

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

DESIREE CABRERA: There you go.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Desiree. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the cross community working group on internet governance conference call, on the 21<sup>st</sup> of December 2016. We'll start with a quick roll call, and then we'll adopt the agenda afterwards.

Desiree, if you could please do the roll call?

DESIREE CABRERA: Of course. In the room, we have Alan Greenberg... Someone is talking? [Inaudible] Alan Greenberg, Farzeneh Badii, Judith Hellerstein, Marilyn Cade, Mary Uduma, Rafik Dammak.

I believe Becky said that she was the number ending in 6367. And [inaudible] we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond, and I believe Rafik Dammak just popped in.

And for staff we have Nigel Hickson and myself, Desiree Cabrera. [CROSSTALK]

BECKY BURR: And for the record, I am the person in [inaudible] 67.

---

*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.*

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Is that Becky Burr?

BECKY BURR: That is correct.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much Becky. Have we missed anyone in the roll call? Anyone else?

There is a lot of background noise. If you could mute your phones please, as we, yeah, contributing to interference, right. Thanks very much Desiree for this roll call. The agenda is, first starting with the proposal for the annual review of working group activities and secondly, working on the GNSO Council requests for the cross community's charter amendments.

There was a proposal to swap the two over, and start with a GNSO Council request for the charter amendments. Are there any objections to swapping those two agenda items?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up and everybody is muted. Yes, we have lost Nigel, that's actually fine then, because we can just go straight into the agenda item number three. Nigel is back with us.

So, let's us then go to this. And Rafik, are you able to speak now or not?

---

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, [inaudible] speak.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so, I guess over to you then for the charter amendments.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks [inaudible]. So, maybe just first to, to remind about this [stake]. So... Olivier, is it possible to put the [inaudible] into the Adobe Connect. So, we got [inaudible] from the GNSO, in Hyderabad, and it says [inaudible] to do a review of our current charter against [inaudible]... working group, just because a framework, and this to update the charter.

And also, I think [about?] work plan and deliverables from the CWG [inaudible]. [Inaudible] the GNSO [inaudible] that to, or open to us to work on this suggestion with regard to [a new?] structure, that may respond to the needs for cross community work on internet governance.

So, what you're thinking to have comparison [inaudible] with CCWG accreditation, and if we both, the staff too is [inaudible] and the format will be a table to kind of [inaudible] paragraph by paragraph. On the other hand, we think that [the new?] structure for our [work?], we got a document from the GNSO, listing the different [format?] and [inaudible] useful.

And we may think about [inaudible] people [inaudible] that used for [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Rafik, it's Olivier. [Inaudible] jumping in. You did sound a little bit garbled, so I think we caught most of what you said. Desiree is trying to get the GNSO motion on the screen at the moment. How are we doing with that Desiree?

DESIREE CABRERA: Just putting it in. It will be two more seconds, but I should have it up soon.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. And then maybe, Rafik, will you then be going through the motion quickly then, to show us what is expected?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes. I think just want to highlight [inaudible] of the [motion?], and in particular, the [inaudible] part, so we have kind of this idea of the [inaudible] to do. The link is, includes all the motions focused on that task, so please go to...

Okay. So, [inaudible] part, we have just [inaudible]... organization for the CWG. However, [inaudible] this condition [inaudible] review of the [inaudible]... CWG framework, and in particular the GNSO Council work to be subject to [inaudible] work plan, with regular updates and clear deliverables.

---

The GNSO Council [inaudible] that the CWG will present by ICANN date report on these findings, which [inaudible] charter or recommendation [inaudible] to the group [inaudible]... following the submission of the CWG policy [inaudible] Council will consider the recommendation, [inaudible] whatever, and it will continue as [inaudible] or [inaudible]...

So, I want to share this first, pending the first item, GNSO Council is expecting [inaudible] work. I mean, to basically work and give regular updates and [inaudible], in terms of [inaudible] we encounter that and the next agenda items, I think [inaudible] more details of that [inaudible].

So, and basically ask for [inaudible]... ...of our charter. Proposed amendments, or recommendations to [inaudible] the group, and a new structure. So, this is basically what we are asking through the motion.

I just want to confirm that we have the [inaudible]... on that, with that [inaudible]... may ask the GNSO Council to be more specific.

Any comments on this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Rafik, it's Olivier speaking. Your voice did come out quite garbled during your explanation, but Desiree has now put the motion on the Adobe Connect. So, I guess people are reading through this. As I understand, there really are three things. First, the need for clear deliverables, and I guess [regular?] deliverables as well.

And you mention that we're going to be working on this in the annual report. And then reviewing the charter, two options. Either proposed

---

amendments to come up with a suggestion for a new structure. Is that correct?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes. [Inaudible] or still, [same problem?].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Can you speak a little more?

RAFIK DAMMAK: No.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You still sound a bit garbled. Anyway, I guess the floor is open. I note that Farzaneh is saying, we have to start a drafting team. And we can... And Marilyn Cade is asking regarding deliverables, that really our deliverables are the activities including participation and events. So, many of those deliverables will indeed, come from, I guess the staff reports that staff are drafting anyway, as part of the work.

