

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay, we're recording.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Desiree. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance call on the 21<sup>st</sup> of October 2016. The time is 14:03, and today we are going to be having a policy call. Let's have a quick roll call please, Desiree.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay, in the room we have Berry Cobb, Farzaneh Badii, Judith Hellerstein, Marilyn Cade, Matthew Shears. For staff we have Nigel Hickson and myself, Desiree Cabrera. And for the chairs we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond and Rafik Dammak.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Desiree. Have we missed anybody in the roll call? I guess the way the room is set up we are not missing anyone, so thanks for this. And today's call is going to be all on the different policy updates that we've had, United Nations, CSTD, the Internet Governance Forum, the World Telecommunications Standardization Assembly and the ITU Council Working Group on Internet Public Policy. Can we adopt

---

*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.*

---

the agenda, or are there any amendments or additions that we should make to the agenda?

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, good afternoon. It's Nigel Hickson here. In light of some of the exchanges we've had in the last few hours, or last day or so, perhaps we could expand the ITU item to include the WTSA, which kicks off next week in Tunisia. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Nigel. We have that. We have CSTD Internet Governance Forum, WTSA and ITU Council Working Group on Internet Public Policy. So we do have all four, incl—

NIGEL HICKSON: Apologies. I'm behind the curve here. Sorry. Apologies.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: – including the – well, it's on the screen. The agenda is on the screen, including the link to the African Telecommunication Union proposed Resolution 47, a proposed amendment. Okay, I see no other hands up. Let's get moving then with the United Nations CSTD. We are going to have a brief update in Hyderabad, but it's probably worth having an update for ourselves first. And for this I guess I can turn to Nigel Hickson who's been keeping a close watch over this, and I know that others on the call have also kept a close watch, so please jump in as you – as needed. Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thank you very much, Olivier. I'll be quite brief because I think participants know a lot of the history to this. So the WSIS review, the WSIS+10 review, the UN General Assembly session in December last year, the outcome document from that mandated the CSTD, the Committee [sic] on Science and Technology for Development to set up or to renew the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation to meet between 2016 and to report to the UN in 2018. So this Working Group was established, and I think we discussed it on a previous call. It was established with membership of governments and membership of stakeholders. And there are five representatives from the technical community, five representatives from the civil society and five from business. Marilyn Cade is a member of the business constituency, and I'm a member of the technical community.

The first Working Group took place on the 30<sup>th</sup> of September this year in Geneva here. It was a one-day meeting, primarily dedicated to process issues. And we did circulate a note of that, a note of that meeting. Primarily it looked at the agenda of future meetings. It looked at the membership in terms of observers and their rights and responsibilities. And it did look at what sort of questions the group should answer, what questions the Working Group should answer in terms of its work. It was a productive meeting, and it bodes well for the work of the group, which will next meet in January in the margins of the CSTD Intersessional Meeting. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Nigel. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking, and I've just also put in the chat, as is also the link on the agenda, the link to our CSTD wiki page. And I was going to just ask you if as updates arrive, was it possible for you or some of your colleagues to update that wiki page since it would be a good way for people who have missed the call or who are just coming in without having paid attention to this process before, to see where we are and to have quick updates on this? Is that a possibility?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, indeed. Yes, that's an excellent vehicle for making sure that people are kept abreast of the various developments that take place. Perhaps just one other point, Olivier. Of course the 30<sup>th</sup> of September had some significance in that it was the Friday, the day of the IANA transition. And the IANA transition, or the IANA process is, of course, linked to the concept of enhanced cooperation. It was because of the linkages between the IANA functions and the US administration, or partly because of that, that this working group originally was conceived. So hopefully some of the, if you like, tension behind the process of enhanced cooperation might be alleviated by the transition. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Nigel. Marilyn Cade, did you have anything else to add to Nigel's update?

---

MARILYN CADE:

Very briefly, yes. Chair, I would like to make a couple of comments. First of all, I would like to acknowledge – Nigel, thank you so much for that great update. I'd like to acknowledge that in the past ICANN provided funding for something that is extraordinary. It is now assumed a right and a privilege in some of the UN bodies that take [extraordinary] funding at the CSTD. And ICANN, in the past, had provided funding for webcasting and transcripts. And this has significantly improved the openness of these working groups. I would just suggest that I'll be calling. Pat called already but will be calling again for the solicitation of such funds because that means that the working group is able to be, in its formal sessions, open and transparent. It's expensive for people to travel to Geneva, but with this additional support we are able to really model more openness and transparency.

