
DESIREE CABRERA: Okay, there we go.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Desiree. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance call on the 17th of August, 2016. The time is 15:00 UTC. Today we've just got an agenda that's... Let's first start with a roll call. This is a call, by the way, that is just an organizational call so we are going to discuss primarily all of the meetings that we have to organize in the near or less near future. But we do have some deadlines, so let's get going.

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

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay, in the room we have Klaus Stoll and Mary Uduma. For the Chairs we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond and Young-eum Lee. And for staff we have myself, Desiree Cabrera, and Nigel Hickson.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Desiree. Did we miss anyone? It looks as though we haven't, so welcome everybody and let's start immediately with the agenda Item #2. You'll notice that there are no action items from the past calls or meetings because all of the action items that we had were all completed. And the other action items that we had did not

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.

have to do specifically with any of the work that we're going to discuss today. As I said, this is an organizational call.

So let's get going immediately with the ICANN 57 planning. There are three parts to this. And there was a bit of a confusion on the mailing list and so maybe I might ask Nigel Hickson because I might be the one that's completely confused but there was the search for a high interest Internet Governance Public Forum discussion. There is the face-to-face meeting and then there is a public session. So actually I don't know why it's a high interest Internet governance, it's a high interest public forum discussion at ICANN 57.

Nigel, you had a look at the e-mail as well that was received. So the e-mail that I received was through the SOs and ACs – the Supporting Organization and Advisory Committee – Chairs mailing list that announces all of these organizational details. And to me it read very much like the past arrangements where you do have one or two high interest topics that are shepherded by the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees. In the past there have been topics on IANA Stewardship Transition, there have been topics on the new gTLD Subsequent Procedures, and various other things. But these were all run and organized by the SOs and ACs. That did not look to me as though it was the same thing as what we were doing as a Cross-Community Working Group which was our public session and was entirely independent of the Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committee process.

But Nigel, you might have a different information on this. So Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. Thanks very much. Good afternoon. Really I think I don't have a different position. So essentially what we had done at the last couple of ICANN meetings – not the last meeting in Helsinki because that was if you recall a so-called B Meeting where we didn't have the same ability to organize sessions but for the I think the Marrakech meeting and the – Marrakech? Yes, Marrakech meeting and the meeting before that – we asked to have the Internet Governance session as a high interest session. I mean not one selected by the SOs and ACs, but we had the ability to in addition to that session which could be ICANN Accountability or whatever, we had the addition to nominate other high interest topics and we put in the Internet Governance public session as the high interest topic.

That's why I thought it was the sort of same thing, but you're right it's slightly different. The SO/AC thing is more specific to the SO/ACs and what we were doing in the last couple of meetings is putting Internet Governance public session as a high interest topic because we thought it would gain more credence that way. But of course as is mentioned, we don't have to do that. We can just put an application in in the normal way.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Add that we did receive two apologies – one from Veni Markovski and one from Matthew Shears for this meeting. So Desiree, if you could

please record these as well. I think that you have been copied on it, so they should be recorded.

Over to you, Klaus Stoll.

KLAUS STOLL:

I just wanted to inform you about an event which might fit in here which might not fit in here which we proposed NPOC together with part of the [inaudible]. You know with the GNSO reform [inaudible], there is a lot of talk and outreach of the GNSO with the other groups but our thought was that it might be a good idea to actually get the other stakeholders in ICANN actually to voice their expectations and their views about the GNSO. So we proposed an in-reach event for Hyderabad 57 under the title “The Role of the Non-Commercial Stakeholders within ICANN: A Dialog to Foster Understanding and Cooperation with ICANN” and we actually put up a wiki of speakers which is basically to have introduction housekeeping by [inaudible] done in Part 2 – The Role of Non-Commercial Stakeholders within ICANN” hearing from David Olive [staff], Steve DelBianco, and James Bladel, and then have a question and answer moderated and then a panel basically with the different proponents – David Olive, Steve DelBianco, James Bladel, [Pete] from the NCUC, me from NPOC, and [Kapani] from the [inaudible].

If that is an event that would fit in there I don’t know, but I just thought I’d run it by you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Klaus. You mentioned, is that taking place during the ICANN meeting? Is that a pre-event?