But I guess it really is up to us to amend the reports...

Someone needs to mute.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Hi Olivier.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, hello.

RAFIK DAMMAK: So, I do, yes. I do think really first, people are jumping in terms of draft team, or whatever, we have to do the review, and so that's one of the expectations to get support on that matter. So, we need first really, as CWG IG, to get familiar with the new framework.

So, I think we shared the link to the report. So, we need to get familiar. And having kind of the new document to highlight missing part, or discrepancy between our charter and framework, we can have a better understanding, what are the areas we need to cover.

So, I think that should be first priority for us.

Hello?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Rafik, it's Olivier speaking. Would you like me to run the queue? Or, are you running the queue? Because people are queuing up.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. I see, Alan. Yes, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. One of the issues with the GNSO is that the... We have an echo. Is that this CCWG does not have a finite life with a plan termination, and does not, is not likely to issue a final report. Are they

---

willing...? Do you sense that the GNSO is willing to be flexible on that? Because the rest of it is rather mute. We can go through whatever exercise we want in getting a report, but if we have to cease to exist and then re-charter ourselves every year or two years, it seems a bit futile.

So, are they willing to be flexible on that one? Or do you sense they are?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks Alan. That's why they give us some, how to say? Some room here, when they're asking us if we, if we can provide recommendations, we constitute the group and the new structure, acknowledging that maybe the cross community principle, I mean framework, and not maybe the right framework for us.

So, I think they give us some liberty here. But how much we can spend on that, or what can be the structure we can propose, and how that will be agreed with the other chartering organizations that another topic that we didn't discuss yet.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you. Just as a follow-up, it seems rather silly, and I'll see that work, because I think, in reference to Monty Python's silly is the right word, that in order to satisfy the GNSO, we have to change our name from a cross community working group, to a cross community discussion group, and therefore not have to follow that work.



---

I would have hoped the framework would have been flexible that it could adapt to us, but if not, then we should no sooner rather than later. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks Alan. I see Marilyn. Hi Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you. I know we've got background noise, so if anyone is not speaking... Oh, thank God. Thank you. I just wanted to make a comment, pretty much in support what Alan said, but also, I see Greg has joined. I'm just going to comment on behalf of the business constituency.

This means 70% of the business constituency members are really active in internet governance issues, outside of ICANN, but also within ICANN, very much aware that even though we have achieved a major step, only 17 years into ICANN's existence, on the transition of IANA, really the threat and concern about ICANN in its overall rule, has not fully gone away.

We should not assume that internet governance is not an ongoing challenge, and that guidance to the staff and the Board, and input from a cross community working group is not needed. In fact, it's probably even more needed because there is confusion in some members of the community that, okay, we're done here. Now we've saved ICANN. We can move on with just being ICANN.

---

Externally, and the world at large, that is not the case. This issue is really, really important, and ICANN's continued contribution within its core mandate, remains very important at SCSTD, at the IT working group on WSIS and on the international public policy issues at [inaudible].

Without guidance, we do not know where the staff is directing or where they're going. And I'm not being critical about the staff. I think the staff are great about making the bottom up input. We need to be providing that. I think, also, that we probably need to do a better job of outreach to the contracted parties, particularly to the brand new ones.

I know Becky is on the call. But many of the contracted parties are brand new, and they may not fully understand the risk to the unique situation that ICANN gets them. They are contracted to ICANN, and they are not then being asked to [deport?] to every government in the world. And perhaps we're not doing a good enough job of educating some of the brand new contracted parties about why it matters.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks Marilyn. Yes, Greg, please go ahead.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. Greg Shatan. Sorry, it takes a little while to get off mute. Two things. First, I think that, as a pragmatic possibility, at least for the short term, and to deal with the beginning, middle, and end problem that we have of fitting into the CCWG framework, would be to establish a

---

charter that we work in phases, which has beginnings, middles, and ends, and with deliverables.

And those phases could be annual or tied to other, to the internet governance calendar, if you will, in some fashion. Doesn't have to be annual, it could be tied to something that has a longer arch, but at least that defines that we will have a beginning, middle, and an end.

And I think that from the GNSO's point of view, that's probably not their biggest concern, but it is cited by those who want to be formulistic. I think the bigger concerns are what they perceive as the lack of communication outward from the group, and it may be that different people are doing that job in varying degrees within their communities, but we need a communication that's not only dependent on our ability to personally go back and orally report, or write a personal report to our communities.

We need something more structured, both oral and written, and that segues into the other concern I think the GNSO had, which is we have a lack, we lack any defined deliverable. And indeed, those reports could be deliverables, if defined as such, but we haven't really delivered any deliverable in quite some time, and aren't inclined to have any particular deliverables.

So, I think that if we could work in phases, have a communication come in, and have deliverables, that would at least kind of make us, practically speaking, more valuable. And I agree 100% with Marilyn that we need to serve the whole GNSO and have the whole GNSO engaged, and the contracted parties are obviously a huge part of that.

