DESIREE CABRERA:	Okay, there goes the recording.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Desiree. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening, everybody. This is the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance call on Wednesday, 30 March 2016. It says '15 at the moment on your screen but, no, we are in 2016.

The roll call, I guess, is the first order that we need to deal with. Let's have a roll call, please, Desiree.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay. In the room, we have Alan Greenberg, Claire, Judith Hellerstein, Klaus Stoll. From staff, we have Nigel Hickson and myself, Desiree Cabrera. For the [chairs], we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Desiree. Have we missed anybody in the roll call? Anybody online who is not in the Adobe Connect room? No one at the moment? Okay. We have apologies from one of the co-chairs, Rafik Dammak, whom I spoke to a little earlier. He is currently traveling, so he might be able to join up, but for the time being he is sends his apologies. I know that several other people are traveling as well. Many are at the South School on Internet Governance in Washington, D.C., which I hear is doing very well.

But today, we have just a review of our action items, primarily our action items from the face-to-face meeting that the working group held in the recent Marrakech meeting. Then we will be looking at the public consultation on the Cross-Community Working Group framework. There is a consultation on at the moment. It has, thankfully, been extended, so we have a bit more time to respond. Finally, we'll be looking at the preparations for the working group session at the WSIS Forum in Geneva in May, and we'll have an update from Nigel Hickson on the OECD Ministerial discussions.

Is there any addition to the agenda or amendments to the agenda to be made at this point in time? I'm not seeing any hands go up, so the agenda is adopted as it is currently on your screen.

Our second item is to look at the action items from our last Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance call. I had a look, and there does not appear to have been any leftover action items. Most of the call was dealing with the preparation for the two meetings that we had in Marrakech, the face-to-face meeting and also the public meeting. So at this point, I'm just opening the floor if there are any action items that might have not been recorded that anybody remembers from that call. I'm not seeing any hands up, so that is also closed.

Then let's move to agenda item number three. Now we're looking at our face-to-face meeting in Marrakech. It was a good session. We had a pretty good turnout of people. Nigel Hickson has circulated some notes that Andrea Beccalli had taken during the meeting. I'm not going to go through all of the meeting itself. Just to say that we started a discussion.

You've got the links, basically, in your agenda here. But the agenda itself was primarily just a WSIS Forum workshop preparation and then a discussion on the purpose of the working group and the effectiveness of the working group in providing guidance to staff. There was some good discussion that took place during that session.

We have some action items from that. I thought it would be a good idea perhaps to go through those to see where we are standing as work has continued since Marrakech. There has been a small lull, but it's now back to moving forward.

First, on the WSIS Forum, the planning for the Cross-Community Working Group session, just as a quick summary, the idea is to have a user session to champion the multi-stakeholder process as it relates to the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability and how the final proposal was put together. It might include some recommendations, so a "helicopter view" as one could call it, a complete summary of the recommendations themselves.

The format would probably be the same sort of format as what we had last year at the WSIS Forum, which was a stage and a classroom setting, as one calls it. I believe we now have the location of the meeting, and I believe it's going to be in the same room as we had last year, so a classroom setting. It would be interesting to have contribution from the co-chairs of CCWG Accountability but also a member of the CWG group. That's the CWG Stewardship group as well.

There were certainly some discussions as to maybe if the audience itself is not very knowledgeable or familiar with ICANN, there would certainly

EN

need to be an introduction of how IANA fits with ICANN's role, etc. So it's primarily going to be a session that will be one where people go to learn things. There will be some discussion at the end, but it looks more informational than one where you're looking at discussing the proposal itself and defending it with the outside world. At least that's my understanding of the discussion which took place there.

Several action items. Let me just go through the action items, and then I'll open the floor for discussions on these and perhaps for an update on those action items and whether they've moved forward.