One other comment that I would make is we began the discussion about working methods. We didn't conclude those discussions. There are parties and different stakeholder groups, nongovernment stakeholder groups, who are calling for observers to have the same rights as members. That is not accepted by most of the government members, but we – I made a proposal that we be more open to accreditation to enable parties who have attended the WSIS Forum or [inaudible] CSTD meetings in the past to be accredited as observers. I think that's achieving broader support, and it will be helpful in the attendance.

The final comment I'm going to make is, while the topic of the management and oversight of ICANN, not just the IANA, but ICANN, is a subject of – that it is a subject in enhanced cooperation. The issues are much broader than that, and we really need for ICANN to be at the

---

table explaining what they do, what they don't do. But also, we need to be calling on all of the governments who are the active members of the working group, some of whom are GAC members, that we could engage with while we're together, and others are not, so that we are addressing the broader issues of enhanced cooperation.

Enhanced cooperation is much more than what ICANN does. But it can arm or limit ICANN's success. And I think it's really, really important that we, from the CC – sorry – the CCWG IG pay attention to this group and try to be friendly to the governments who are attending the ICANN meetings and also to encourage the attendance of all of these governments at the Internet Governance Forum itself where there will be even more opportunity to engage positively.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. Are there any comments or additional questions from anybody else on the call? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. We're taking note of this. Marilyn, just one question on your, what you mentioned here with regards to the GAC members and so on; often it is different people that take part in the different fora, whether it's Internet Governance Forum or CSTD. Are you seeing a convergence rather than a divergence in this?

MARILYN CADE: Thank you for that question. So I'm not going to name the countries, but I am going to tell you that as a result of looking at the membership I've gone through the membership of the CSTD and then the membership of the working group. I've gone through the list of the GAC members and

---

done a spreadsheet for my own purposes. Governments sometimes work in a silo with limited resources. They don't always know who to contact in their sister agency or their sister organization. I think we can be friendly, and if we choose to do that we can be part of the solution rather than part of the problem. I say that because most of the attendees at the GAC are not aligned or are not cognizant of their Science and Technology for Development membership.

But we had the opportunity because, as Nigel knows, we had the opportunity back in Geneva through the mission to help to bring forward engagement from the national level. It takes a little work from us, but I suspect it is work we want to do. Even if you don't know who your representative is in the GAC, it's pretty easy to find out, whatever country you're from, because it's public information. We could invite the GAC members who are part of the CSTD Working Group to our session. We could offer a friendly invitation. I think that would be helpful to us, not be a cost to us, and help us to spread our own message.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for [the thought], and it's Olivier speaking. And that's an interesting way forward. And I wondered if we could do this immediately in Hyderabad. We can certainly evaluate – if you have the list, or Nigel, whoever is involved with this, has the list of GAC members who are involved with CSTD, then we could send a special invitation for them to join us during one of the sessions that deal with this. Certainly the session that – the public session would be good because there is a section on it, on CSTD, on [this]. I see Farzaneh Badii.

---

FARZANEH BADI: Hi, Olivier. Farzaneh Badii speaking. In response to Marilyn, I see the other side of the story. Sometimes the GAC representatives are not friendly to us and will not take our message. And I don't [think] this approach is optimal for everyone [too involved] with their GAC members. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Farzaneh.

MARILYN CADE: Actually, could I respond to that?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Very, very briefly. Two things. I really appreciate the concerns that Farzaneh has just raised, but I'm going to quote myself. I've never changed a government meeting by not meeting with them. We're not going to get the unfriendly governments in our session, but we may get the – those not yet convinced, those not yet informed. We're not going to get the government who is chairing a working group at the ITU Council who doesn't even attend, but we might get three or four of the other governments that are just beginning to be engaged, particularly from the African countries who may be new players and new members and a few from Latin America. So while I agree it's not perfect, I would just – if Nigel would accept a friendly amendment, I would say always



---

start out by hoping that all are interested. They may not all be friendly yet.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. Okay, I see there's some worth into doing this, and of course, yes, some countries might be conducive to discussions; some might not. In At-Large we have a, I think it's a worldwide At-Large structure, ccNSO, or ccTLD and GAC rep spreadsheet sort of thing that has details of who is where at ICANN. I don't know if it's up-to-date, but it might be something that we might be interested in this group here. And certainly it would be helpful just on the scale of the CSTD to start with to find out who the GAC reps are for the countries that are represented on the CSTD, and perhaps, and send them a private invitation or direct invitation for our event in Hyderabad and then follow up later on afterwards. And of course there is the GAC list, which is also out there. We can easily find out who the GAC reps are for every, for each country.