---

Last, I think the discussion group, while it might fit better than any of the other ones, doesn't necessarily contemplate a cross community structure, and it seems somewhat of a demotion. Discussion group sounds a lot like a talk shop, and I don't think that's the impression we want to give. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks. Wow, okay. So, maybe I just, in kind of in term of reminder. In fact, we were are supposed to be reviewed on an annual basis by, at the AGM. So, we can't have that phase, an annual phase, really, and think to make some work plan on an annual basis. While we acknowledge that internet governance is always kind of, always coming, and so...

In terms of structures, yes, we can maybe go with consultation group, but the document that we got from GNSO, is not kind of, I mean, it doesn't mean that we are restricted to that. That's the kind of education, what the GNSO came up in the last years, with trying to respond to different needs and requirements.

And I think we can use that to create even a mix or hybrid solution. For example, I may think if we... Since IGO issues are always coming on a regular basis, maybe we can have something similar to standing committee. And because standing committee doesn't have kind of requirement to kind of to have an exact work plan, or deliver to whatever comes to it.

So, maybe jumping quickly to [inaudible], maybe it's premature at this level, but we can agree, at least, maybe on some criteria that we want to satisfy that we need something cross community. Think of the

---

different SO and ACs as we have now and so on. So, maybe that is something that we can work on, a list of criteria that we want to match.

Okay, yes Alan, you can go ahead.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you. To respond to Greg. You said cross community discussion group, not because that was the right word, it was invented on the fly, just because it was a name which doesn't have a formal framework associated with it. I have absolutely no problem and strongly support regular reports, although I hope we're not talking about 60 to 80 page reports each time, which is the norm for a normal cross community working group, so to speak.

All I was trying to get is clarity. If indeed, that framework that was approved is going to be enforced rigidly, then we might as well know it now, and when we re-charter, change the name, so that does not apply to us. That was the only real question. I, of course, strongly support not just being a talk shop, but actually doing something, and I think, in general, we are doing that, and regular reporting.

But I want the rules of engagement, so to speak, to be clear at the beginning so we don't have to do this twice. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks Alan. Okay. Yes, Olivier, please go ahead.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much Rafik. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking for the transcript. And I think Alan is quite right on the, how rigid the interpretation of the guidelines for the cross community working groups will be adhered to, because reporting is one thing, start and end is another thing.

We obviously need to make sure that we fit within the box. If we can't fit within the box, then we have to find a different structure. And the problem I have with finding a different structure, and it was mentioned already on this call, is the so-called emotion, as in saying, well, it's not a cross community working group, it's something that doesn't exist yet in the ICANN context, and therefore, it is less important, and the ability, the chartering of this new structure might be a completely different kettle of fish.

The concern here, of course, is that there will be times when we might need to take urgent action, and the current structure as a CCWG allows us to directly consult the chartering SOs and ACs. Without a formal chartering, or formal such avenue to the SOs and ACs, it would be very difficult for this working group to go back to SOs and ACs and tell them, oh, there is something that we need to do very quickly, because it's so important.

Now, that something, of course, we can't really put it in. But I do remind you that the process for the ITRs has started again, the International Telecommunication Regulations have started. So, you know, we are likely to see some things in the future, that would be likely to affect ICANN directly, and we might need to do a call up for arms at the time.

The problem, of course, the definition of when and how will that happen. And I've noticed in the chat also, the question as to, you know, where do we start? How do we start this? Do we start with the review of the work, the cross community working group directives on how a cross community working group should operate, and have a table, and see if we fit in the box or not fit in the box?

And then, work on that specific section so as to then be able to fit in the box? Or how do you, you know, how do you suggest moving forward on this?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks Olivier. I think there are two aspects. And the first is, we need to kind of really compare our chartering against a framework. We need to see, to highlight the difference, to get an exact idea of what is missing, or what can be approved. On the other hand, I think we now list the issue about the reporting, that maybe it was not enough, maybe it's not what was expected, and we can work on that.

At the end, this is more kind of, let's say, practice, it's not necessarily the charter. So, we can improve the reporting in the coming weeks. It doesn't really, has to wait for what we will do as amendment in the charter, or if we need a new structure, or whatever.

So, this is two tracks. And I think that's why we designed our agenda on that matter, because we are going to discuss about the reporting in the next agenda item. So, for now, we have really to understand what is, what is missing, in our charter.

---

---

We, as a reminder, when we had kind of, that when we wrote kind of letter, we sent to the different SOs and ACs regarding the notion of member and participant, we tried to base it on the practice in other cross community working groups. So, we try to do some updates before.

Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Rafik. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. Again, [inaudible] is able to speak [inaudible]...

...something which I think has gained some traction. What are we intending to accomplish? And how are we intending to accomplish that? What is the best working methodology to the work of the group? And just casting aside the, whether it fits in the CCWG framework, it just is important to have a plan to accomplish the goals of a working group.

So, my view on this, and I'll share this as a starting point, I guess, and I hope that others would be able to come up with comments or criticize, or not, my understanding of what this working group does is several fold. On the one hand, we are tracking, thanks to the work of staff on the one side that are doing this as part of their duties in the government engagement and the internet governance engagement, which, by the way, takes place, whether this working group exists or not.