The first is for staff to work with the working group regarding volunteers attending to the ICANN booth. Let's do them one at a time. I know that Nigel has come back to me with an update on this, but could you please let us know what's happening next on this. Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry, Olivier. I do apologize. I was on mute. Yes, well, we haven't done anything specific on this, but I think following this call what we ought to do as I think you suggested is put round a – what do you call it? Oh, dear. My brain is gone. But where you fill in the gaps anyway. A poll.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: A timetable, perhaps, or a Doodle?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, a timetable or a Doodle even.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we could do a Doodle.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. I try to refrain from using these words that are introduced into the English language for some sort of odd purpose. But anyway, yes, we do one of these dreadful Doodle polls, and then hopefully people might sign up to be able to man the booth.

I don't think we're going to do it for the whole week. We'll select the days we're going to do it for, perhaps just two or three days, and we'll go from there. We're not pretending to do anything grand or anything like that. It's just an opportunity to be able to display some literature from the community, from ICANN, or whatever. We can go out to, if you like, ask various parts of the community for any information like ALAC or ccNSO or GNSO if they've got any information they want us to display, of course.

Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. The first question that comes to mind then with this is, it's a multiple question actually, is this an official ICANN activity there at the WSIS Forum? Is there any kind of fellowship or are people sponsored to go there? Or is this really just for the people who will already be attending WSIS Forum?

EN

NIGEL HICKSON: No, I certainly don't think this is an official activity in terms of any sort of formal meetings or anything like that. It's just an opportunity to give out some literature, to have someone sitting behind an ICANN flag which is sometimes quite helpful in case anyone has queries about ICANN. I don't think we're going to make too much of this. If we have to leave piles of literature and people help themselves for half an hour or an hour, then so be it. It's not like it's [inaudible] or anything like that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Nigel. Let's then continue down our list of action items.

Secondly, the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance co-chairs are to ask the mailing list who will attend the WSIS Forum. I guess that's directly related to the earlier question. We can just send a Doodle out with the different days, or a poll, and then people can just fill in the different days. I know that there are several members of this working group that will be going there, but it's probably easier to do that than to just send it out by e-mail and then everyone is going to answer yes, yes, yes, no, no, no and just fill our mailbox with yeses and plus-ones and minus-ones. Could we just have an action item then on just sending the Doodle poll out? Someone is muted again. All I need is just a quick yes or a plus-one or something in the chat so we know that…

NIGEL HICKSON: Oh, yes, of course. Yes, we can do that. Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright, thanks, Nigel. Let's go to the next one then. That's the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance co-chairs to formally get in touch with the CWG Stewardship and CCWG Accountability co-chairs on whether they would be available to attend the WSIS Forum with the understanding that it would be obviously better for Europe-based co-chairs to attend.

I've sent an e-mail out to the co-chairs, and so far there has been a positive response from all of the co-chairs on CCWG Accountability and a cautious response from the CWG Stewardship co-chairs saying, "We need to have more details as to when this would take place and what the arrangements would be."

I understand there isn't any funding for these co-chairs to come to Geneva if they're already not in Geneva. So the next step would be to ask those – I guess formally invite the co-chairs or choose maybe a subset of those co-chairs to come to Geneva. Obviously, as we said, it's probably more cost efficient (except of course if the co-chairs that are based outside of Europe are in Europe at the moment) it would be cost efficient to focus on the Europe-based co-chairs.

Secondly, if they were to ask for funding – so travel, [inaudible], etc. – we would say that they would need to find their own means. Whether there is a budget or not in the CCWG and the CWG for this sort of thing, I have no idea.

This is just to let you know that this is probably the next step forward. I wondered if there were any angles that have been forgotten, or any

objection to us proceeding in this direction, or approval? Okay, no movement here, so that's all fine. No objection. Thanks, Renata. Renata Aquino Ribeiro has joined us. I also noted this.

Next is then the move forward. Do we need anybody else on the panel? We're going to have to think quite carefully about this because it's quite important. But we'll look at in agenda item number five on our call today. We've already done a significant chunk of work on this.