KLAUS STOLL: No, that is not a pre-event. We put in a request for a time slot during the ICANN meeting.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: During the ICANN meeting. Okay, thank you. So then maybe if you can drop a note to the mailing list about this as well, that might be interesting. I have no specific wish in one direction or another, but it sounds like an interesting session.

KLAUS STOLL: Okay, I'll go forward to the mailing list.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that should be great. Yes.

So if we start with 2a – the high interest public forum discussion – and there have been some in the past: “Internet Governance in Transition: The ITU as a Battleground for rival Vision” is one suggestion that was made. It’s a blog from David Gross – Ambassador Gross – there was some discussion on the mailing list about his blog post and so some members have said, “Well maybe that could be a good interesting discussion that we could have.” But then I’ve also noticed that there

was some opposition to this idea because we are ICANN and some are saying, “Well, why are we discussing ITU at ICANN?”

There is a question, I guess, first as to whether we want to have both slots in a high interest discussion, which is what it seems we’ve filed for in the past or whether we want to just file for our own public session. Nigel, is there a difference between the two as such as the way that we have to file it, and is there any potential for having a difference as far as the time slot is concerned because I recall that in the past there was some discussion to have our public session earlier in the week rather than later in the week?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. Perhaps we should be clear. So what we did – and I think we did this for at least two or three ICANN meetings, perhaps for 53, 54, 55 – is we put the Internet Governance session – the normal Internet Governance public session that we organize altogether – we put that in as a high interest topic discussing the IGF or the ITU or whatever the topic was, and the face-to-face meeting of the CCWG we just put in as a normal topic. I mean, that wouldn’t be a high interest topic because it’s a normal working session.

The perceived advantage of having a high interest topic is that you’re given a better choice of rooms perhaps, you’re given a room that has certainly remote participation but also remote hubs. You recall that for ICANN meetings for all the high interest topics now we have this remote hub system where you have groups of people in various countries and they come in, so we have that ability if we have a high interest topic.

But you're right, Olivier, in that if we have a high interest topic, high interest topics are only in certain slots. They're like the Monday afternoon and the Thursday I think and whatever. Although this meeting in Hyderabad might be different, I don't know. But we would be constrained when we could possibly have the session.

And also it's in a big room, so that was another slight issue that we had a big room and sometimes it's difficult to fill a big room. So with a high interest topic you get a bit more prominence and you get the remote hubs as I said. But it doesn't mean to say we can't have the session. We don't have to put it in as a high interest topic, we can just apply for it in the normal way and we can apply for the Internet Governance public session, and we can apply for the face-to-face meeting as two separate issues.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel.

So my next question then goes to everyone on the call. Do you think that we should have both a high interest topic and a public session? Because it looks to me – and I'm not seeing anyone move at the moment – but it looks to me as though it really is either one or the other.

And I guess that I can see certainly the advantage of applying through the high interest topic. The exposure is obviously what we wish to have as a Cross-Community Working Group. I can see the inconvenient which

is that we might be told, “no, you can’t have it.” But does it mean that if we don’t get a high interest topic slot we could be getting a public session slot, or is it a case of all or nothing? I’ll ask Nigel and then come to Klaus in a moment. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thank you, Olivier. No, absolutely no. If we put in for a high interest topic, it goes into a different selection routine, if you like. And if the meetings team come back and say, “Well, sorry CCWG but we’ve got enough high interest topics.” Then it means that we can still have the session, we just don’t have it as a high interest topic. So we don’t lose the IG public session. I think that would be somewhat odd because we’ve had an IG public session at all ICANN meetings certainly since Costa Rica apart from the last one when we had this new form of meeting.

So if we put in tomorrow for a high interest public session and we were told that, “Well I’m sorry but the agenda’s full,” or there’s other then we could just put in in the normal way. We wouldn’t lose the session.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Nigel. Klaus Stoll.

KLAUS STOLL:

Yes, I think the same as Nigel but the question I think is very simple is, do we really have a topic that is of very high interest to most of the

stakeholders and able to fill a big room? And if not, then I just would go for a normal session.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Klaus. And I note that Young-eum Lee says she suggests having one. So I gather this is the mentioning that we should apply for the high interest topic and if we don't have something that's of importance enough, then we can always fall back.

