DESIREE CABRERA: Okay, there you go.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Desiree. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance conference call on Friday the 3rd of June, 2016.

Today we have an agenda that's quite packed, with Markus Kummer, the Chair of the Board Working Group on Internet governance who is meeting with us. And then we'll be finalizing the CCWG Workshop at the Internet Governance Forum – or a proposal for that. And finally, we will also be hopefully selecting the slot for our face-to-face meeting – the slot that we will be asking for.

In the meantime, whilst you peruse the agenda may I ask for a roll call please, Desiree.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay. In the room we have Avri Doria, Becky Burr, Jim Prendergast, Judith Hellerstein, Markus Kummer, Ryan Johnson, and we have one more person who I can't tell who it is.

For staff, we have Mandy Carver, Nigel Hickson, with Tarek Kamel on the phone.

And for the Chairs, we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, Rafik Dammak, and myself, Desiree Cabrera.

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.

EN

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Desiree. Have we missed anybody in the roll call? Anybody's name not been mentioned? Okay, no one else. Fine.

Thanks and welcome everybody. Are there any amendments to the agenda to be made as it currently is displayed on your screen? No amendments. So the agenda is adopted.

We'll start quickly with the action items from our last call, and the only one that is still remaining is to check on the availability of the presentation video from the WSIS Panel that took place in Geneva a few weeks ago. Nigel Hickson, do you have any update on this?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. I've obtained the YouTube video from the ITU which has all the captioning on it as well and has the whole of the session from the introduction to the question. So it's now a question of whether we can extract from that YouTube video the necessary content to put into another format as a presentation document without the question. [inaudible] has been talking to the IT people in ICANN to see if that's possible, and apparently there is a problem doing it. But perhaps we need to explore it a bit further because I'm sure that there must be a way of doing these things, but it's not that simple because the video we've got has a lot of other content with it as well that the ITU have added in. So it's not just a case of just cutting it in half.

But anyway, we'll continue to look at that.

EN

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this update, Nigel. That's very helpful. For those people that are not aware, this is the video of the Cross-Community Working Group session about IANA stewardship transition and ICANN accountability that took place at the WSIS Forum a few weeks ago. By all accounts it was pretty good, so we felt that there might be worth actually taking a copy of this and using it in other [inaudible] as well.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so let's then swiftly move to today's discussion with Markus Kummer who is the Chair of the Board working group on Internet governance. Welcome, Markus.

As a background, we found out a few weeks ago that the Board has created a working group on Internet governance and that you are the Chair. We have no further information as to what the function of that working group will be, and I guess we can hand over the floor to you to find out what it is about and what your plans are. So, Markus Kummer.

MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. And hello, everybody. My pleasure to be on this call. Yes, setting up this working group has been in the making for quite some time, but as we were busy with other things we were never actually formalized it until recently. But there was a decision in principle taken already in Dublin, but we did not set it in motion.

To give some background, there was a similar group some years back dealing with Internet governance issues, but it was disbanded then presumably because the feeling was then that WSIS was over and there was no need to continue this kind of Board Working Group. And at the same time, I was told that the Board felt the issue was of such

importance that it should be a matter for the entire Board. But as is often the case, when you think something is an important issue and should be taken by the entire body of whatever organization then it falls between the cracks. So some of us felt there would be merit in having a group to discuss issues related to Internet governance activities ICANN is engaged in just simply to have a better flow of information between staff and between Board, and also to ensure more cohesion.

You may or may not have noticed that various Board members pop up in various meetings and quite often we don't know about each other in advance. So obviously there will be merit in having also the exchange of information among Board members – what are you doing? Are you taking part in this meeting? And also that we make sure that we all sing from the same hymn sheet. It's nothing really revolutionary or game-changing, but it is really just to provide a better flow of information and then if the group thinks that there are issues that ought to be discussed by the entire Board, then we can bring it up to the entire Board.

I think it is timely now with also a new CEO in place who has also expressed his interest in positioning ICANN in this Internet governance landscape. And obviously, there are members of the community who are also interested in being a part of this discussion. So I am very pleased. Before we actually have the first meeting of this Board Working Group that will take place in Helsinki, that I have this opportunity to have an exchange with your group here.