Now next is for staff to check whether there might be any financial support available, and that was the answer. I believe there isn't. So maybe only one co-chair of CWG and one co-chair of CCWG would be needed, and they could be just taking a one-day trip to come to Geneva if they wanted to keep the costs low. We've got Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, sorry for interrupting, Olivier. I'm no expert on ICANN funding. All I have clarified is we don't have any funding on WSIS in general. So we don't have any funding line for people attending the forum in general, but if of course the co-chairs were attending, then it's possible – and it's not my area – that they could obtain funding through the CCWG Accountability or the relevant working group, but not through the general government engagement WSIS process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. A question just as to how to do this: would the co-chairs of the CCWG IG be going through you, or should we just let the co-chairs of CCWG Accountability for them to work their own way with

staff on their side? What I'm asking is, could you perhaps facilitate this and ask staff or let staff in CCWG Accountability that this is forthcoming as well? Or we might just probably copy everyone.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you. We can certainly make sure staff are aware that the co-chairs are being invited to attend this WSIS session, or some of them. I think that we might get around to this under item five, but in your earlier invite, Olivier, you elicited some positive responses from some of the co-chairs. It's possible some would be wanting to come to Geneva for other things or would be just happy to come anyway, with or without funding. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. I'm aware time is ticking, so we need to move on. Next, in the second part of our face-to-face meeting, we had a discussion on the working group purpose and suggestions for the future. There were quite a few suggestions made. Let's just focus on the action items, per se.

Those are that first staff was to submit details of the CCWG consultation to be discussed on the next call. That's indeed what we're going to be discussing in a moment.

Staff is to indicate a link to updated IG timeline. Staff to check on whether ICANN-related timeline could be formatted in such a way that it easily fits on an A4 page. At the moment, it is linearly horizontal and does not fit. Nigel, have you had some chance to look at this and to ask

EN

anyone in the graphical design department or whoever is dealing with this?

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, no, I haven't. We can, obviously, follow it up. We need to, no doubt, update the timeframe from time to time because other things crop up and, indeed, there are other things to put on it. So we can look on how we format it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Nigel. That's something that is an ongoing action item.

Next, staff is to check carefully with Marilyn as to whether she was okay with having her timeline published on the wiki. I haven't seen any response from Marilyn yet. I don't know whether you have received any response, Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: No, I haven't either.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Next, staff to check on whether ICANN-designed timeline could be formatted. That's pretty interesting. It's a repeat of number two.

So action item number five, staff to ensure that having regular updates from the likes of GNSO, ALAC, and ccNSO to be discussed on the next CCWG IG call. That's one thing that we are going to be discussing

shortly, as there are several points. But certainly, there's a preparation for comment on the public consultation on the CCWG framework.

I'm just looking at this section at the moment. We haven't got anything in the agenda that actually would be dealing with this issue of having regular updates from the GNSO, ALAC, and ccNSO. I'll just share with you that I do update from time to time the ALAC with a few details of any of the points that we currently discussed in the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance, but certainly not as a standing item at every ALAC call. Certainly, if there is nothing going on, there isn't any report or anything that is drafted or sent to the ALAC.

I spoke with Rafik a little earlier before this call, and the GNSO has a liaison with this working group, and the liaison has the responsibility of letting the GNSO Council know of progress. Rafik himself is a co-chair of the Cross-Community Working Group but is not on the GNSO Council. So he is not able to follow the discussions there particularly closely but is required and requested to provide updates, obviously. That's something that he would do.

Certainly in Marrakech, there was a session of the GNSO meeting with the ccNSO. The topic of Cross-Community working groups and the one on Internet Governance came up. Questions were asked and all three co-chairs, including Young-eum Lee, were all present. We all answered questions and provided details of what the working group's activities were about.

There is a forthcoming discussion on the GNSO Council later on in April. The co-chairs of the working group will probably be following up on our

next call. Maybe we will be following up on any details that we should give on an update of the working group. But we haven't been formally notified of any requests so far. Requests for any specific details.

That's where we are at the moment on this. I'll open the floor now. One of the suggestions, of course, was for regular updates to be provided to each one. This is in our charter. In some way, it does say there could be regular updates, but there is no slot in any of the supporting organizations or advisory committee meetings that have chartered this working group. So we could propose this on a monthly basis.

Finally, also still looking at the organization of our calls, there was a concern that they were too operational and not substantial enough. You might think that this current call is not substantial enough. And there needed to be some background papers on where issues impact ICANN.