Any other comments on this? I don't see any other hand up. Thanks for the update on CSTD. I'm glad to see things are moving forward. I was a little concerned about the early days when we have heard that things were just not progressing too well. But it is good to see there is some progress, and just one thing that we would need is, before I move on to the next thing, Internet Governance Forum, is to find out – there is one person who is dialed in marked as anonymous. I'm not quite sure. If you've just dialed in and you're not on the Adobe Connect, could you please identify yourself if that's okay, if you can hear us? It's total

---

silence. Okay, well I'm not sure what to do, but fair enough. We'll work it out with Desiree on this.

Right. Let's move on, and – oh, I just note, one note from Mark Carvell in the chat, agreeing with Marilyn. We should try to convene a CSTD member, GAC reps, GAC agenda, Tuesday the 8<sup>th</sup>. Allows some time for this, but it would keep it – would need to be kept tight, 30 to 40 minutes. I could speak to them. Okay. Mark, I don't know whether you're okay with then perhaps suggesting that we might have some members of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance in attendance. I think that probably would be the aim here.

MARK CARVELL:

Olivier, yeah, it's Mark speaking. Yeah, I mean that's – what I was suggesting in terms of speaking to them is I could get them motivated to come to the meeting on that day, Tuesday the 8<sup>th</sup>, when the GAC agenda is easing up a bit. I mean we have a long period of [inaudible] adjusting. But I think that is more likely to be the opportunity for a get-together for 30 to 40 minutes maximum to update on what's happening in the CSTD and get them to coordinate with their leads in the CSTD. That's the idea I had.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Mark. Thank you.

MARK CARVELL: Yeah, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Is that – would it be – is it possible then to – I mean, would that be closed, or that could be an open meeting? As I'm saying is we could have members of the CCWG and Internet Governance in attendance then?

MARK CARVELL: Well, sorry, maybe I misunderstood then. I joined this call a bit late, but I thought you just wanted to get together with them in a group –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, correct.

MARK CARVELL: – rather than have a public session, yeah? It's – as I understood it from Marilyn, it's establishing the linkage to get representatives to the CSTD representatives for several of these, or if not all of the CSTD members, yeah?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks. No, it's just – what I mean is that not a public meeting, obviously. What I mean is members of the CCWG on Internet Governance, there will be active members that are going to be Hyderabad, and I'm not imagining that at this late moment there would be more than 10, 15 people or so probably that [inaudible] on this call.

---

MARK CARVELL: Yeah, okay. Well, let me know if you want to firm up on this, and then I can swing into action in Hyderabad, if not before.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, that's fine. If you can follow up on that please, Mark, we'll follow up with you. Keep us in the loop on this. And I've noticed that when Mark speaks anonymous – anonymous anonymous actually seems to be working. So I think it's Mark Carvell who is marked as anonymous at the moment.

MARK CARVELL: Oh, my apologies for that anonymous affiliation. I don't know how that's happened.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: No, you just dialed in, so that's why. Dialing in, it doesn't actually sometimes ask for your name. Okay, so let's then move on, and let's go to the Internet Governance Forum because time is passing quickly. There isn't very much to talk about regarding the IGF, or at least that I know of. The process is moving forward for the workshops. As you know, we have a workshop that's come together quite well. We will have a little bit of time in Hyderabad to speak about it and just work on it, but I think that things are progressing. We have Matthew Shears who will be moderating the workshop, and I will sort of work with Matthew to make sure that all of the people that we have invited to the workshop, will be – which actually is a roundtable – will be able to

---

attend. And we've got sort of song sheets or some kind of a workshop flow prior to it taking place.

Now I'm not a member of the MAG, and I know we have members of the MAG on the call. They might have a lot more information on the Internet Governance Forum than I. So perhaps could we ask Marilyn Cade to say a few words, as you have mentioned about day zero activity?

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you. I don't want to – I think there may be others on the call who are – I see Jim Prendergast who was probably – I don't know, Jim, if you were on the MAG call. [Inaudible] I, unfortunately, was not able to be on that call, so I might come back, if you don't mind, to you. I wanted to speak about [day zero] because it's a very robust – not to – we have our own workshop. ICANN also has a workshop on day zero, so CCWG IG has a workshop. There's an ICANN workshop – sorry, session on day zero, as well as an open forum. So Nigel should speak to that. I wanted to speak to a couple of other things about day zero. Day zero is going to have a newcomers session. So for anyone who is a newcomer at ICANN, there will be a 90-minute overview on day zero. There's also a full day organized by the Mexican host. The full details are being published. That includes a high-level event in the afternoon.