That's all from me. Maybe also just a technicality, it is a working group. It has no sort of legal status. There is no reporting of staff to this group. We don't take orders, but the charter says that we are provided

consultation and advice on ICANN's efforts related to the [envelopment] in Internet governance and we consult with staff [on] collaboration and engagement in Internet governance activities. So there will be no surprises, the Board is not surprised by activities by the staff and also vice-versa. That's the basic intent.

And also we have already an evolutionary clause that's scope will be reviewed in six months' time, and whether the group should be continued will be reassessed in two years' time from now.

Well, that's all from me. I'm happy to answer any questions you may have.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Markus. The floor is open for questions from our community. In the meantime, whilst I don't see any hands up I have a couple of questions to you.

The first one is on the relationship between this newly established Board Working Group and the group that you're speaking to at the moment – the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance. You're quite aware that the CCWG-IG was created in the past because there was a feeling in the community to have more interaction between staff and the community on Internet governance issues, and this working group has pretty much filled that mandate. Now that the Board Working Group on Internet Governance is also having one of its aims as being a better interaction with staff and the Board on these issues, how do you see the relationship between the Board Working Group and the CCWG?

MARKUS KUMMER: This is obviously something that will need further discussion also among our working group and between the two groups. But I definitely don't think we are in competition, as the Board Working Group is really just essentially the liaison between staff and Board but it can also, of course, be the liaison between the Cross-Community Working Group and the Board. And in an overall picture, we are clearly moving more towards Cross-Community activities and there the involvement of the Board in these activities is also an evolving process.

But clearly, I think yes, there will be a need also for dialog with this group and I will look forward to continuing this dialog. Also, your group I think is more operational in terms of organizing events and I don't see the Board Working Group as organizing workshops. I attended the workshop you had at WSIS and it was excellent. And on the agenda you have a workshop you're going to submit for the IGS, and I don't think that the Board Working Group will be that operational. Of course, we would be happy – I'm sure that I can speak on behalf of the fellow Board members who are part of this group – to cooperate with you and if you ask one of us or whatever to be part of any workshop, you'll find open doors. But I don't think we will [come] down to the operational level of organizing events. Does that answer your question?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much, Markus. Indeed. I do have further questions for you, not seeing anyone else in the queue at the moment. The other one was to do with the nature of the work of the Board Working Group.

From what I understand from what you've just mentioned, this is primarily a coordination to make sure that you utilize Board members to their fullest extent when they're traveling, and so that there's some coordination and knowledge about what Board members are visiting – what outside event or what are they involved in and so on. The Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance have been working closely with staff when it came to ICANN making a comment in other fora, whether on CSTD, whether in ITU issues, or whatever other kind of requests there are for comments out there. And the way that it has done so is by generally Nigel who is the person liaising from staff with the CCWG, sharing the documents that staff have written and taking in inputs for any amendments or any additional points that might be worth considering and then sending out to the consultation.

Is there a plan by the Board to do this similar sort of thing?

MARKUS KUMMER: This definitely would not make sense in my humble view to have a parallel exercise. If we wish to be engaged in this [inaudible] open discussion among the working group, then my suggestion would be that we piggyback on what you are already doing, that it is one exercise and not two exercises.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Markus. Another question comes down to the relationship that the Board Working Group would have with the ICANN CEO. As we know, he's a brand new CEO, there have been rumors about the CEO wanting to focus more on ICANN's core mandate. We are now

looking at the changes with the Empowered Community and changes in ICANN Bylaws where the mandate of ICANN is now being a little bit more, I would say, enumerated in the bylaws rather than before being quite a fluffy mandate, if you want.

And so the question really comes as to whether now is the right time to start a working group on Internet governance when the bylaws seem to be pointing at ICANN actually reducing its involvement in Internet governance, or wider Internet governance circles.