One of the suggestions that was put forward was to separate the informational calls and the consultational calls. The ones that deal with policy could be separate calls. The ones that deal with our own work group's internal work and ongoing work and processes, such as the one we're having at the moment, could be a separate call. So the informational calls maybe that deal specifically with policies would be ones that could be geared toward a wider public, and the other ones, the process calls, are [really] toward the working group participants and members.

These ideas, unless I hear anything against, I think are good ideas. But I will open the floor now for any comment on this. As you know, we never take decisions during one meeting, but now this is a call so there

EN

might be some interest in feedback on these suggestions. What I've just read, by the way, is from the link on the agenda here: "Meeting Notes and Action Items." You'll be able to see all the [prose] and details. The floor is open for comments and questions and discussions. Klaus Stoll, you have raised your hand. You have the floor.

KLAUS STOLL: Thank you. I just wanted to say that I think it's actually quite a good idea to separate the operational from the discussion because people like me sometimes are more interested in the discussion sometimes more than the operations. I think it just would liven up the whole proceedings and give people an incentive to come in and find out what other people think about specific items. I just wanted to say that I support it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Klaus. I have a question then for everyone, and you included. If we were to then have separate calls, would you say that we would have then two calls in a week or would we alternate week-on-week between the operational calls and the informational ones? I'm really looking at frequency [inaudible] here. Go ahead, Klaus.

KLAUS STOLL: I just think it would be quite sufficient to alternate week-by-week because, for example, at the end of the more conversational or topic-based discussion you can [really put it in the last] if there's something

very urgent on the organizational front [like what I mean is] just to clear it up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Klaus. The way I understand it is we could have, let's say, an operational call, such as the one we're having now. And in the Any Other Business, we could then have anything that's particularly urgent as far as policy or information is concerned. And we could also have then, and I'm reading the chat also at the same time, the idea of having an alternation of calls. So the next week, we would have a call that deals only with policy, and if there is anything that is urgent as far as operations are concerned, we could have it also in the Any Other Business, making sure that the Any Other Business doesn't trump (no pun intended, sorry, let's not use this term, I guess) doesn't exceed the amount of time spent in the main part of the agenda. I note your agreement on this, Klaus. Thank you. Good point.

Any other comments or suggestions? Okay, so what we can do then is, as Alan Greenberg says in the chat, we could try this. Therefore, I believe that next week would probably then be a policy call only dealing with policy and no operational issues. I don't see anyone saying no, no, no, so let's then move forward with that. That would then be certainly an action item then, but the next week's call will be a policy call. Please bring the topics forward for the policy discussions.

Let's move on then. How do we decide the policy topics? Indeed, Klaus, well there are several policy discussions that are ongoing, such as the OECD Ministerial. There are others that are out there that we have been

following quite closely like the WSIS+10, like the CSTD was another one. I think that we could probably have discussions on the MAG meeting taking place next week, the Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group at IGF. These are the ones which I would suggest just off the of my head. We could certainly issue a call for topics on the mailing list to have more topics being brought to the table for our policy discussions next week. Probably a good process forward.

Okay, now, next – and I realize the time is ticking, so we need to move – next is the preparation for the comment on public consultation on CCWG framework. As you would be aware, there is currently a consultation that is currently marked as closing on 16 April. It has been extended. It was going to end in a few days' time.

Marilyn Cade and I have been tasked with reviewing the consultation and reviewing the document that has been put up for the consultation. It effectively looks at putting some kind of standards for cross-community working groups. I wouldn't even call it standards. Let's call it guidelines for cross-community working groups. Among the guidelines there, I've looked at the whole discussion and the whole consultation on behalf of the At-Large Advisory Committee so as to provide a kind of a statement from that ALAC on this.

One of the points which I have noticed is that there is a discrepancy or a difference between what's being proposed and the way that our working group at the moment currently operates, which is a bit of a concern because that would then mean that if there was a redrafting of the charter or a re-chartering of this working group, we might end up having a working group that is shut down. The reason being that it is

specifically mentioned in there that a cross-community working group needs to have a start, a middle, and an end, with a final report being delivered within a certain amount of time and with the working group being disbanded after the final report has been supplied. So we are in a bit of a question mark position at the moment.