We are tracking what is going on outside of ICANN's walls in all of the different UN and other internet governance environments outside of ICANN. And we have a duty to relay this to our own communities. So,



we should facilitate whatever report is being drafted by staff. We should facilitate this transmission of reports to our communities, perhaps even adding to it, and we of course, have many of our members that are involved in external internet governance.

So, we should beef up those reports with the input from those of us that are present, firsthand for most of us, in those external processes, so that we can have regular reports that we send to our communities, letting them know what's going on out there. That's one thing.

Secondly, I would foresee that if there is something that ICANN needs to respond to, public consultation that takes place, let's say a CSTD consultation, we have had staff draft an ICANN answer, of course, at short notice, because these things always happen at short notice. That they have been very good in passing this by the working group, and asking for input from us.

And we should fully engage in providing staff with feedback, and at the same time, I think that we should also be considering in some cases, and I'm saying this as in very seldom, sort of rare occasions, when something is really required from the ICANN community, we should be concentrating it to drafting something ourselves as well. And perhaps even relaying the consultation to our own charting support organizations and advisory committees, and asking them to let us know if we're on the right track or not, when it comes down to these external processes, bearing in mind, they would have been regularly told about what we are doing through our regular reports.

---

So, that's the view that I sort of had. And we had done this on some occasions, but the work has been somehow unsteady. We did have a very broad input to the NetMundial initiative, sorry, the NetMundial consultation quite a while ago.

And then, of course, the cross community working group on IANA stewardship and one on ICANN accountability came up, and I'm well aware that many of our members were then really, their attention was taking on by the other work. I'm hoping that now that we have less work in the accountability, at least for some of us, that we would have a few more volunteer cycles to seriously engage in this working group here, to both inform our communities, but also bring the point of view of our communities to these external processes, and to ICANN staff for respond to these external processes regularly.

So, that's the proposal I have. I don't know if there is traction for this, or if anybody has a different view. I would be very interested to hear that. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks Olivier. And I think Becky wants to intervene. Yes Becky?

BECKY BURR:

Thank you very much. I'm sorry, I'm reluctant to insert myself too much here, but since I had a hand in the CCWG framework, I think maybe some of the things, some of my perspective is useful. I think that the issue... I agree with what Olivier said, but I think the issue is that CCWGs who have their formal processes in place, to ensure that sort of the

---

---

output of the working group is supported back to the chartering organizations, and every chartering organization has its own methodology for, you know, sort of putting its stamp of approval on the output of the CCWG.

And I think that is as it should be, but the, you know, that's the critical feature here. And so, you know, when the CCWG, for example, puts together, when this group puts together a statement or contributes to an ICANN comment on something, I understand that the timelines are short, so you know, to me, the real process point is... At some level, there is a piece of work for the chartering organizations to do here, which is to say, how they want the members of this group who represent the chartering organizations, what the communication back and forth is, and what the authority to speak on behalf on, or to say, this is supported by the chartering organization is.

So, you know, that's really, from a process point, that's the substantive process point, but otherwise I think this is really about, you know, articulating the goals of the group, and how we intend to accomplish those goals. And nothing more and nothing more pernicious, but just sort of good governance.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks Becky. Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Rafik. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And thanks for this Becky, that's very enlightening, and I fully support what you're saying

---

here. And I think that if we can work out a specific process by which the working group can go back to its chartering organization, then [inaudible] a response quickly enough to be able to get a green light for bringing this input either to staff or to an external process, then we're, then at that point, we'll certainly make things a lot easier, because we'll have sort of a channel, and we'll know how many days to expect until we get a response, etc.

The concern [inaudible] is just the concern of time. And that sometimes is just a week, sometimes it's two weeks, and sometimes it's even less than that were given a chance to respond. And I don't have an answer for that, at the moment. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks Olivier. This is kind of, I'd say, a topic for discussion for us to figure out how to create a process, and also to ensure this practice. Okay. I see that Greg has raised his hand. Yes, Greg?

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. Greg Shatan again. I think what I hear Becky saying is that we shouldn't try too hard to comport ourselves into a CCWG model, if it's not really our model. I do think regardless, that the ideas of better and more formal outward communication deliverables, add value to the community and gets the community more involved and ultimately will get more people involved with the CCWG, or whatever we are.

I don't think that by Copenhagen, we're necessarily going to invent a new structure that fits what we do, but I do think that I like Becky's

---

approach of being, trying to define exactly what it is that we want to do. And then be sure that we have a structure that accommodates that. And that, you know, was seen as a worthwhile... I still think that being chartered and having accountability and profile with the SOs and ACs, you know, is part of establishing the kind of rigor and credibility of the group, and that we do need to be seen as speaking not just for ourselves.

But when we do speak, you know, even ICANN staff, and the only way that we can do that is really through regular and responsive communications with our communities. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks Greg. Okay. Sorry Greg, I guess that's an old hand, or you wanted to intervene again? Okay, thanks. Okay. I see that this discussion is still ongoing in the Adobe Connect chat, but is there any further comment here? Because I guess we need maybe to move to the next agenda item soon, but at least to ensure that we have some action items from here.

Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks Rafik. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And Marilyn actually asks about the Board working group on internet governance, and yes, that's one body that we have not mentioned yet. As you know, the Board has a working group with Marcus [inaudible] as the chair of that working group. And they, of course, are doing their work on their side.