MARKUS KUMMER: Well, I get the point. But [to draw] the environment, it will not go away. And I do understand the general tendency to limit the scope, but there are issues out there that do need the attention of ICANN as well. I mean, I think there has always been a little bit of tension between – shall we call them isolationists and those who want to engage broadly, and the pendulum is swinging back a bit towards a narrower mission.

But that, I don't think there is less need for this group. I mean, the group – to get back to what it's supposed to be – it's more than just coordination of [inaudible], that I think is in itself a useful function. But it is also to look at what should be the scope of the engagement of ICANN in the broader environment. And the Board, while as I said, was [nominally] interested but had very little opportunity to have a broad discussions of engagement in the broad landscape, this will need to be defined by the Board as to what point does ICANN need to stay engaged. In my view, absence from the discussions is not an option as you leave it to others to take decisions that can have a far-reaching

impact on the organization. But how we define that, that is very much I think up on the Board's agenda and also what is our message we give to the world at large. There is a feeling that the message in the past has sometimes been a little bit too expansive, equating more or less ICANN with the Internet and there is, I sense, in the Board definitely a feeling that ICANN should be maybe a little bit more modest and also make it clear that the Internet depends on a distributed governance system, and ICANN is part of that, has important part but it's not *the* most important actor. It's one actor among others.

There is definitely a need to define to be sharper in – and also in view of now with ICANN to [inaudible] we're going to have how it will define that. So to cut a long story short, while I get your point that it seems maybe counterintuitive to come up with such a group at this point, I think there will be work that will need to be done to position or reposition ICANN in this arena and, again, with the new CEO on board I think it is an opportune time to get started with this.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Markus. I don't see any hands up at the moment. I ask if there are any other questions in the room. I do have another one in the meantime, which is all about accountability with the renewed emphasis about accountability in ICANN at all levels, since we've seen the work of Work Stream 1 and now moving on to Work Stream 2 of the CCWG on ICANN Accountability. What steps are you planning to take in the Board Working Group on Internet Governance to ensure a maximization of this accountability of the Board and

accountability, I guess, of every component part of the Board and therefore accountability of your working group?

MARKUS KUMMER: Now this is part of, like you say, a broader discussion. And you will have noticed in Amsterdam we decided to have our – essentially opening the doors and making our transcripts of our calls available, which has long been done as part of the community. So it's time, I think, the Board follows suit and does the same. And I think this working group is part of that movement definitely. And we also felt that there is also a need to make – there were some decisions taken in the past which came as surprise to the Board as well as the community, and this working group I see very much as one of the functions of making sure that there won't be any big surprises, that whatever ICANN staff and I commence the staff dealing with the Internet governance issues, and that they are [inaudible] with very professionally, that we actually do it also in a very transparent manner. And there your group, of course, the CCWG on Internet governance is also of immense help in making matters transparent.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Markus. We have Jim Prendergast in the queue. Jim, you have the floor.

JIM PRENDERGAST: I'll bail you out on this one, Olivier. Markus, you just really touched on one – it's not a question but more a comment and that is, you talked

about the Board and the community being surprised about some of the decisions that have been taken in this sphere in the past. I think if the Board Working Group's role is to work to minimize or eliminate those going forward, I think that's something that everybody in the community would certainly welcome. There was a lot of angst and energy spent trying to understand why things were happening in the past, and if we can avoid that in the future that's going to benefit all of us. Thanks a lot.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jim. Markus? Yes, please. Go ahead.

MARKUS KUMMER: I just would like to thank Jim for his comment. That's very much in line with my thinking.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And we appear to have lost Markus Kummer.

MARKUS KUMMER: Can't you hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, we can. It sounded like you finished the sentence and were cut off.

MARKUS KUMMER: No, I was just thanking Jim for his comment. That's all.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Markus. I'm used to more verbose speakers that I forget you being a diplomat, things need to be more concise.

One more question for you that I have is with regards to the proactivity of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. You've mentioned a lot of reaction, as in questions and so on. Is there any proactivity in that working group? In other words, what are your focal points in the next few months, and do you have specific focal points?