It's understood that the working group itself would not be in a position to submit a statement to the public consultation because we are not chartered to submit statements to public consultations. However, the co-chairs of the working group could issue, in an individual capacity, could cosign a statement that would put forward points of view that were [emitted] within this community and they would also share their own point of view.

This is not new. There have been some cross-community working group chairs who have shared their points of view on consultations in the past, and certainly the co-chairs of the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability have made use of this ability. So it's not something new, and it's something that we could certainly do. The question is now, what do we decide on moving forward? Should the co-chairs draft something? Certainly, everyone is free to draft something. Should we put together a wiki page? Certainly, I guess I could just open the floor now rather than rambling. Open the floor for suggestions as to what our next steps should be. I see that Alan Greenberg has put his hand up. So, Alan, you have the floor.

EN

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I have two answers. First of all, yes, I think it's quite reasonable for this working group or the co-chairs as appropriate and expedient to make a statement simply pointing out that this is currently a CCWG and it doesn't plan on ending.

The second part of my answer, and I'll put a belligerent warning flag up, is that should the CCWG on CCWG Frameworks choose to ignore the comments that I just suggested we make – and I presume ALAC will also be making such comments – then we rename ourselves CCWG Prime and thumb our noses at them. The day that rules like that say we can't do something that makes sense, I say it's time to simply ignore the rules. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. Are there any other thoughts or comments on this call? Greg Shatan, you have the floor.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you, Olivier. I guess this points out also a way in which this group is different from all other groups that are called CCWGs. Indeed, we predate some of the standardization of CCWGs, which is fine by me. [But since we're a standing committee and not so much a working group per se, I agree that working groups] intend to have a goal and once they meet that goal are no longer required, should have a beginning, a middle, and an end. Not doing that is dangerous at best and a terrible use of resources, but we're not that. Our job ends when there's no more Internet governance. Thanks.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Greg. Any other comments. I thought I'd let you all speak today. I've already spoken enough, so I'd be interested in hearing more feedback on this. I see agreement from Nigel to both what Alan and Greg have been saying.

On the whole thing of renaming ourselves Cross-Community Standing Committee or any other name, one of the points which has been made in the ALAC proposed comment is that at present there are several structures that exist for cross-community work. There is, of course, the cross-community working group structure, which is chartered by the supporting organizations and advisory committees, co-chartered by those organizations, and that therefore relate their work formally back to their SOs and ACs.

There's also a cross-community working party, which is a type of structure that is currently used by the Cross-Community Working Party on ICANN's Corporate and Social Responsibility to Respect Human Rights, the human rights working group of ICANN. That is not chartered specifically by SOs and ACs, and so it serves as a good platform for discussion. But there certainly is a question as to the nature of its relationship with ICANN's SOs and ACs. The working party on human rights is supported by the GNSO, and I do not believe – and please anyone correct me if I'm wrong – I don't believe it is formally chartered by the GNSO nor any of the other advisory committees or supporting organizations.

And there's a Cross-Community Committee. That's one which has been created, the Cross-Community Committee on Accessibility. But again, I'm not sure what the nature of its relationship is with supporting organizations and advisory committees.

Then there are also other review groups like the Geographic Regions Working Group, IDN Variant TLD Issues Project, various review groups which are not part of the AoC mandated Review Teams but slightly different. I'm, again, not so sure about the nature of the relationship with the supporting organizations and advisory committees except that in many of those cases people are selected by the SOs and ACs to serve in those groups. Often, that kind of process is Board-driven or staff-driven in case of an implementation project.

So if this working group here, the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance, was not allowed to continue, I'm not sure what other vehicle could work, bearing in mind that the working group here is really set up to be a good link between the ICANN communities with the Board, with staff, as it relates to Internet governance. It acts as a bridge rather than just a group with a start and an end.