The discussions and meetings we've had with the Board working group have been very good so far, and in full collaboration.

So, you know, we could have full collaboration with them. They obviously are working with staff on ICANN responses, but I think it's sort of a three way component where we now have a link to the Board through the Board working group. We have a link to ICANN staff. We have a link to these supporting organizations and advisory committees through the chartering, whatever vehicle it is that we would have, and it really is down to making use of these names, and making sure that the community view is known there.

So, I would suggest first steps really, to design the process by which our communication link will take place with our supporting organizations and advisory committee, perhaps a timeline on how we can, sorry, technical timeline on how we would be phased by, let's say, external consultation. The amount of time that happens until we can pick it up.

We can then send it, well get our discussion going. Then advisor our chartering organizations. It comes back to us. We draft something based on the input from our chartering organizations, or even we draft something before that, pass it by the chartering organizations, get their feedback, amend it, and then send it both to the Board working group, but also to ICANN staff, and also, as I said, in those rare cases.

And I think that there might be just very few of them sending it directly out, if we are given the permission to do so by our chartering organizations. But I think that's one of the, you know, that's what we have to start working on. I really, in parallel, we can certainly see if we

---

---

can fit in the box of the cross community working group box, but I'm not sure that it's going to take us anywhere.

My gut feeling is that it is going to be very difficult to fit in the cross community working group box, and we also have to think about an alternative way, but with equally strong links to chartering organizations, so that we have the ability to do the same thing as we would have under what I've described earlier.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Olivier, I'm not able to raise my hand, but I just posted a question. What you're proposing is asking for permission from the chartering organizations. Greg, and you, and others, Becky, were very active on the... I was a participant, not a contributor. Can we just understand how the others [inaudible] CCWG, did they have a mission? Or did they go to, did they go out for public comment, and then bring a draft document back?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I'm sorry. It took me a little while to come off mute. My feeling is this working group drafts a first draft, it then consults its chartering organizations, and if it gets the green light or any feedback, it incorporates a new draft, and then it can send it out, either responding to staff or responding to an external public comment.

The final document, as Becky mentions in the chat, has to be affirmatively endorsed by the chartering organizations. And that's where there is a real problem with timing. [CROSSTALK]

---

The [inaudible] that you say Marilyn comes, from the community taking part in this working group, because it is here that we have all the experts that know what they're talking about, and that have been following those processes, some of whom actually [inaudible] in the processes, and then we inform the chartering organizations, pass on the first draft or even final draft, and then wait for them to come back to us to proceed forward with it.

But I just don't know how we're going to do it in the time that that's given in some of the cases, including the amount of time it would take us to reach consensus to draft something within the working group.

NIGEL HICKSON: Can I...? Excuse me, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Nigel, go ahead. It's Rafik who is running the show at the moment.

NIGEL HICKSON: I'm sorry. It's very, very difficult to hear a lot of this on an audio connection. But just two points. One is that there is no absolute requirement, I would have thought, for the cross community working group to wait until the Board internet governance group, if you like, asked something.

It's a two way process. It's the cross community working group on internet governance feels there is an issue on internet governance that the Board working group ought to be aware of, or ought to take a view



---

of, or whatever, then, you know, that can be done, that process of input. I just don't think it has to be the, it has to be the other way.

Also, I think one of the values of the cross community working group on internet governance is to get a, is to get views. So, the organization, I'm not going to say staff, of the organization, if we're drafting something and we have a deadline of four days, as we often do, for an ICU proposal or something, and you know, we just want a sanity check, but we're just, you know, that we've considered the main elements of an argument, being able to get other people's attention, this is something called, you know, I think, consultation, is very important.

We're not looking for a charter view, we're just looking for someone to say, ah, have you considered that? Have you considered why? And, you know, this is the same as going down the pub and asking the people in the bar, you know, their views on something. It's just that you might get more intelligence in the cross community working group.

So, I think, you know, we have to be a bit realistic and practical of that. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. Thanks Nigel. So, okay, several issues rising here, including now about how we, as cross community working group, we can handle consultation and coordinate with our chartering organization. Okay. So, I think we have to list all these kind of issues that are arising, because probably we need to work on them later, and to try to see if we can get some proposal or solution.

---

Can we take note of all of these issues so that we can follow up later on? And I think that we are reaching the top of the hour, and still have one agenda item to be covered by Olivier. So, if there is no further comment here, I would suggest that we move to that other thing, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks Rafik. It's Olivier speaking. If you could just... Because I think we need some action items out of this discussion, which I think has been very helpful. I was going to suggest the two first action items will be devise a [process?] by which the working group drafts its own response to consultations.

And secondly, devise a process by which the working group response to the sounding board request from staff, when they are themselves drafting a response, and they're asking the working group, and what, you know, for their own input, as Nigel has just mentioned here.