MARKUS KUMMER: I don't want to pre-empt the first meeting of the working group. It will be up to the working group obviously to decide. But I think what I hinted at was already just to the position of ICANN in the broader Internet governance landscape and the messaging of ICANN. This is something – and I know also you're [on this] very interested in having a discussion and, in the end we may come to the conclusion there's no need for any repositioning. That's fine as well. But I think we do need to have this discussion, and especially also as you said, in light of the outcome of the CCWG on accountability, do we need still to [keep] be engaged? My view is yes. But I think we need to have this discussion.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Markus. Any other questions?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so first I'd like to thank you for joining us on this call. It's been very helpful to hear of this brand new news, as one could say. I just have one, maybe not last question,

EN

perhaps a request for you, which is whether it would be possible to have you regularly on our call. I don't mean on every call, but I'm saying being able to coordinate from time to time and having you on the call during one of our coordination calls would certainly be helpful to establish that link not only between this working group and you, but I guess your working group and the ICANN community.

I know it's early on, but can we have your commitment of regular involvement?

MARKUS KUMMER: Definitely. You are reading my mind. I was actually just going to suggest that it makes sense that we have this kind of dialog, and I was going to thank you for inviting me to have this very first exchange of ideas. This is very helpful, and I think it will also be useful going forward that we have a very close dialog on these issues. Thank you again.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Markus Kummer.

We can now move on. It's the half hour mark, so we have another 30 minutes to continue with the rest of our call. Markus, you're very welcome of course to remain here. We're preparing a proposal for the IGF, if we manage to find it in time. And also are working on just planning out our face-to-face meeting in Helsinki.

So, finalization of the CCWG-IG workshop. A small group has been put together in the same way as has happened for the WSIS Forum, and

Matthew Shears who unfortunately I don't appear to see on the call today. Is Matthew on the call?

He is not, I gather. Matthew Shears has been working with the small group to try and see what panelists we could have and to see how we were going to build this, because there are, first, the deadline is the 6th of June which is only in a couple of days' time now. The other problem is that if we have a panel session, we need to have an actual paper to be written before that that will be submitted at the same time as the request. And thirdly, we also need to have a list of panelists and of confirmed panelists or at least panelists that are aware that we've put them on the list.

The awareness part I'm not too concerned about. It's the function of just an e-mail. I think that we know most of the people, if not all of the people, that are being suggested to be on this panel. But the question really comes as to whether we can have either a paper ready by Monday or whether we need to go for a format that is actually a debate format that is somehow different because a debate would need to have views from each points of view – the for and the against, the yea and the nay.

So that's where we are at the moment. We are looking at the number of panelists that we could have. I guess perhaps the first thing you might ask yourself is what would be the topic? And the topic itself is a small bit of IANA stewardship transition, a larger part of ICANN accountability, but an even larger part of accountability in the wider sense for Internet governance. So we could be looking at the current model in ICANN, the multistakeholder model that we have – how does one make a

multistakeholder model such as the one in ICANN accountable? What are the proposals that were made? But relating this over to a wider Internet governance perspective so as to debate whether this could be a model that is not only possible with other organizations out there, but the wider ecosystem.

We still are in the early days of this. But that was the general outlook for this. I know that others are on the call, that others have taken part in the discussions that are on the call. Perhaps they wish to also share their points of view on this. Perhaps the first thing I should ask is to ask Nigel who has been our focal point – because, of course, it's ICANN that will file this request – so Nigel, I don't know if you have anything else that you'd like to add to this. But I guess that the full discussion here really is to try for us to focus a little bit on what exactly we want to present and to make sure that we present a workshop that will not only be interesting to ICANN audiences, but more so actually, interesting to non-ICANN audiences, and that will also respect the criteria that the IGF has put forward based on the diversity and both geographical and gender and other points which they have added, because, I guess, of this year's overall theme in the Internet Governance Forum.

Nigel, are there any points that you wanted to raise here? Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. We've certainly started. There is an application process, as you say, for IGF workshops. I think all credit to the IGF MAG, they take workshop proposals very seriously. There's quite a competition for workshops and so it's only right that we respect

EN

that and put in a decent proposal. Unfortunately, the website is atrocious – he says not wishing to be quoted – but I just find it abysmal. I can say no more. I've been struggling for hours and hours. I'm submitting two proposals and it's just not easy at all.