So then the question is the topic itself, as Klaus has opened the door to this one. Do we have a topic that is interesting enough for the wide ICANN community? I haven't seen any suggestions apart from the "ITU as a battleground for rival visions." What I do note, though, is in the past public sessions, the session that we had in – and we can already see the past sessions that we had – we had a session in Marrakech and we had another session that was in Dublin. I've just checked the links for these ones. The type of topics that we had, the one in Dublin was about the WSIS + 10 Review Process and the preparations for the IGF in Brazil and a discussion of the ICANN objectives and all sorts of pertinent Internet Governance issues. It was more of an informational session.

The one that we had in Marrakech was in three parts. There was a quick GAC high-level meeting report, there was a WSIS + 10 process discussion, and then there was supposed to be a discussion about fragmentation versus openness. And unfortunately, the WSIS + 10 process and the GAC high-level meeting report took so much time that we ran out of time and were not able to do the fragmentation discussion.

So that is still something that's on the table. Would we be interested in perhaps having a fragmentation discussion on this? That's the suggestion I'd be putting on the table for this. The second suggestion is the ITU as a battleground for rival visions. Are there any other suggestions here or is there any support for these two suggestions?

The only thing on a procedural level that I would suggest, having seen the tension that went around the last session we had in Marrakech was if we have more than one topic – and in fact this has happened also in Dublin and it's happened before – if we have more than one topic we end up having one topic taking more time than the other. Usually the first topic taking more time than the second topic. And we need to have very, very, strong moderating to be able to end the discussion there and then. I would suggest on this occasion that we just stick to one topic then. We might have just an update on something and then a major discussion topic. Because if we have an update on something, we can certainly tell people who are providing an update we can give them 10 minutes and that's it. If we start a discussion it's very hard to stop it halfway through and then say, "Well now let's talk about something else."

So I'd say maybe update on something to start the meeting – 10 to 15 minutes – so maybe on the working group's activities since this is the public session of the working group in a way – and then after that dig straight into the big discussion.

Are there any comments on this? I note that Nigel mentions in the chat we did also discuss flagging the IGF maybe as an update. And certainly yes, Nigel, I think an update on the IGF would probably fit well in the

first part of our public high interest session. So update on IGF, update on WSIS on what's been happening so far, no more than maybe 20 minutes, and then one big topic of discussion. But I guess we need to choose that topic of discussion. And just as a reminder we have until tomorrow. And I believe, Nigel, do we need to furnish the topic for discussion if we want to have any chance of getting a green light for this?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. I think on the update we could give the examples on the sort of update, the work of the group and on what we're doing at the IGF or something like that. But for the main discussion topic, if we think fragmentation is – and we did obviously prepare for this discussion as you rightly said and then we didn't have time – and I'm not saying it's the best thing since... but it is pertinent. The WEF are having a meeting later in the month in Geneva and it's on the agenda for that as well and it is an issue that crops up quite a bit in various discussion fora and there are various proposals on for workshops at the IGF on fragmentation.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Nigel. Anybody else wishing to contribute to this? I'm typing at the moment so the current proposed discussion topics we've got fragmentation, we've got the various ITU discussions I guess, and then we have – any other thoughts for our main discussion topic?

I see Marilyn Cade wishes to speak. Yes, Marilyn. You have the floor.

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you. My apologies for being late. I'd just like to be really careful. I posted this on the list but I'm going to say it again, I think we need to be careful that we're not ITU-centric, and I want to comment about why that is important. I know that some of us primarily follow the ITU activities. I'll be happy to post my revised timeline again. But I think we need to be really careful here. I think we need to be thinking as we are a CCWG-IG we also need to recognize that there are other UN entities that are engaged in work that is relevant and influential that ICANN needs to follow – that means the staff and the CCWG-IG need to follow.

So let me mention three. One is the CSTD – the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology for Development – has an upcoming launch of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, but also the launch of the Intersessional work. So that's one.

The second is that UNESCO is increasingly I think important for us to follow, and they have a really special event that's coming up at the end of October that is about the – I'm trying to think of a good way to say this – about the misuse of the technology for radicalization. Now while that's not an ICANN issue, it's an ICANN community concern.