There is also a number of events that other parties – and I think maybe Farzaneh can comment about this. There's a full day from ATC, other events that are really, really useful and relevant to the concerns of the CCWG-IG. The Mexican host will be, as I mentioned before, conducting a

---

full day, broken into different segments on day zero. And during the – I wonder, perhaps we could get the full agenda for the IGF posted. If it's not posted we could get that posted, Olivier, to this list and also, perhaps ask Nigel to comment on whether ICANN will be doing a reception at any point because that may be also of interest to those of us who are attending the IGF.

The IGF opens in the morning on day one with a special town hall approach on the SDGs in Internet governance. It then goes into the opening ceremony where there will be a number of high-level events. And then it goes into its overall program for days two through four. There is a lot going on at the IGF, and a lot of overlapping meetings. The ICANN sessions, if Nigel might point out when they are scheduled, I think that would be really important to understand the scheduling.

I see Matthew – both Farzaneh and Matthew have posted, so let me turn to them and thank you for posting the full agenda. I was just going to say something about the deliberative poll. Many of us in the MAG opposed the use of Stanford's deliberative polling and did not support it. It's being repeated on a particular topic that I don't want to go into – unless somebody has a specific question I don't want to go into some of the concerns about different activities. I think our focus is what benefits ICANN and how ICANN is influenced by other activities at the IGF.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this update, Marilyn. I'm going to go first for Jim Prendergast, since you had mentioned him, and he has written a number of things in

---

the chat. And then I'll go to Farzaneh afterwards. Jim, are you able to speak? Sorry to put you on the spot like this, but –

And we might have a technical problem with Jim Prendergast. I can't hear you at the moment. You might need to connect your – in the meantime let's go to Farzaneh Badii, and if we can get back to Jim afterwards because I can't hear Jim at the moment. It doesn't seem to work. Farzaneh, you have the floor.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you, Olivier. Farzaneh Badii speaking. I'd like to have – perhaps it would be useful to actually highlight the sessions that are related to ICANN work and ICANN gets mentioned and discussed and the functions that it does. If this [discussed dealings] in session, maybe those sessions should be highlighted, not IGF sessions, in general because that would confuse our group as to what sort of activities we focus on. And I think we should focus on – I think Marilyn mentioned this, but I think we should focus on ICANN-related topics that are going to be discussed during sessions in IGF, and yeah, so I don't think that generally saying that [if a] session on cyber security is going to happen, is related to the [manage] of our CCWG. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Farzaneh. It's Olivier speaking. And I've just put a link to one of our wiki pages because we have a wiki on the IGF, which is a page about our actual workshops. But there's also a subpage, ICANN-related workshops at IGF 2015 in Mexico. We've got the ICANN events, which lists at the moment the workshop we might wish to – and I'm asking

---

everyone here to fill the other, the rest of the page. Last year we tried doing that. We got quite a few things listed, quite a few workshops listed, and that would, obviously, we'd have ICANN events on one side and events organized or recommended by ICANN community members. I think that's what you mean.

So now you've got the link here. I will share it with the mailing list so that we, everyone has the ability to add on this as long as it's related to the ICANN mission, mentions Farzaneh on this. I think that's what you were asking for, and we've got this pretty much ready to – we just need to fill it up, and I require your help to fill it up. Jim, are you trying to – shall we try you again and see if you've managed to connect your microphone?

JIM PRENDERGAST: Does that work?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Now we can hear you. Welcome. Go ahead.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Sorry, I've been running back and forth. And I've got to – managing something else here at the house. So is there a specific question you want me to talk to, or just supplement what Marilyn talked about on the MAG call?



---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's really up to you. It really is down to the follow-up. I mean anything else that's relevant to our group here, as far as the IGF is concerned, and that Marilyn might not have spelled out or explained.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Yes, so the only other thing I would add – I think she covered it all. Just looking forward I think the MAG renewal process is going to kick off sooner rather than later. In fact, it might actually kick off in the next couple of weeks just because the IGF is so late in the calendar year this year, and they can't wait until after the IGF is completed. So I think we should keep an eye out for that. There will be – I believe when they put the call out existing members will have their stakeholder group and their length of service on the MAG indicated to help them form sort of a nomination process going forward.

But there's still – you know, one of the points of contention that folks have made is that the nominations are not publicly available, so we don't know whose names were put in once they are selected by UNDESA, so there's still no decision on whether or not all the nominations would be made publicly available or not.