Anyway, in terms of the choice of the format, there is a choice. If one does a panel discussion, as you said, one needs to provide a background paper which is not impossible. I can work on that because we've got material obviously from the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability, and other material from the IANA transition proposals. But there is also other formats – the debate format, which may or may not be applicable but Marilyn Cade has suggested helpfully that one could do a round table. That would fit into the so-called Other category. And if one did a round table then perhaps that could be interesting and she suggested in an e-mail on the sort of format that one could use. And then I don't think we'll need a background paper, or one could submit one later. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Nigel. I, unfortunately, had not caught up with my e-mails so I was not aware of Marilyn's note on the idea of a round table. Just as a question, because you filed the request for last year, wasn't it a round table format that we asked last year, or was it a panel format? I remember vividly the setting was a horseshoe fashion. It wasn't one of these tables on a stage. So could it have been that last year we had already filed for a round table, or are these categories new this year?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you, Olivier. I think we asked for a panel, but then we asked for the format of the panel it be in a round table. [inaudible] while he's getting into the detail. But I don't remember this distinction last year, but I might be wrong. But yes, certainly the way that people have been interacting on the list and the excellent contributions we've had from a number of people suggest that it a round table format, as you suggested yourself, could be appropriate, where you effectively have the participants sitting in a horseshoe and the moderator ask them questions. But obviously it's up to this group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Nigel. We have Jim Prendergast in the queue.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Thanks, Olivier. One thing also to keep in mind is this conference venue is not a "traditional" conference venue. It's a historic building where the local hosts have been in their presentations to the MAG been touting the fact that that will allow us to try and do different things. So I think if you want to move chairs around, that's probably a possibility. At least that's what I was interpreting from their presentations, not to expect a traditional conference center that we had, say down in Brazil or in Turkey, or some of the other places, but some place that may lack some of the features and benefits of a traditional conference center but may give you more flexibility to move things around once you're there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Jim.

Any other comments? I was just going to say that I guess our first hurdle really is to get that workshop request filed and for it to be a good enough request for the MAG to accept it. I know that we do have several MAG members in our working group and they have all had to recuse themselves from the preparation of the workshop and, in fact, they have been very good at this. But at the same time, we do need to make sure that we have enough support at the time in the room when that workshop will come up on the screen and the question will be asked as to whether this is something worth putting in the overall IGF agenda or not.

Having been at past MAG meetings, I certainly know that these workshops, either they are absolutely incredible and they go through right away without any discussion about them because people have marked them so well based on the request, but most of the workshops go through a process of discussion at the MAG meeting and then it's a question of who is going to champion that workshop.

So I have no concern about this. I have more concerns about actually being able to have a workshop that is interesting enough for it to actually go through without needing that additional discussion. I don't know what the process will be this year, actually, for MAG members. But, I hear, with more than 200 workshops that might be submitted, that it's a lot of work for them. So good luck and ours definitely needs to stand out.

Is there anything that we need to add at this point? And I'm turning again to Nigel, because obviously I haven't seen Matthew on the call. So I'm not quite sure where he is on this. We have a listing of proposed people on the workshop, a proposed list of people. If I can just quickly turn to it.

For those of you that wonder why the discussions didn't take place in the main working group mailing list, it's because we did have some criticism in the past when we were organizing workshops and discussing people. These are people on the mailing list and these then get put over in the archive and so, and sometimes it's not very elegant to do such a thing.

But the people we have so far shortlisted are as follows. We have Olga Cavalli who would be our participant from the GAC; Carolyn Nguyen from the Private Sector who is working for Microsoft; Izumi Okutani from the Regional Internet Registries. Some of these are people that we did ask for the WSIS Forum, by the way, but they weren't travelling to Geneva and we weren't quite sure of the quality of remote participation so at the end they didn't take part. Jimsun Olufuye from the private sector; Leon Sanchez who is the Cross-Community Working Group Accountability co-Chair and he is from Mexico, so that would be really helpful to have a local there; and Tatiana Tropina also is listed.