The third is the IGF itself. I'm a MAG member and so I want to be careful that I'm focusing on my role as a MAG member. Yes, ICANN put forward certain proposals, but I think there are other activities that it would be good for us to be aware of because it isn't just the ICANN open forum or the ICANN booth. Most of those need to be about what staff drives, but

I think there are other opportunities to support how ICANN supports the IGF and that includes providing funding for Fellows and bringing forward broader voice. And then I'd like to later please come back to talk more about ICANN 57.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Marilyn. Just to mention your table of key Internet activities in 2016 is actually linked to this agenda, or at least a recent version I think is linked to the agenda under the public session part. [Tijani], you can click on that and you can see the forthcoming activities.

Marilyn, I also recognize that you arrived – I don't know when you got on the call – but we are planning the public session and the high interest public forum discussion as one because we are going to go for a high interest public forum discussion, and if we don't get that then it'll be a public session of the working group. So that's how the whole agenda has now somehow come together.

On the topics that you've mentioned – so CSTD, UNESCO, and IGF – would these just be okay as updates for our public forum discussion, or do any of these warrant the possibility for a wider discussion, so digging into the topic? Bearing in mind that having more than one topic is going to be really hard, that we've seen how things have panned out in the past, and so it probably would be better to just focus on one big discussion topic for our high interest public forum session.

MARILYN CADE: Let me comment. I've just typed this into the chat. Short updates, short updates, I mean really short updates, and then a major topic. I fully support that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks Marilyn. So we just have to focus now on what would the topic be, that major topic. We've got fragmentation on the table at the moment. I've noticed some push-back – and in fact I saw it also on the mailing list – regarding having a discussion about ITU, specifically because of what you've just said as well, Marilyn, the CSTD/UNESCO/IGF sustainable development goals, all of that is going on. Then do we have any other alternative?

Fragmentation looks good at the moment. We were going to address it in a past meeting. We didn't manage to do so. And as Nigel said, the World Economic Forum is working hard on this as well. And there are some significant components when it comes to ICANN and fragmentation.

Are there any other topics that we might wish to go with or are we okay with fragmentation? I'd like to hear from everyone on the call. Go ahead, Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: I just want to ask a quick question. Look, we have a very sensitive timeline on the IANA transition and the accountability work. I am very positive that we're in a positive moving forward. So I'm assuming that

that's going to be taken care of in other sessions at ICANN. If that's the case – and I hope we're all in agreement that's the better strategy we don't take that on – instead we focus on... I'd be happy to focus on fragmentation but I don't want to make it just about... I think we've have a little bit too much of... people who are funded to engage in this debate and I'd like to make sure that we be very broad in the speakers on fragmentation – we reach out to people like [inaudible], we go to [inaudible], we don't just focus on the World economic Forum study funded by somebody I'm not going to say I don't know, or by others who are funded but let's go into the community.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you for this input, Marilyn. Anyone else? Young-eum Lee mentions in the chat that she agrees with Marilyn. So I don't see anyone objecting to this. I see agreement here, so that's good. Going once, going twice, I don't see anyone else swinging one way or another specifically so it looks like fragmentation is probably the way forward but I note as wide as possible a panel. I would imagine that as someone who was going to introduce it we would have to invite Bill Drake to speak as one of the panelists. As you know, he was a representative in this working group but he has now left and is doing other things, but he would be one of the panelists that you mentioned. [inaudible], you mentioned a few.

Nigel, do we have to provide a list of proposed panelists or can we just write a spiel about the description of the thing itself?

MARILYN CADE: Hold on. I don't agree there's any certain speakers. I think we come up with an agenda and a program and then we define the speakers. I'm not willing to turn things over to somebody just because they used to be among us. They are highly respected, but look, let's define the agenda and then you define the speakers.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Marilyn. I'm just saying at the moment do we need to list speakers? If we need to list speakers, I would say that Bill Drake would obviously be one person that we'd be putting in there. I'm not saying that we are to choose speakers and then define the agenda. That's obviously not the point.