I think the only other thing just on day zero that Marilyn talked about, you know, several, you know, lots of events happening on day zero. I think one of the things that Lynn St. Amour, who is the Chair of the MAG expressed some concerns about is some of the themes that the Mexican government were talking about potentially being too close to the sort of topics that will be discussed at the IGF Proper and wanted to make sure that they didn't sort of duplicate those discussions that will

---

be happening later in the week. So there's supposed to be a written update sent to Lynn from the Mexican government on that, but I haven't seen anything related to that. I think, as Marilyn mentioned, I should just reiterate I'm not a member of the MAG, but some might accuse me of stalking them. So that's just my observations, not official MAG decree.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jim, the stalker. Very helpful information, and no doubt we'll have more ability to discuss the preparations by – well just after the Hyderabad meeting. We probably will have one more call before the Internet Governance Forum takes place. But in the meantime I do ask all of you to consider filling that wiki page, which I've shared on the chat and which I shall be sharing with the mailing list.

Moving swiftly on to WTS-16 – now that's something that's on our doorstep – the World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly. Having been at a meeting of the Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group on Internet Governance, the UK group that the UK government has convened for Stakeholder Engagement in Internet Governance Policies, I've learned of a number of proposals from a number of countries, and in fact on our own mailing list Bill Drake pointed out a proposal from the African Telecommunication Union. I know that other countries, Russia, China, perhaps some countries in the Middle East, might also have some proposed modifications, amendments or proposals to make that would be affecting ICANN. We've only got one listed here, and perhaps it might be interesting for us to build something with these proposals that affect ICANN, with your help, of course, because I'm sure there is more

than just one. But I've noticed a lot of traffic on the mailing list with this, and so perhaps we could have a good five minutes or 10 minutes on this specific proposal. Nigel, did you wish to speak to this first and then we open the floor, or we can just open the floor right away? Go ahead, Nigel [inaudible].

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thanks very much, Olivier. Just to put a couple of things in context, first of all – I mean, I won't go back to the IGF, but Marilyn asked a direct question about whether ICANN is holding a reception, so that's always good to give news on, I suppose, in that we are holding a joint cocktail reception with ISOC and some other folks; date to be determined. Apart from that, all the ICANN sessions, the open session and the two workshops which we're organizing plus various other things are all on the program, and you've mentioned that.

On the WTSA, to put this in context – and this is the four-yearly conference on the World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly. This is the ITU-T's conference. It looks at a number of recommend– sorry, a number of resolutions that have been passed at previous WTSAs and also sets out the work program for the different study groups. So it's a long-standing conference that takes place. There is a long regional preparation process for this in all the different ITU regions, in Europe here through Com-ITU, which is a subset of CEPT, and ICANN have been involved in these different regional preparation meetings. Not in all places because in Russia, for example, they don't allow stakeholders to take part in the Arab Regional, so it doesn't allow

---

stakeholders to take part. But in all other regions stakeholders take part in the preparation sessions.

And the proposals are, of course, coming in. The African Union proposal on Resolution 47, Resolution 47 is a resolution that I think was dropped at about 16 years ago on country code top-level domains. There's also a resolution on [ITV 6]. There's a resolution on international domain names. There's a resolution on cyber security. And I can send around a list of the resolutions that we've been looking at, which might be of use. But of course we can focus on Resolution 47, which I think is probably the most important.

It's also worth saying that one of the other main activities of the WTSA will be to set out a work program for some of the study groups, as I mentioned. One of these study groups, Study Group 20, is on Smart Cities and the Internet of Things, and this study group started its activities sort of after the last WTSA. So this WTSA has to give it a mandate, and one of the concerns of some European countries, and the US and a number of other countries is the breaking of the principle of technology neutrality by the ITU and some of the membership in calling for Internet of Things projects to be based on the digital object architecture rather than leaving it up to the market or other players just to decide what the technology should be. And that is of concern to a number of players. Thank you for that.

MARILYN CADE:

Actually – it's Marilyn – can I – I want to make a quick comment, please.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks, Nigel. Marilyn, you're next.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I just wanted to thank you, Nigel. This is an absolutely perfect update, but I want to make a comment about why the digital – I think people who are not spending their day lives in either the ITU or elsewhere may not understand that the DONA idea, this digital architecture that's being proposed, may break the Internet as we know and have agreed to [a cringle] authoritative groups. And you were very cautious and generous in not being more critical. I appreciate that, but I will be more critical. I think this is a really significant issue that we should be very concerned about. It could actually break the Internet as we [bleed in] the single authoritative groups.