We could also have the addition of Maria Maciel who is also from Latin America and Caribbean Region, and also we could have [Farzan Abadi] who, as you know, has been very much involved with many of the different aspects of the different Cross-Community Working Groups. So that's the current short list. This is not finalized yet. We might add more

people – we as in this small group. If you're interested in taking part in the putting together of this workshop – and remember there are only two days, just 48 hours to go. Drop me a note quickly after the call or even now, and you'll be put in the small e-mail distribution as we are.

Nigel, is there anything else that we need to cover at this point? I don't see anyone putting their hand up wishing to say, "Well, I think we really need to this or that." I note that several people who are in that small group are on the call at the moment, so they have already helped out.

Okay, no further comments from anyone. So Nigel, are we okay? We're set to go then? How are we going to do with this? Maybe I can follow up with you afterwards if you want.

NIGEL HICKSON: Just one thing, Olivier. This has been very useful. I think if we did put in the suggestion for a round table, that could fit in quite well with the number of suggestions we've got. You've run through some excellent people. The guidance for a panel is that one doesn't have more than five or six panelists including the moderator, so that would, if you like, limit the representation. But with a round table perhaps we can go further. So that might well help.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. I forgot to mention – and I think everyone has worked this one out – that it would be Matthew Shears who would be moderating this, and if he is moderating a round table, he has moderated pretty good discussions in the past so I think for a round

EN

table that would be really probably a format that he would really thrive in quite well.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so maybe then we can move on with the agenda. But certainly the round table seems to be an interesting format. I'd just like to add one more thing which is that we probably do need to have a discussion paper to maybe kick off the discussion in the round table. But, of course, we're not talking about a 20 – 30 page paper. We might just be looking at a one-pager setting the scene and the questions that we could start off with. And that, of course, the different participants in the round table, once they are all confirmed, can start this up prior to the IGF. We definitely have more time rather than having to send it out on Monday.

Okay, I don't see any hands up, so thanks for this and let's move on to Agenda Item #5, and that is actually a very small agenda item. It's our selection of a face-to-face slot in Helsinki.

As you know, the meeting in Helsinki is going to be a policy/outreach. Actually, it was outreach to start with but now that the meeting has been changed from being in Central America and has been moved over to Helsinki, there is perhaps a slightly different angle to this, and certainly the second thing that needed to be done was the focus on policy. So there are no general meetings out there. There is no large-scale public meeting or a big opening ceremony or meeting of the Board with the community and this sort of thing. It's much more a meeting that's focused on each one of the supporting organizations, advisory committees, doing policy work in their own communities but also meeting up in the afternoons to discuss specific topics.

There is a link in the agenda that shows you the current – and this is the current schedule as in May 15th – so that's 15 days ago. Unfortunately, we haven't got anything more recent to share. But that one actually shows the different formats. Has this been updated maybe? Maybe it has been updated, I don't know. No, it is still May the 15th.

So we had a number of slots that could be available. We sent out a doodle to everyone and a number of people have responded. And I just wanted to have a quick look at the doodle, and so far the options that seem to be the most suitable ones are Tuesday the 28th of June in the afternoon. And the times which are shown on the doodle, by the way, are local times so it would be from 3:15 to 4:45 is the most popular one. The second most popular one is the one from 5:00 p.m. to 6:30, still also on the Tuesday afternoon.

And I just wanted to try and confirm this with you, if there was any objection or any approval here with the additional people that are on this call. The 15:45 to 16:45 session takes place at the same time as a joint meeting of the GAC and the ccNSO, as is currently marked. None of this is confirmed, unfortunately. So perhaps someone in the ccNSO might be to let us know right now if that joint meeting of the GAC and ccNSO is taking place, or someone in the GAC might be able to tell us that. And it also takes place at the same time as the discussion for the charter of this CCWG on the use of gTLD auction proceeds.

So that's the thrilling things. There's nothing else happening anywhere else, or at least it's not being shown on the agenda.

Mark Carvell, you have the floor.