The third action item I was going to suggest was to, in parallel with those two things, to actually look if we, if the working group fits in the CCWG box by doing that table, which you had suggested. And that's all the ones that I have got at the moment. I don't know if anybody wishes to suggest any other action items, and then we can move on.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Olivier. [CROSSTALK]

---

MARILYN CADE: Yes, it's Marilyn. Maybe we can go back to Becky's proposal, which I had supported, which I think is actually for, it's yes, this fits into the CWG box, but also examining, for ourselves, for our purposes and what we're trying to accomplish.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks Marilyn. Okay. So, we'll take note of all the group's action items. And I think also... Sorry, please, if you are not speaking, please mute yourself. And also, I think the reporting, hopefully I'm not missing that. Okay.

So, hopefully we can cover this action items and ensure the follow-up later. So, now I would like to really give the floor for Olivier so he can move to the next agenda item. Yes, Olivier, the floor is yours now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Rafik. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And so now we're going to work on a deliverable. The proposal for an annual review of the working group activities. We've had a couple of intermediate, they're not really reports, quick presentations that Rafik and I made to the GNSO Council in Marrakesh. I remember one, I can't quite remember if there was one in Helsinki.

There might have been one in Helsinki, briefly. But no real actual sort of proper report on what the working group has been done. And that probably is one of the reasons why there is a big question mark outside this community, or outside of this working group membership about what the group is doing.

---

The proposal here is to take some of the reports which have already been drafted by staff, and sort of, you know, put them together effectively in one document. And also adding the, what this working group did in relation to these different events, whether the staff submitted some document or consultation with the input from this working group, whether we had members of the working group that were actually present in those external events, and this sort of thing.

We've got here a list. So the staff report CSTD WTSA [inaudible] suggested work with the ITU processes would be, would also need to be included in there. Obviously WTSA is an ITU process. Then a report on the WSIS forum in Geneva. I recall that staff had drafted a report on this, and perhaps we can even have the inclusion of the note on the workshops that we held there.

Then the report on the GNSO that was for the GNSO in Marrakesh, or was in Guadalajara. I think that these are actually just, or all [inaudible] reports. I can't remember if there was a presentation as such, but we can certainly take a few specific ones from the transcripts, if we have not already included this elsewhere.

The staff report from the IGF workshops in Guadalajara. I know that these have been drafted as well, and in fact, there are other reports which have been drafted by external organizations on some of the workshops that ICANN attended, that were directly related to ICANN. We could certainly have a look at those and add them to our longer report.

And then, as I said, just put some linking paragraphs in between. But I'd be interested if anybody else have a suggestion for a different way to put this annual review together. The concern I have right now, is obviously volunteer time, staff time. I remind you, we only have two staff members. Well, one staff member who is supporting this group, Desiree Cabrera.

And another staff member, Nigel Hickson, who is liaising with the government engagement parts of ICANN. So, and is involved with all of you, [inaudible] processes. So, it's not like we have a whole set of staff that could hold the pen and work on this. If we have to write a long report ourselves, we're going to have to hold the pen.

And I know how our limited our volunteer time is all around. So the floor is open for suggestions please.

Marilyn Cade, you have the floor.

MARILYN CADE:

Thanks. I just put in the chat that we need to include, we need to document the face to face meetings that we've held, the guest speakers we've had, and the sessions, sorry for the typo. Sessions that we have organized at the ICANN meetings, including the topics that were discussed, and whether there were any, I think, for me, looking at the sessions, for the most part the purpose has been informing the rest of the community, but not doing so in a perhaps well structured documented manner, and we may need to go back.

---

We do have transcripts of each of those sessions, but we may need to go back and just summarize the, at this meeting, we held both the face to face meetings, just included the new CEO, or the Board working group, and because what we have right now is just the external activities, and I think we also need to include the inside ICANN activities.

That shouldn't be too hard to do. We have agendas, so we know who has been participating. I think head count in each of the meetings may be a little difficult for us, but you know, we might be able to [inaudible] that, and if we held open mics in those sessions, that will also be in the transcript.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Marilyn. Olivier speaking. [Inaudible] and I think that head count would be possible, because we have conducted rough head counts, and I certainly know for the last few meetings there was someone around for doing headcounts. We can give rough head counts on this. Judith Hellerstein next.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, this is Judith Hellerstein for the record. Yes, I agree with Marilyn. I would say the same thing. I'm thinking we can give little summaries of what we've done in the past year, and also both of the work, [inaudible] meetings, but in our weekly meetings, and what we've been working on.

And as well as what sessions we've done, what we have accomplished, as Marilyn says, we can have head count, but also you know, give an

ideas of what we've done, even though we didn't have as many people at our high interest sessions, that's also a deliverable, the fact that ours was chosen also suggests what we've been doing, and the cross community nature of it.

And so, I think something like that, and as Alan says, the transcripts are available, so we can take snippets from there, and just do that, it's like year-end review. This is what we've done during the year. And if we did that every year, or even twice a year, I think that would be great. That could count as deliverables.

So, that's just something I thought about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Judith. Olivier speaking. Any other suggestions to add to the yearly reports?

Did someone just ask for the floor?

Nope. Okay. Well, I take it then that's everything that needs to be in that report is listed, so all of these external processes, plus the internal processes that we've, the eternal events that we've had. Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: Actually, yes. Quite some time ago, I worked very closely with the staff to do an expanded timeline of external events. And wondering, actually, if we shouldn't... You made reference to this, and the ICANN staff does do a calendar of events from ICANN's point of view, but as you recall, last year, I contributed also my special, fairy chart of

---

---

everything you wanted to know about meetings going on in internet governance.