Nigel, do we need to define speakers or can we just define the agenda at this stage?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you. I'm sure we can just define the agenda, if I recall rightly. And I must admit my memory is not as good as it should be. I think what we have to do is we write a paragraph describing the session, agenda items, and I think what we've discussed so far and what we might discuss in the next half an hour or whatever will be sufficient for that. And then later on we can define who the speakers are. Obviously in describing Internet fragmentation perhaps we could just as an example give a link to the WEF paper and perhaps there might be some other papers we can give references to. That might be of interest to people, but I don't think we have to have speakers as such.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Nigel. I'm putting in the chat a cut and paste from the Marrakech discussion and the people that were listed there as panelists were Bill Drake, Patrick Feldstrom, and Ihsan Durdu. And I don't know whether we would have to choose them now, but obviously this was the idea then. There's no spiel associated with it, so obviously if we can do a little spiel about this – fragmentation versus openness – and then leave the whole point, have a link of course to the fragmentation paper but then not go any further than that as far as panelists are concerned, just do a spiel of what we expect the discussions to be about. And I think that Marilyn has gone in the right direction for the spiel on what it is.

I see Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. I don't think I've ever seen a need for identifying the panelists or the detailed agenda when you're applying for a session. If it was a session just for the group, then all you would need to do is provide a title. If you're trying to sell it as a high interest session so the other ACs and SOs agree that it's a high interest session, you obviously have to flesh it out enough to make the case. Other than that, the other details – the full agenda, the speaker list, other things – get filled in much later.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Alan. We're all in agreement – so no panelists yet.

So the topic itself – fragmentation. We should be obviously looking at various angles to it, and I would have suggested that maybe the discussion that we need to try and generate in the room is all about how this is affecting ICANN and sort of a more ICANN focused thing, or would you say that we need to have a wider view than just focusing on the ICANN component part of fragmentation?

MARILYN CADE: Can I just make sure I understand. Right now I'm looking at...how many participants? Ten? I think we need to be careful that what we're doing is putting forward a very strong proposal and then asking for the comments. So I'm just going to make a comment.

Years and years and years and years and years ago, some group walked into ICANN and proposed an alternate route. Talk about fragmentation. I think we need to say to ourselves, what is ICANN's role, what does fragmentation mean, and then what is above – I'm just thinking about this. I've got a few people on this list who understand this comment – we have in the ISO stack we are at the bottom three layers of the ISO stack. Not everybody understands this, but I'm looking at this list and most of you do.

About that ISO stack, we could fragment the Internet from a content and information standpoint and blow the entire Internet up. So I think

it's important to ask about what is ICANN's role in fragmentation, how do we prevent fragmentation in our three layers, and then how do others who engage in ICANN or [veb] ICANN understand the risk of fragmentation?

That's an educational comment. But I think we should start with a building block of let's make sure we at least have some senior technical speakers about the risk of fragmentation in our three levels, and then we build above that.

So we're in India. And I just want to make this comment. I'm trying to get the Indian business participants to attend and they don't really actually understand that all of this matters to them because they're building stacks. So why don't we take into account the fact we're going to be in India and we're not just talking to ourselves. We're talking to the Indian NGOs, the Indian business, and the Indian government players.

If we could have speakers on the bottom three layers and then build on top of that, I think this session would be really important about why fragmentation matters. It means you can't send an e-mail and expect it to be delivered. It means you can't send an attachment. It means you cannot actively contribute to how your community in your country is connected to the single authority of the Internet. I'm hoping Mary might be able to speak, but I'm just going to say fragmentation matters. And I think we need to describe why it matters.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Marilyn. Thank you. I'm taking a few notes and things are taking shape. So you recommend the first part of discussion would be informational, as in what is fragmentation and focusing specifically on the ISO stack at the bottom three layers and perhaps even explaining that. Then after that, why fragmentation matters, how that translates to end users, to participants in the room, to people that are going to use the Internet and why this matters? Would you say "why this matters" when it relates to ICANN or actually "why this matters in general"? Because then I could say well then the third part is how that relates to ICANN, and then start a discussion on this basically and saying what can ICANN do on this? Or should anything be done in ICANN about this?

MARILYN CADE: Olivier, you've just said something that I think is really valuable, and that is made it into a four layer. I think that's right. We talk about why we matter at the fundamental three-layer of the ISOC at the ISO stack and then we talk about why we affect everyone else, and then we talk about why everyone else ought to care about what we do at ICANN and then we talk about why ICANN needs to be engaged with everyone else outside of our own community.