And I think we need to – actually, thank you Matthew for your comment, but I think that DOA is not worrying to industry. I think DOA is worrying for those of us who believe in a single authoritative Internet and into an open standards approach. So I'm just going to slightly modify your comment. I see you've come back in agreement. I think we need to be really, really concerned, and we need to be speaking up within the CCWG-IG and encouraging and strengthening the engagement, not only of the ICANN staff, but also of the technical community, the [RERs], the ccTLDs and others who are engaged in the technical community that say if you are a member, a sector member of the ITU, you should oppose this. I think this is a really important comment that we need to be stepping forward on.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. In the meantime I did have a question on the actual timing of this conference. I mean this is something which we've known was going to be a big hurdle. It's taking place next week. What resources is ICANN sending there, or is ICANN able to send someone there? And I wondered whether anybody on the call has within their organization, their government and so on, has people going to that meeting since it's just before the ICANN meeting.

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, just to clarify, the meeting starts next Tuesday and goes on to the 3<sup>rd</sup> of November in Hammamet in Tunisia. And ICANN will be represented by myself and [Venima Cospiel, Venima Cospì] and I. And there will be a number of other organizations there, including ISOC and RIPE NCC and the GSMA, etc. as sort of stakeholders. And obviously there will be government representatives. So this proposal will be discussed in detail, of course. The African Union proposal only came out less than a week ago, so it has caught folks by surprise. We were told by the African Union that they would submit a proposal that mentioned their concerns on the delays on dotAfrica, which many of you will be – many of us are sort of familiar with. But we weren't expecting a proposal that, if you like, proposes work for Study Group 2, which directly duplicates or duplicates to a large extent, work that is already taking place in the community, as others will know better than I do, and also taking place in the GAC in terms of geographical indications, and names, and country names, etc. So we think this proposal is entirely inappropriate. You will not be surprised to hear that, and we're talking to other organizations about it. And thank you for the opportunity to talk. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. Forgive my lack of knowledge in this, but is this like the WCIT, the WCIT, where is it actually divided between having governments and the other sectors and there are some discussions where the other sectors have to basically leave the room and only governments remain behind, or is everyone on the same sort of level, the same footing?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah, this is Nigel. Well, I mean I think the process is similar to – and you were, of course, were of course at the [inaudible] I think, Olivier, or certainly one of the larger conferences. So you've had direct experience with this. I mean, all the sessions are open to members and to sector members, so sector members includes the likes of ISOC. I have the privilege of being in the ISOC delegation because ICANN is not a sector member. But you're right; I mean, there are some coordination meetings between governments, which of course sector members would not be invited to.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. I think I've mentioned perhaps even going further than this and that for some of the larger conferences governments are the only ones that speak and depending really on who the chair is, the chair might or might not give the ability for a nongovernment to speak. That would be the gist of my question. But I gather it's if it's the same process, then yeah, it really depends on the way that this will be chaired. Any other points on this? I've noticed Ryan

---

---

Johnson has mentioned that a small delegation from Access Partnership will be attending. I know that, of course, the UK government will be present as well, along with many other governments, I'm sure. I mean, is there any other updates from anyone who wishes to add to this?

I realize the coordination is very important, and I'm not sure whether this Cross-Community Working Group with the limited resources it has can actually go out there and actively coordinate people. But I would hope that people who are attending this call or even listening to it afterwards will go back to their delegations and encourage this coordination when it comes down to issues which are as important as this proposal that we are seeing and several other proposals that are out there as well. Matthew shears, you put your hand up. You have the floor.

MARILYN CADE: And after Matthew it's Marilyn, if I could speak.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Marilyn. You're in the queue. I see Matthew is muted at the moment. Let's try and unmute Matthew. Matthew Shears.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Okay, can you hear me now?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Now we can hear you. Welcome. Go ahead.



**MATTHEW SHEARS:** Hello? Perfect. Thank you. So I think this is a really good discussion because we've touched on a number of things that are imminent in the ITU. And I think it would be good if we could add this list of issues and how we intend to address them to, face-to-face, in Hyderabad because I think this points to a set of issues where – very specific issues where ICANN and the Internet ecosystem are implicated or threatened or however you want to characterize it. And I think these are the kind of things that we should be discussing strategically amongst ourselves and also with the Board. Thanks.

**OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:** Yes, thank you, Matthew. It's Olivier speaking. And so we'll make it an action item to add these issues to our face-to-face meeting. And mentioning the face-to-face meeting, the timing is still not 100% set. You've seen that I've sent a new proposal for the timing, which would be quite late one evening. We're waiting to hear from meeting staff if things can be shuffled around. It's been a bit of a headache on this, but certainly these issues, it would be very important to discuss them with the Board and discuss them among us as well, face-to-face. Marilyn Cade, you're next.