MARK CARVELL: Yes, Olivier. Thank you and hello everyone. Well, as I said in the chat actually, my GAC schedule does confirm that ccNSO joint meeting 3:15 to 4:00 on Tuesday. I think that's happening, in which case you won't have any government people… Well, unlikely you'll have government people able to join which perhaps would be regrettable. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much for this, Mark. Thanks for this confirmation. So, as I said, the second most popular time is from 5:00 p.m. So 17:00 to 18:30 on the Tuesday. That actually doesn't seem to clash against anything, apart from the PDP new gTLD Subsequent Procedures discussion and that's your session leader GNSO. That's a whole group.

So that's again another question mark as to whether we would lose more people or would be prevented from having more people in the PDP new gTLD Subsequent Procedures or in the charter [for the] CCWG on use of gTLD auction proceeds.

Just a question, Mark Carvell. The joint meeting of the GAC and ccNSO is just going to be 90 minutes in length, or does it last the whole afternoon?

MARK CARVELL: No, the schedule has it finishing at 4:00, so it's 45 minutes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this. That means we will have to check on this.

Any other comments in here? Does anybody have any preferences other than the Tuesday afternoon? I note that there are other possible times. There is also Monday from 5:00 to 6:30 had five people in favor. And unfortunately, not many people responded to the doodle so it's a little difficult for us to know whether this really reflects everyone. There is also Thursday the 30th from 3:15 to 4:45, although I'm a little more concerned about missing out the Thursday afternoon sessions since this seems to be the closing – it's not a ceremony – but I guess the closing sessions that involve the Board, the Wrap-Up as it's called. Here we go – "Workload Scheduling and Management: Improving efficiency of SILO and Cross-Community Work Prioritization – Year-Long Planning." The GAC is leading on this.

At this stage, I'm a little confused. I guess many other people are confused as well. So with only Mark having mentioned the concern of the GAC meeting with the ccNSO at 15:15, I do note now that you said it was a 45-minute meeting. These will be requests for slots, so what I'm planning on doing then, in agreement with the other co-Chairs of this working group, is that we should be asking for two different slots. It's not assured that we will get them, but our preferences would therefore be on the Tuesday afternoon. And we will be asking for the two. So 3:15 to 4:45 and 5:00 to 6:30. And if we're told that there is availability in both, then perhaps we can give our preference for the second one rather than the first one.

Any objections? Matthew shears, better late than never. You have arrived, Matthew. We have five minutes. I was going to ask, any other business [then]? And in the Any Other Business, perhaps since I haven't seen anybody ask for any other business earlier in the call – I don't know if anybody wishes to ask any other business but we have four more minutes until the end of this call. We have spoken about the finalization of the workshop. We have spoken about the format which could be a round table. And I've briefly given a current listing of proposed panelists or proposed participants. And you have been announced as the moderator for this. Did you have anything else that you needed to ask at this point, bearing in mind we have two days until the closing date for filing this request? Is there anything else you'd like to ask this group?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Can you hear me, Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you, Matthew. Welcome.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes, I do apologize. I'm sorry for coming in so late. And based upon our exchanges, I think on e-mail, I think we're in a pretty good place. I like the suggestion – and it had completely slipped my mind – I like the suggestion of the round table. I would say that we have to be careful about the round table because we need to ensure that the facilities can actually accommodate the round table format. One of the challenges

we had in Brazil was that we did not actually have round tables when there were supposed to be – I'm not saying physically round tables – but we did not have the ability to have a round table format or layout in those rooms where we thought we would have. So in my particular case, I had organized a round table session where we had to spend five to eight minutes reorganizing all the tables and everything. So I think the round table is the right way to go based upon what I think we're trying to achieve with the session, but we just have to make sure that we can actually make it happen, so to speak.

Just a couple of other things. I think that the diversity of the proposed panelists I think is good. I think we should – as long as everybody is comfortable – I think we should [inaudible] with what we have at the moment. Obviously drop a note to those who haven't been asked or e-mailed on the list who are the panelists, but I don't think it will come as much surprise. And we can always add/subtract as we go forward. And I'm happy to be the moderator if that's what everybody wants. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Matthew. And on the round table format, we had Jim Prendergast who spoke to us a bit earlier about the actual location which apparently is a historical site and the ability to have the actual format that we request is actually higher than in Brazil. So apparently the local hosts will be very accommodating, and that's certainly good news for us.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Excellent.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Any comments or questions on this now that Matthew Shears is with us?

