may have to move it to the following week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. I'm just a bit concerned that time is ticking, and we do need to finalize our Marrakesh meeting agendas. But if we can come to consensus on the mailing list, that doesn't put pressure on us to have a call next week, and we can certainly have a call starting on the week of the 22nd of February.

I note that Monday next week, the Monday the 15th is President's Day, so that's a US holiday. That Tuesday, Wednesday, Tuesday to Thursday, Bill Drake is unavailable. Others are unavailable, at random on other days as well. Next week looks like it's a bit hard.

So maybe the week after. Look let's do a Doodle. We're going to do a Doodle for the two weeks. So with a sprinkling of days on the week of the 15th, and a sprinkling of days on the week of the 22nd. And if there are really so many people who are not able to make it to the next week's call, then we'll have the call on the week of the 22nd.

And that will probably be the easiest way to find out. And with this, thanks very much for being on this call. And speak to you very soon. This call is now adjourned. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]