**MARILYN CADE:** Thank you. I'm just going to – I've noticed that Judith has suggested Alejandro Pisanty as an ambassador. There's some from Europe, there's some from Africa. I'm not sure what that – perhaps she could explain that. I've attended most of the [inaudible] in the past. It's not too late to

---

---

try to influence the governments who are coming in unless they have signed on to a position. So perhaps I would ask if Nigel thinks it's possible to look for a bilateral engagement from those governments who are friendlier to our issues and the African Telecommunications Union. I want to distinguish between the African Union and the African Telecommunications Union. I think that's really important to distinguish and ask whether Nigel thinks it would be possible to have an early [bilateral] between those entities who are attending perhaps organized by ICANN and [inaudible]. And Judith is suggesting ISOC has ambassadors also [inaudible]. Perhaps they could also be taken into account. But the earlier you meet, the better, because the fact is even if governments have signed on to a position, they will sometimes agree to modifying the position in order to get an outcome. And I think we need to be focused on what we think the outcome is that may [need] a modification of the resolution.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Marilyn. And Nigel Hickson, could you respond to this?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, yes. Thank you, Olivier. Just very briefly, and of course Marilyn is totally right in this regard. I mean, we do need to speak fairly early on this proposal because it's come out fairly late, has the effect that some governments won't have fully focused on it and won't necessarily have taken positions on it, which is helpful. Certainly the regional preparation processes haven't taken account of it, and we will be talking with others, to a number of governments and stakeholders. I mean although

---

it touches on the ICANN remit, it's directly contradicts, of course, the assurances that the ITU Secretary-General and other ITU staff have given concerning their role with regards to Internet Governance and the role of other institutions, such as ICANN, so with the thought that they would be – have concerns, as well, on this proposal. But certainly we will endeavor to have some early discussions. And thanks, Marilyn, for the suggestions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. I mean, is there anything at the moment that can be done through the GAC members because I guess this really the African proposal comes from the African government. Has there been any early discussions already with them? I mean, I'm quite surprised that certainly this thing comes out without anyone seemingly having forecasted it.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, Olivier. I mean as Marilyn recognized, it comes from the African Telecommunications Union. It was, as I said, we knew there was going to be a propo– well, we were told there was going to be a proposal on this, but it goes a lot further than was imagined. It doesn't necessarily have, although it could have – I'm no expert – the full backing of all the African countries. And we are discussing it with African countries, and we are discussing it with the African Union. And we are discussing it with the GAC Chair, and hopefully the GAC membership will be alerted to this proposal. Not [least] because as far as the GAC is concerned, whether the proposal is about apples or pears, the fact is that GAC is

---

discussing these apples and pears, and here you have another organization wishing to discuss the same apples and pears. So I think the GAC might have a view on this. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. Marilyn, your hand is still up.

MARILYN CADE: – to make one quick comment. I think we need to go back ourselves. Nigel is very experienced in this, but I'm going to reference it for anyone who is not – [inaudible] doesn't carry around the Bible of [WITSA]. This is a direct confrontation and negation of what we agreed to. We agreed that the technical – that governments would not engage in technical da da da da da da. I think I really want to applaud ICANN's work. I'm sorry I can't to be at the WTSA. I will, Nigel, invite you to perhaps talk to me separately about getting [inaudible] and statement in opposition of this. I think it's probably too late for us to make a negative statement from the CCWG, but perhaps we could make a statement from the CCWG that says we raise concerns about the introduction from the – into the WTSA, and we believe that in large part the responsibility belongs within – at the national and regional levels and within the ICANN community. If we could come up with a short statement, not something really in depth, I think that would help us to also – why ICANN needs to be engaged in these issues and ever diligent.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. Can we just have this as an action item, please? You've said something here. I mean, I think I didn't write it down, unfortunately, but this looks like something that's possible. I advise you I've lost the interconnect conductivity for some reason, so I have a frozen list at the moment of speakers. So if I miss anyone, at the moment I've got Judith Hellerstein and then Mark Carvell. Let's go with first asking Marilyn please drop the line and just send it out by email so then we can just follow up directly on this. And then Judith Hellerstein, you're next.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, this is Judith Hellerstein for the record. I do agree, and I think we also, since this is so last-minute, we need to [inaudible] maybe the ISOC ambassadors. And I put them on the chat, just from Mexico, Bulgaria, Sri Lanka and Africa. And so they're in different regions, and maybe we could all work with them and to, especially the African ones who's from Zimbabwe who I don't know, but maybe others know him, to get them to sort of push forward and make their calls known because they're usually – as Marilyn mentioned, to be chosen they're very influential in their own country. And so I think that is a good point to try to work with them and to see what they can do, but also working with others. There's a bunch of other ones that are also very related to our remit.