I have a chart. I'm hoping to find it. I shared it with Sally. I'll ask the ICANN staff to find it for me. But it was a chart which showed how we are small but we're critical, but we influence others but others build on us. And I think that's the message we want to give and then we support the idea that ICANN needs to be an informed player in these other very critical additional Internet Governance events to prevent fragmentation.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That sounds like one of the conclusions already or one of the potential conclusions or directions in which we're going. Thanks for this, Marilyn. Are there any comments on this now? I'm going to do a quick cut and paste so you can see that. I see that people say that this makes sense. I've just done a little cut and paste on this.

And just as far as our process is concerned, obviously the deadline for filing those requests is tomorrow. So what I'm planning on doing is I'll work with staff immediately after this call and we will be forwarding a summary of this discussion and of the proposal to the mailing list and see what kind of a feedback we get on our mailing list until tomorrow, and then Nigel can pick this up on the mailing list if there is any serious opposition to this or any amendments and so on and build it into the proposal so that we can file it tomorrow.

Are you okay with this, Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Of course. Yes. We can work on something and submit it. I mean we can look on the submission form and see what other details we need, but I think with this sort of discussion we'll have enough material.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Excellent. Thanks for this, Nigel. I see Young-eum Lee says that this topic makes sense. Judith, you mentioning that the deadline had

been extended until the 1st of September. Nigel, have you heard something like this?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Nigel didn't hear it. Nigel said he didn't find it because I remember hearing it on a call last week that it was extended. But I don't remember any details, but I mentioned it and maybe staff know about that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Judith. Nigel, if we could please check if this has been extended because that will make our life a little easier since we'll have more time to pass this proposal by the working group and also to refine it and make it a little bit fuller than just jotting down a few lines about what this session is going to be about.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. When I saw Judith's message I did pick this up and ask the Meetings Team and one of the Meetings Team came back and said that they weren't aware of this. It's possible that someone's agreed an extension, but most of them seem to be on vacation or away. I can certainly try and find out in the next 24 hours I'll do some more calling tonight. There's nothing on the website to suggest that the dates' been changed, but of course it might have been. But yes, we can start working on this anyway under your proposal I think. I think there's quite a bit of material here.

Just while I've got the microphone, so to speak, the one thing that I know we'll be asked to... we have to put in our request if you like, as

well as the description and the proposed agenda which I think we've got, we need to indicate when we might like the session – whether at the beginning or the end of the week and of course the week is a bit different because it starts mid-week this time and whether we want a workshop type format. That's what we've asked for before, an interactive format rather than a panel as such. But I await your advice.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. So know that the week this time is somehow not starting in the beginning of the week. Let's just call it towards the beginning of the meeting or towards the end of the meeting. I recall from previous discussions that we were preferring the earlier part of the meeting.

Marilyn, I heard your voice as well. Was it in relation to this?

MARILYN CADE: It is. I have no idea what, Judith, you've seen, but the rest of us haven't seen it so why don't we just park that and focus on what we know if that's okay with you. I think instead we ought to focus on what's the best [time]. I'm going to say a couple things. The Business Constituency that I'm a part of, we're going to focus on the Monday and Tuesday. Indian business is not going to attend Saturday and Sunday. I have no idea why the business – I have no idea why the meeting staff didn't understand that that doesn't work, but that's okay. The point is we only have, I think, three days. That's Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, of the second week. If we could focus on the Monday afternoon or the Tuesday afternoon, it's very difficult for us to get everybody to come to

our sessions. If we could publicize soon what our time is. I think we also have to understand that the GAC members are not going to be able to stay the entire seven days. I've spoken to several and they're asking me who I think I am, frankly. So if we could just pick the Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, of the second week of the seven days, don't expect to do something on Saturday or Sunday. It just doesn't work. And then we prioritize what we're doing, which I think is an important session.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Marilyn. Really it will depend on when the high interest sessions are. Nigel, do you have a copy of the meeting block schedule that is out there somewhere? Maybe Alan has a copy of it. I don't know. But the meeting actually on my calendar seems to be starting on the Friday, is it? So on Thursday or Friday and then goes over the weekend and then continues Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and finishes on the Wednesday.