I see both Alan and Greg have put their hands up, so let's start with Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I repeat again, let's put a comment in and see what happens. I believe this is a waste of our time. This group will continue under some name until we either decide we're not doing anything useful or there's no need for us to continue or something will

replace it. If we need to change the name and the title and the auspices under what we're working, let's handle that at the time. If we really don't have anything more important to talk about today, let's adjourn the meeting. Sorry.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Alan. I sense the urge to get moving. Let's have Greg Shatan and close the queue after Greg. Greg, you have the floor.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. I just wanted to note in your taxonomy of cross-community working entities the Cross-Community Working Party on Human Rights appears to be chartered only by the noncommercial stakeholder group within the GNSO, and primarily it draws its participants from within the NCSG. I think there have been participants from time to time from other places or at least individuals like Michele. I participated in one meeting. A couple of things like that, but it's basically an NCSG creation, so it has about the same credibility although perhaps a better name than, say, a committee that the Intellectual Property Constituency formed to discuss matters of concern. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Greg. Thanks for this information. I wasn't aware of the inside details, so that's a good thing to be aware of as well.

Let's then have a call for just volunteers to draft this first draft of this statement. I don't believe it should be ten pages in length. It probably is just a few lines even. We've already got Marilyn Cade and me. Does

anybody else wish to volunteer to just help putting a few words down? And then we can share this with the mailing list and see if it gains traction. I'm saying here this will not be a statement of the working group. It will just be issued in the names of the three co-chairs of the working group. I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so I guess it will be Marilyn and me. Oh, okay, Greg has volunteered. Okay, thank you. Thanks for this.

Let's move on. Next, we have to prepare the CCWG working session at the WSIS Forum. You will note a link to the WSIS Forum agenda. We have got a link to the preliminary agenda – I guess it's an agenda, isn't it – preliminary agenda itself, draft agenda. That's what it's called.

The meeting will be on a Thursday morning I believe, so now we just have to build up on the discussion that we had just a moment ago on the co-chairs and all this. We've already got an action item to now try and get the co-chairs of the CCWG on Accountability into the room. We have to choose as to whether there should be other people on this panel with a caveat that we can't have too many people on the panel since the amount of time that we're being given is not such a long time.

I think, is it 90 minutes or so? I'm not exactly sure. I'm trying to see this. Maybe I should ask Nigel. He usually knows these things a lot better than anyone else here. Nigel, might you know by any chance?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. I'm fairly sure it's 75 minutes, but I'm just trying to find it. I'll confirm in a minute, but just while I'm on if I may, Olivier, thank you. Yes, we've been allocated this session on the Thursday, and then

essentially the workshops take place on the Monday and the Thursday. So I think the Thursday is quite a good slot for us. We'll be able to do what we want essentially. We can have a roundtable type discussion. We can involve the audience, of course. So we're free to do what we want. Last time, as you know, we had several panelists and then we asked questions of people in the audience as well. So it's really up to you how you want to play it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for that, Nigel. Sorry. Alright, I just cut off, so go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: No, no. Sorry. You go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks, Nigel. I was going to say the time is 16:45 to 18:15 on the – is it the Wednesday or the Thursday? I think it's the Thursday. Yes, it's the Thursday. It's called CCWG Accountability. It's in Room Popov 2. We have a sort of [green] amount of time here to discuss this. I guess I open the floor as to whether we should have external participants as well, discussion around the cross-community working group. I guess there will be other participants in the CCWG Accountability who will be there.

I was going to suggest that in the usual tradition we should have gender balance. We should also have geographical balance on a panel. And thirdly that we should be careful about having too many people on the panel. As some of you might have noticed, the time pressures that we ended up with when we had our public meeting in Marrakech. So we

need to restrict this and make sure there is a good amount of interaction.

We haven't got a moderator per se yet, but that last year fell together at the right time. We had a good lineup. It was a good session. This year, I guess there might be more to discuss, a lot more to discuss since certainly the accountability discussions have generated a lot more – I wouldn't say conflict – but certainly you have warm discussions within the IANA discussions, which were quite technical to start with.

I open the floor for suggestions as to who else or how the session flow should be. Whilst I don't see anyone else put their hand up, I could certainly continue with the suggestion that I might have, which is that we could have a short presentation first about the process that was used for the accountability consultations and how the work related to the IANA process that we spoke about last year. That I guess would be the link between the two workshops. And then move on to obtain feedback from each one of the panelists as to how they managed to relate to their community and what it means for them. I guess that's probably one of the ways forward.