Like, as Olivier said with the cybersecurity one, Resolution 50, it was extremely hard to get that. And every time you touch it there's so many problems. So it's always very leery of having to do that one, and that could also cause a lot of problems. And there are several different ICANN-related issues in that one, as well. And some other numbering

---

ones, with Resolution 20, which was all about numbering, and I think those are also a lot of very interesting ones to look at.

And then there's some other [A Series] ones, but they're not as important – more important. But it's the – the study group – there's – the problem with the WTSA now is that it seems that the [T sector] is looking for a new remit, and it keeps trying to duplicate work that is already in the development sector without as much expertise. And that's a serious problem, I think. One is the cost, and the other is everything is a duplication. And so I think that also – there's something that needs to be done on that area, as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Judith. It's Olivier speaking. And I still don't have Internet at the moment, but I know that it's Mark Carvell is next, and we have passed the top of the hour, so we're going to have to finish this pretty soon. Mark.

MARK CARVELL: Yes, thanks, Olivier. Well, the point I was just going to make was there's often this problem of disconnects within administrations. You know, we can involve many, many African GAC representatives in discussions, but they don't link up with whoever is doing ITUs. That's always the challenge in many cases. Quite often it's the case in South Africa. So you know, we have to address that problem, and we'll do our best in order to do so. But quite often that's the case, and this is an example of what can happen as a result of that. Thanks. I'll leave now because we're out of time. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mark. It's Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Nigel, I gather you have probably taken note of the different points that have been made here. Coordination seems to be one thing that has come recurrently, so I'm not sure – I mean we've got the ISOC ambassadors on the one side and on the other side, obviously, governments and the work that you're doing with bilaterals in the early moments of this discussion. Is there anything else that we need to discuss on this topic?

NIGEL HICKSON: Well, I mean, I think from my part the discussion has been very useful, and thank you very much for those that have contributed. I mean, if the CCWG wanted to come up with a statement, then that is potentially of use. I mean, it's an idea. I mean, I can't speak for the CCWG, but I mean, I am certainly hopeful that this, the proposal, will be given a certain amount of airtime, so to speak, amongst the ICANN wider community and that folks will have the opportunity to raise concerns back to their national governments, as I think was suggested. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. And Marilyn, may I ask you please to then, as I said earlier, drop that – it's a one-liner, isn't it? It's just a couple of lines. I guess if we have a long statement it's going to be hard to go through the whole process of having it actually going through our different SOs and ACs. But a short statement like this will likely get the support that it needs to get in order to be able to be used by ICANN.

---

MARILYN CADE: Beyond what I already said? Sorry?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, no, that's fine. It's just I haven't marked it down, and we don't have the time to dictate it right now – well, we could just look at it in the – listen to it in the recording of this call. I'm afraid I don't have Internet. Yeah, go ahead.

MARILYN CADE: I'll just say I'll call you right after this, and we'll fine-tune it and send it out. Is that okay?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Excellent. Let's do that. Perfect. Thank you. Now the last part of our agenda is actually on another topic, and that's the ITU Council Working Group on Internet Public Policy, the open consultation. This is something which has already passed, so I don't know if it's worth discussing it now or whether everything that needed to be discussed is already on the list.

NIGEL HICKSON: Just very briefly, Olivier, I think the only significant thing to probably report is the open consultation itself was on the last open consultation topic, and I circulated what ICANN had contributed on that, and there was, I think, a link to the other contributions. The Council Working



---

Group – this is the closed Internet Council Working Group with the ITU – decided on the next consultation topic, which is related to developmental issues. And I think when Veni circulated – Veni Markovski circulated the questions. But if he didn't, I'll check, and we can circulate to the list what was agreed is the next consultation topic. I mean, this will be publicized by the ITU anyway in due course. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this. And I'm back on the Internet. Okay. So I don't see any hands up. As you said, we'll be, as long as you can let us know by the next consultation issue as soon as it comes out, then that's absolutely fine. We've got a number of things to do after this call, so we are six minutes past the top of the hour. Let's go into any other business. I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Thanks very much, everybody. Here we go. I've lost Internet connectivity again. Great. Thanks very much for attending. It's been very, very helpful, very interesting from my perspective. I hope it's been very helpful for all of you as well. And we will continue this discussion in Hyderabad and also on the mailing list. So thanks, and this call is now adjourned. Have a very good weekend. Goodbye.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**