So Marilyn, you seem to be pointing out as looking at the end of the ICANN week rather than looking at the beginning of the full ICANN meeting week – as in ICANN meeting week, not the week itself. This is how confusing the holes are and [then] gets it starts on a Thursday and finishes on the Wednesday. So you're looking at Monday, Tuesday, being the last two days of the meeting. When are the GAC members supposed to be there? Are they going to be there at the latter part of the ICANN meeting or will they be at the beginning of the ICANN meeting?

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, obviously not all the governments have to stay but as I understand it from the Chair of the GAC they're expecting GAC members to stay right up to the last day. There is the AGM. I expect some people might not be there for that, but they will be crafting their communiqué on the Tuesday, I imagine. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Nigel. When are they arriving? Are they arriving on the 3rd or the 4th – the Thursday and Friday then before?

MARILYN CADE: Be really careful about this. If you're funded by ICANN to attend, then you could be there for the full session. If you're not funded by ICANN and over 50% of the GAC members are not funded by ICANN. Why don't we instead of speculating, we ask the Chair?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We could certainly ask that yes. Thanks, Marilyn. That's another action item then please to ask the Chair of the GAC about their meeting week. We already have the block schedule.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, I've located the tentative block schedule on the site and it confirms that high interest topics would be held on the Saturday, the Sunday, and the Monday. So the schedule starts on the Thursday. The Thursday and the Friday are down for what's called intracommunity work then the Saturday is the opening ceremony and the public forum, and no doubt

some of the high interest topics, and then Sunday and Monday are cross-community work, intracommunity work, Tuesday is the AGM and the public forum, and then Wednesday is further intracommunity work. So it's quite a different schedule from a say normal meeting or from some of the older meetings.

So the Monday would probably work as a high interest topic. Certainly we could ask for the Monday if that's what you thought was best.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Nigel. I've sent a link to the block schedule on our chat so you can all have a look at it, and indeed it's a very strange set-up. Monday seems now like the right time then to do it, but we also need to ask the Chair of the GAC whether GAC members will still be there on Monday. Hopefully, they still are. Another one of these new things.

Okay. Are there any other comments on this? So we've got the date, our preferred date. We have our preferred... well, the time I don't think we'll have much of a choice because that's obviously according to the block schedule on how that will work. We have the topic. We have a draft timeline on the topic or schedule on how we'll be taking the topic down and discussing it with the room. The format of the room is what we need to discuss quickly now.

I don't know whether we'll have much of a choice. The last format that we had in Marrakech was just a schoolroom type with a big head table and a very large room in front of us. It worked. Somehow it worked because we did have quite a few people coming to the microphones and speaking on the mics. We can certainly ask for a roundtable if we can

have one, but I gather that this will really depend on what the high interest topic session format is. I'm not sure whether they'll be ready to change the format of the room if we asked for a roundtable. We can certainly ask for it.

There have been some instances over large roundtable surrounded by a lot of seats around and it might well be that this is the format that they'll be able to offer on this occasion. I've noticed, and also through in the past as well, people saying roundtable is probably better, so let's ask for a roundtable format and if we can't get it, then we'll have the classroom format which I think is the fallback on this.

Anything else that we need to know, Nigel, for this? I think that sort of covers all the questions that you've asked.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you very much. That's fine for the high interest topic. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, Thanks for this, Nigel. The only thing we haven't spoken about – and we have two minutes remaining – and that's the face-to-face meeting. So that's the quick thing basically – we want to have a face-to-face meeting. I don't think we have a deadline yet as to what we want to discuss in the face-to-face meeting. Are we looking at the tomorrow deadline, Nigel, is just for the high interest sessions? It's not for the actual content and agenda of all the meetings is it?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, absolutely right, Olivier. I'm not sure what the deadline for that is, but it's certainly not yet because it hasn't been fully posted, I don't think. So we probably have a number of weeks to talk about the face-to-face session and come up with a draft agenda for that and then to apply for that and decide when we want it, etc.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Nigel. I guess rather than talking about the contents of the face-to-face meeting which we usually manage to set up at the very last moment, maybe we should have a general view of the people on this call as to what – do we wish to have it earlier or later during the ICANN week? So are we looking at Thursday/Friday or Saturday/Sunday, or are we looking more at the Monday and Tuesday? I'd certainly say we can't go for the Monday if we're going to have our public meeting on the Monday. We could certainly look at later on the Monday or on the Tuesday, but bearing in mind that there often, as we heard, the drafting of statements, etc. takes place later on in the week so I was going to suggest that we might have it somewhere like on the Thursday/Friday or the Saturday, or even the Sunday. I don't know, the earlier part of the ICANN meeting.