I don't see anyone vehemently saying no. There's no one vehemently saying yes either. Any other suggestions? Okay, I don't see anyone putting their hand up here.

Now we are over a month ahead of the time when this will take place. The WSIS Forum is taking place in May. We do have a month and something to finalize things. I was going to ask Nigel, what are our deadlines for organization this? I remember that last year there was a

deadline for the supplying of panelists' names, an introduction, perhaps a paper. Should we have a paper that's submitted there? Certainly, last year one thing that was working so well that a lot of people really appreciated in the room was to have a nomenclature, a page that would give an actual glossary of terms. Certainly, I know that there is a glossary of CCWG Accountability terms that has been developed.

We have a lot more material this year than we had last year at the same time on this process. How do we make sure – can we perhaps have a stocktaking of what material we have at hand? Could that be maybe a good step forward? First step? Am I still on this call, or am I dropped off?

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, I can assure you, you're on the call. Just on the process, personally I think your idea is excellent. We ought to have a paper, and I'm sure that's something that staff can facilitate if the working group want that. We have a final [open] consultation meeting at the ITU on Friday where questions such as deadlines for panels, etc., will be answered no doubt. I think essentially the ITU is pretty flexible usually, and at least as long as we give them names two to three weeks in advance, I think we're probably okay [to get it on] to the website and they'll update the website for us. But, yes, we ought to be thinking in those sort of timeframes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. What I was going to then suggest is I just mentioned a few potential avenues just now on what could be arranged

for the day. The idea of a stocktaking of what material is currently available, and I know there is a lot of material available, would be maybe the first step in asking the CCWG Accountability staff to provide us with details.

Because I think we have to formalize this certainly and find out if they are to make such a presentation at the WSIS Forum – and I'm saying here whatever panelists will be supplied – what material they have to work on that's already available. There is quite a lot of material that's available out there, and how can we arrange the logistics of getting that material and making use of that material. That would certainly be a first step forward. Then after that, once we have a knowledge of what material there is, we'll have a better idea of what the flow could be.

If we could have a short presentation that would be no longer than about 15-20 minutes and then afterwards a discussion with the different chairs, I think we've shown that in last year there was no shortage of questions. Certainly, having seen discussions taking place on some open mailing lists, there is no shortage of discussion either here on both the process that was used but also on maybe some of the contents of the proposal.

Indeed, the question is – and I think maybe we should ask maybe the panelists themselves, the co-chairs of the CCWG Accountability on whether they would be amenable to discuss the actual contents of the proposal as well as the process by which they reached that proposal. Okay, I don't think I'm saying anything outrageous since nobody has shot me yet, so that sounds fine.

EN

Let's then move to the next part of our call, and that's the Any Other Business part with the OECD Ministerial. Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you, Olivier. I'll be brief. The OECD Ministerial on the Digital Economy is taking place the week of the 20th of June in Cancun in Mexico. This is the third Ministerial on the Internet Economy, although the first one was called the Information Society in [1988 in] [inaudible], which I remember well. And there was one in 2008 in Seoul. So this is like – got the wrong year – but anyway, this is 2016 in Cancun in Mexico.

It will feature high-level sessions on the open Internet, on innovation, on consumer trust and privacy, on security issues, all connected to how these contribute to the digital economy. Also, a session on the Internet of Things.

They're expecting about 30 ministers from about 30-40 different countries. The OECD is opening up the Ministerial to several countries in Latin America that aren't OECD members that are in Latin America, and also associate members can attend as well. So it's possible that, for instance, China will likely attend and India probably as well.

The preparations are ongoing and I'm in Paris at the moment for the committee meeting that's finalizing the Ministerial declarations and the other papers. I will be able to probably in a few days' time circulate the final drafts of the main papers.

The OECD, of course, [isn't] a decisional body at all. The Ministerial outcome and the declaration is purely voluntary. It calls on governments to do various things, of course. We're expecting open standards and multi-stakeholder approach on Internet governance and things like that, but it's really a call to arms rather than a U.N. sort of mandate or anything like that. But nevertheless, it's fairly influential. It's backed up by a lot of research papers and background papers which are of great interest.