I think that's also a deliverable, that we should come back to. And I'm happy to work with another volunteer to, not just the ICANN staff, to put that together, because that's a heads up. It informs lots of members of the community, and I think if we added that as a deliverable, it's a neutral deliverable. It just tells people events that are going on, that are directly, that are viewed as being relevant.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you Marilyn for this. It's Olivier speaking. So, I'm putting down make unique reference to the calendars. I would suggest that we include this year's calendar, which is already drawn up, but I am aware that they are a little bit out of date, the last one being updated sometime over the summer.

But I don't know if there is a plan... Do you have a plan to draft a calendar for next year? And I'm going to turn to Nigel who is back on the call, whether staff has a plan to devise a calendar as well, themselves. When we mean calendar, it's the timeline which has been very good at being able to forecast what's coming up. [CROSSTALK] ...and then Nigel, or Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE:

Yes. So, I'm developing the 2017 timeline right now. I'd be happy if somebody would just send me the, what's on the list from last year to look at it, and help to provide in the updates from the timeline that I



---

keep. Sometimes the staff has, you know... I think the staff timeline includes a lot of the technical community events, but I don't include. And they're both important.

So, volunteering for next year, volunteering to look back at the last years to see if it needs an update. [CROSSTALK]

I just want to come into Greg. Greg, this timeline is something I do for my clients. I'm willing to contribute it, but not to make it into a Wiki page. I think maybe you mean the ICANN version.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks for this Marilyn. And thanks for sharing this with us, this timeline with us. Nigel Hickson, is there a plan for another, or an update to the timeline in the staff?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, yes, sorry. And thank you for being so [inaudible], the signals are not very good. Yeah. So, we will certainly endeavor to update the calendar for 2017, certainly to show the main events, and of course, always willing to work with Marilyn to make sure we capture as much as we can.

And that would certainly be a deliverable as I would see it. If I may, Olivier, just while I'm on, as I think I mentioned previously, we're prepared to enlist extra resources for this, as the working group would wish. So, I'm certainly not suggesting that we do this as a staff exercise in terms of this annual report, but if, you know, working together with the working group, we could certainly put some extra resources into

---

doing the, you know, pulling together all of the different strands, etc., editing the different ideas.

So, I'm quite, we're quite prepared to put some extra resources into this as the working group wishes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Nigel. Olivier speaking. So, Marilyn, I think one of the action items... Desiree, are you making notes of the action items? Or should I type them in as well?

DESIREE CABRERA: Yes, I'm taking note of them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. So, action item, Marilyn, you can work with Nigel, and whoever is dealing with these timelines, maybe it's with Desiree as well, to produce next year's timeline. And I think we have a somehow updated timeline for this year, it might require a couple of changes. And with a view of including both of these timelines and next year's timeline into the annual report.

And the second action item is for the co-chairs of this working group to work with Nigel on putting this annual review report together. I'd like to ask if there are any other volunteers who would like to be part of the discussion on this, to take part in putting this first draft together?

---

I might be putting you on the spot. Okay, Marilyn is happy to collaborate, okay. So we'll have Marilyn, and if anybody else is interested in helping out with putting this report together, please let us know. Time wise, I realize it is ever so close to the holidays. I don't think that we'll have an annual report done before the end of the year, bearing in mind that ICANN does officially close between Christmas and New Year.

So, it will have to be some time in the New Year, early in January, that we have a first draft out. Okay. Anything else on this? I think [inaudible], but if there are no comments here, there is agreement about the different component parts that we have suggested to go into this annual report. [CROSSTALK]

...I will be sharing this afterwards with the wider working group on the mailing list. Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: So, you're going to revise, what's under two, to include these additional things that we've agreed to, yes?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, what did you say? I didn't hear you.

MARILYN CADE: Well, the proposal for the annual review now, is missing a couple of additions that we made. So, you're going to add those...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, yes.

MARILYN CADE: Yes. And then, I was just saying, I wonder if we could publish a draft outline for the annual report by the end of the year. So, we're not publishing the report, but do you think we can get a draft outline from those of us who are volunteering to work? And that, at least, shows progress.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this suggestion, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. That's absolutely fine, yeah, let's do this. Okay with this. I don't know how others... Mark, Nigel, feel about it, but we can certainly do a draft outline. We've already got a list of the topics, we can certainly do that, and that would be a good point, because then we know exactly where we're going, and some of us can even start filling up the gaps until the New Year, if we have any spare cycles.

Okay, I don't see any other points here. So, just for the record, in addition to what's listed on the screen, in agenda item two, we will be adding the sessions that have been organized by this working group at ICANN meetings, we will be adding some of the topics that have been discussed.

So maybe a summary of the discussions that we have had in our various calls over the year, and we will be adding this year's timeline and next year's timeline as well.

---

---

Okay. I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so let's move on. Mark Carvell is asking, [inaudible] of the adoption of the charter is blank, is there an action point here? That's, yeah, the notes... I think that Desiree will circulate the notes afterwards.