MARILYN CADE: Can I support that idea? I think that's right to go for earlier. Yes, please go for early. I have commitments on the 2nd and 3rd but I don't think... Judith posted something about November 3rd but I have commitments on... I think if we could go... can we go – I'm just trying to figure out

here. Could we go over the weekend when I think actually most people are not going to be enthused about doing things?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's very open at the moment. One of the problems that I don't think that any of the SOs and ACs have actually frozen their agendas yet or their timetable yet on what they're going to do. And of course we can't work by past timetables because it's the first time we've got this one.

MARILYN CADE: I don't know, Judith said the conference starts on the 3rd. Oh, I see, Judith. That's what you meant. Right but I'm busy all day on the 3rd.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [Inaudible] Thursday the 3rd.

MARILYN CADE: Yes, I'm busy all day on the 3rd on a Mentors program, but I think I would suggest you look at Saturday or Sunday. Why don't we do a Doodle.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, let's do that. We'll have a Doodle with Friday, Saturday, Sunday, and see. It might be that some people do only arrive on the Friday because they arrive just before the opening ceremony, the day before the opening ceremony, so we might not have enough people. But then on the Saturday there is the ceremony and then there's a public forum

going on, so I gather that the public forum fills half the day. The opening ceremony fills the other half of the day so I'm not quite sure how much else will be able to happen on that Saturday. It looks like maybe the Sunday might be our best bet. But if we do a Doodle on Friday/Saturday/Sunday, that we'll get a better idea. Although we are over two months before the meeting, and I don't even think that anyone has so far decided on what they're doing. If any of you have, then well done. You're way ahead of me.

Okay. It's three minutes past the top of the hour. I don't see anyone else putting their hands up, and so let's go for Any Other Business. No one is putting their hands up.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Sorry. Just very quickly to confirm – which I think we put on the list – that the workshop proposal I think it was #63...I get confused between...no, it was #64 – the workshop proposal for the CCWG session on IANA accountability, etc. was accepted by the IGF MAG and so that will be scheduled in due course in the program. So at some point on an organization call I assume, we need to just discuss that and agree on a few issues on that I suppose.

Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Nigel. What's your timeline on this, Nigel, because I gather we do need to refine a few things, but how soon? Is it ASAP or how much time do we have?

NIGEL HICKSON: I'm pretty sure it's – I'll confirm on the list – but I'm pretty sure it's something like the 9th of September to make any changes to the proposal we put in. We just need to probably look at it to see whether does anyone that we proposed that might not be able to be a part of it anymore or whatever. We just need to look at that, I think, and refine it if we decide to.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Nigel. Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: I just want to say as a MAG member, I'm not a proposed [speaker here], but I think the workshop is pretty well tidied up, but ICANN also has an open forum. The open forum is not about – I want to be really clear – the open forum is about ICANN, and all we want from ICANN is just a "Here's what we're doing." We want to be careful we're not intervening in what ICANN needs to do itself. But maybe we could just have an update on our next call about the open forum. I do think the CCWG-IG workshop is an excellent design and I applaud not only what the staff did to support it but the members of the community. I say again, I'm not a speaker as I'm a MAG member.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Marilyn. If I could ask then for Nigel to please just reiterate the update on the mailing list and perhaps get the ball rolling on any refinements that we might wish to make to the proposal if we

need to make a refinement on this and where we might need to tweak things. But I do agree. We're on the right track for this.

Great. So with no other hands up, I'd like to thank you all for being on this call. So the next steps on this is I'll follow up with Nigel on sending a summary of the proposal that we have for our public high interest session in Hyderabad, and give it a 24-hour consensus call for any amendments and then Nigel can send it tomorrow.

Nigel, I don't know whether you want to be on the line or shall I call you in a moment, or something, or how do we do this? And we've lost Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry, Olivier. I'm in the office so, yes. Happy to speak.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent.

So thanks everyone, and this call is now adjourned. Have a great day.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]