Stakeholders [inaudible] the process, so ICANN feeds into the technical community along with ISOC and RIRs. We'll have a day of presentation on things like the Internet of Things and security on the day before the Ministerial starts. I'll circulate an updated agenda as well.

Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. I'm just wondering about one thing which is, is there any input from ICANN into the processes themselves? Is ICANN a full member? What's ICANN's relationship with this, or is this really solely with input from governments?

NIGEL HICKSON: No, no. Fortunately, the OECD at a fairly early stage back in 2008 opened up this particular committee, which is the committee on economic stuff, to stakeholders. So there's representation from business, from civil society, from the trade unions, and from the business community. So we sit at the table with the member states.

We're allowed to speak and input into the process. I mean, it's clear if there was a vote or anything like that, then we wouldn't get to vote. But generally speaking, that doesn't happen. Compared with the [inaudible] process, it's pretty open and pretty participative.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Nigel. At this point in time, is there any input required from the community to go toward the process and building the agenda? Well, we did circulate a copy of the Ministerial declaration for any comments, and there weren't any comments. But that's not too much of a problem. It's a fairly high-level declaration. So not specifically at the moment, but in the next day or so, we'll be putting more flesh on the bones of some of the workshops we're doing as the technical community. They are still somewhat in a state of flux. We obviously have more control over those. I will circulate the agenda and ask for any comments or contributions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. I was just going to ask one more question. I think that you sent that draft declaration I think it was during the Marrakech meeting, so it might have been a little lost in the flow. Perhaps we could resend this to everyone. But it did say that the observations should be welcome by the close of 16 March, so it is a bit late to come back now I guess on this.

EN

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Ministerial declaration has been discussed this morning and has generally been agreed. But I'll certainly circulate the updated version.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That would be helpful. Thank you for this. The floor is open for questions/comments. I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so I open the floor for any other Other Business. I guess we've already discussed our next call. That will take place next week. If we could have maybe a Doodle for next week on this.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes? Sorry.

VENI MARKOVSKI: I put a note in the chatroom. In Other Business, there is an event in June 6-7 at the U.N. I put a link to the website where you guys can take a look at it. It's the ECOSOC Multi-stakeholder Forum on Science, Technology, and Innovation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, I see the note. Thank you.

EN

VENI MARKOVSKI: Yes, take a look, please, at this. We don't need to discuss it now. The deadline for submitting proposals for [side events] is April 22. But it's worth noticing that this is the first multi-stakeholder forum under the ECOSOC umbrella. I will know actually more details next week. I'm meeting some people at [inaudible] to find out details.

It's a good opportunity for the community, or at least those of you who are in the U.S. or who have an opportunity to be in the U.S. in New York at that time to [inaudible] [stop by] and see what they're going to discuss. This is preparation for the high-level ministerial meeting in July on the same subject. Needless to say, Internet topics will be discussed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Veni. Could I please ask you to forward a note to the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance mailing list alerting us to this? That would be really helpful.

VENI MARKOVSKI: I will try to [inaudible]. [siren blares in background] I'm on the street now as you can hear, [so I'll leave that] later on today I'll try to do it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Veni. And run. Don't let the police catch you.

VENI MARKOVSKI: No, this is the escort. They're not chasing me. They're escorting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Veni. For the transcript, you can put in brackets there is a siren in the background where Veni is.

Right. I think we've reached the end of this call. I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Next week, we will have the policy discussions and policy updates. Please send e-mails to the mailing list whether you think there are any policy discussions that you'd like to have in next week's agenda. Perhaps we can even send a note after this call. If I could ask Desiree to send a note to the mailing list asking for policy topics to be discussed next week. And the week after, we'll be back to discussing more process.

Next week, I will be for the first three or four days in Geneva for the Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group (MAG) and IGF, so there will be certainly an update on this. We'll follow up with all of the other processes that we've discussed today.

I think that we can close the call now with four minutes beyond the official end. Thanks to everyone having joined. As I said, we'll follow up on the mailing list. This call is now adjourned. Thank you and goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]