Mark, are you speaking about the Wiki page at the moment?

MARK CARVELL:

Hi Olivier. Yeah, Mark speaking. No, I was just looking at the current charter for the working group, prompted by the discussion of the relationships with the SOs and ACs. And I just saw that annex A of the charter, on page seven, is blank.

And I was checking in an exchange with you, what our shared understanding is of the GAC in terms of any formal commitment of the GAC in respect of the CCWG internet governance, and we don't know. So, I thought I would just draw attention to the fact that this part of the charter document, the annex A on record of adoption and extension, is blank.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, thanks for this Mark. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I've put a link to the Wiki page that has this status on there. SO, AC, SG, ratification of CCWG on IG charter, it was called SG ratification because if you recall, historically it started with stakeholder groups in there.

What we have here is GNSO, ALAC, and ccNSO having ratified the charter at different times, with a co-chair. The SSAC has ratified, but we don't actually have a date per se, but they also selected that they would

---

not need to have a co-chair. The GAC did not ratify formally the charter, and I can't remember why, whether there was perhaps a concern about the GAC being formally a chartering organization for this, due to the fact that the working group might be issuing statements that might go against one government or another.

I'm not sure. I can't remember, frankly. Perhaps you can check with the GAC chair.

MARK CARVELL:

Yeah, I'm happy to do that. Yes, I have to check that out. I'm sorry, I'm completely unclear as to what the GAC said, or the extent of any GAC consideration. But I'll follow-up with Tom Schneider, yeah, and the secretariat, okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this Mark. That's another action that will record so we don't forget it, we'll come to you then. And Desiree, for the record, so for Mark Carvell to check with the GAC chair on the status of GAC ratification of CCWG charter, if any.

Okay. I don't see any hands up. Nope, I'm wrong. Marilyn Cade has put her hand up. Marilyn, you have the floor.

And you're muted at the moment.

---

MARILYN CADE:                                 Sorry. I wanted to put on the record if we're ready for AOB, a comment [CROSSTALK]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:                 Yeah, we're ready for AOB now, so go ahead.

MARILYN CADE:                                 Thank you. I wanted to just put on the record, a comment to the ICANN staff to, all of us from the ICANN community who participated in the IGF 2016, also to call out, in particular, because we have Mark and Juuso here from the GAC, the extraordinary hosting of their colleagues from the Mexican government, and not just the local host, but the local volunteers.

We had a number of participants from the ICANN community, ranging from the ICANN staff, to ICANN Board members, to ICANN community members. Many of us were involved in workshops, or main sessions, in the booths. I think it was a really phenomenal event, and so important to have such a well-organized and visible presence from the ICANN senior staff and the Board, showing the flag for acting, multistakeholder and acting on equal footing.

I just wanted to put on the record, because sometimes we forget that the internet governance forum is a sister organization, and that ICANN is a main supporter and contributor to that state. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Marilyn. And thank you for putting this on the record. It's particularly important, and indeed, it was a very large turnout, a very large significant turnout of people from different component parts of ICANN that were very much involved in the IGF.

So, it's good to see this involvement. We are reaching the last five minutes of this call. Any other, other business on this? Is there anything that we've missed? Maybe other action items that we need to have?

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, just very briefly. This is Nigel. I mean, just in response to Marilyn, to really say thanks to all of the people, all of the volunteers. I mean, we do it as a job, but some people, you know, really pulled down amazing sort of contributions of the IGF, which made it such an important event.

So, and of course, with Geneva next year, it's going to be even more significant, perhaps, we'll see. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Nigel. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And now, Desiree, is it premature of me to ask you to read some of the action items that you have recorded? Just to be sure they're all caught.

DESIREE CABRERA: Yeah, sure. Okay. What I have is, devise a process for the working group to respond to consultations. Devise a process for the working



---

group to respond to outstanding Board requests from staff when themselves are asking questions in the working group.

For Marilyn to work with staff to produce the timeline. For the co-chairs to work with Nigel to put together the annual review report. There is also a request for a draft outline on the annual report, which includes adding sessions and events, the sessions on the various calls, as well as the two timelines between Marilyn and staff.

And for Mark Carvell to check with the GAC chairs on the status of the CCWG IG charter, if any.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Desiree. It's Olivier speaking. I was going to add one action item that was suggested is, what are we trying to accomplish? Launch a discussion on the working group mailing list for us to work out what we're trying to accomplish.

I was hoping that we would get subgroups out of this call today. So, maybe a subgroup to work on the charter work, and a subgroup to work on the annual reporting as a follow-up to this, if you'd like to volunteer for any of the subgroups, in helping us either in the charter, or on the report, please drop me a note, or drop a note to the mailing list, and then we can work a bit more efficiently in parallel.

Rafik, you have the floor.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Yeah. Thanks Olivier. I think we should send a call for volunteers on the mailing list, since many people already left the call a few minutes ago. So, we should do that as soon as possible, before everyone go to holidays, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks for this Rafik. Good suggestion. So, with no other hands up, I would like to thank you all for joining this call. And I wish you a happy holiday, and we'll meet again next year, no doubt. So, with this, this call is adjourned. And thanks for all of your work this year. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]