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, if you don't mind just taking you back to the face-to-face [meeting] for a second.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Please go ahead, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: On the face-to-face meeting, in terms of the agenda we had suggested at a previous call that we invite the new CEO Göran Marby to perhaps come and talk to us for five minutes or something. Is that something that the group would still like, because we'd obviously need to consult his schedule on those two times on Tuesday as well, as that could have a bearing, so to speak. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much for this, Nigel. With regards to inviting the new CEO, yes, that was proposed. And I think that I haven't seen anybody speak against that. So it would certainly be great if we could have five or ten minutes with the new CEO to find out what his views are on not only Internet governance but what he plans to be doing in that field. And, of course, to let him know of the fact that we do exist and maybe

perhaps give him a bit of a background as to why we're here somehow. But at the same time, I think it would be great to also have Markus Kummer in that session. So if we can get both Markus and Göran Marby to join us, that would be great.

But I guess now we know the preferred timings for our group, we probably need to find out – you're quite right – the preferred timings for them. So perhaps if you could check with Göran's office and also with Markus. I know we have Markus on the call. Maybe Markus will be able to follow up afterwards and let us know whether he would be able to make it to our face-to-face session.

MARKUS KUMMER: Well, I don't have the overview of my schedule yet, but I will definitely make it a priority.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Markus. That's helpful. Mark Carvell, you had your hand up a bit earlier.

MARK CARVELL: Yes, I've kind of lowered it because I was just checking it out, really. But I just wondered actually if, as this is an ICANN proposal and that's from an Internet-related organization, whether it might be eligible to submit it as an open forum. But I'm checking further. The open forums at the IGF are primarily for governments and inter-governmental organizations. Is that right? I don't know. I was just musing on whether that was a possibility to submit it as an open forum proposal, in which

case you'd have until the 20th to finalize it. It would give you longer. But maybe I'm totally wrong as to whether it's eligible as an open forum. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Mark. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you, Olivier. And thank you, Mark. The open forum, we are putting in a proposal for ICANN as is normal at the IGFs to have a sort of an open open forum where we were open for participants at the IGF to ask the CEO and perhaps other members of the ICANN community a whole range of different questions on the IANA transition and the new gTLD application process, new accountability measures, etc. So yes, that will be an ICANN open forum. So I think that's a bit different from this. We probably couldn't do two open forums as such. But thanks for that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Nigel. That's helpful. And, of course, you've all guessed we're talking again about the discussion of the CCWG-IG workshop at Internet Governance Forum.

Okay, I think we have a number of action items on our list which include Nigel to come back to us with the timings that are possible for Göran Marby to meet with our community on our face-to-face meeting slot in Helsinki. I've got the action item to follow up with Gisella Gruber who is our [inaudible] at the ALAC that will be asking for the ad hoc room. It will be a fully serviced room, so for those people who are not able to

EN

make it to Helsinki you will be able to follow remotely, which is great news and I hope that you will if you're not coming in person.

Apart from this, I don't see any other additional hands up. We are four minutes past the top of the hour, so I'd like to thank you all for being on this call. I have asked for any other business. There doesn't seem to be any. No, I don't think we will have interpretation, Judith, because it's not an ALAC room. It is a set of rooms that are available for booking starting from I think today. So I'd have to follow up very quickly. Or maybe from Monday. So we'd have to follow up pretty quickly on these. But they do have remote participation.

So thanks to everyone for having been on this call. Thanks very much to Markus for having joined us. And I guess many of us will be seeing each other in Helsinki. Safe travels to everyone. And if we have any follow up, both on process but also on policy – and policy is important – then please follow up on the mailing list. And we will be definitely building our meeting in Helsinki on the mailing list. Just a few topics that we need to discuss obviously, including CSTD and others. So, thanks and this call is now adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]