

---

RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now begin recorded.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay, there we go.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. Well, good morning, good afternoon, good evening everyone. This is the Cross Community Working Group Call of the 2<sup>nd</sup> of February, 2017. Today is a Thursday and it's our first call of the year. We had a little time to recoup from last year's activities and there were a number of action items. Today's call is going to be primarily on two things. First, policy topics, a review of what's been happening since our last call as far as policy was concerned. And then, important organizational topics, coming from action items that we had during our last call and our last face to face meeting. We can start with a role call please, Desiree.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay. And I apologize in advance if I pronounce your name wrong. We have in the room Angela from IMDA, Berry Cobb, Jim Prendergast, Judith Hellerstein, Julf Helsingius,, Jusso Moisander, Michael Oghia, Tatiana Tropina. And for the chairs we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond and we're still waiting for Rafik Dammak to join us again. And for staff we have myself, Desiree Cabrera, and Nigel Hickson.

---

*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 CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Desiree. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. Nigel, I note that you are on the call. You did say you were going to be late, I'm not quite sure whether you are just in listening mode or not. I don't know whether you can say, or type in the chat whether you're able to speak.

Today's call, as I said, a mix of both policy and organizational topics. First thing I need to ask is whether there are any suggested amendments to the agenda? The agenda is currently displayed on the wiki page and also on the Adobe Connect room. [AUDIO BREAK] I'm not seeing any hands up for amendments to be done, so the agenda is adopted as it is currently on the screen. And as I mentioned just before the call started, we might have to shuffle the policy topics and the organizational topics, and swap them over in case Nigel is unable to take part in the first part of the call.

Let's go directly to our action items from our last call that was on the 21<sup>st</sup> of December 2016. There were a number of action items; I think many are actually done. Devise a process for the working group to respond to consultation, devise a process for the working group to respond to the sounding board requests from staff. I've sent two separate emails to the mailing list with my very, very first draft 0.00001, it's just to get the conversation going. I've had so far some response from Marilyn Cade on the response to the consultation, letting me know that the numbers that I'm looking at, five days here, five days there, five days there, make the response way too long winded and the process too long winded to be able to respond in the usual time that is allocated.

---

On this call, as you will have noticed, we have a very busy agenda. We probably do not have time to discuss this, and I was going to suggest that we discuss these things first on the mailing list and then touch on these and discuss them more extensively in our next call, later on this month. Clearly, I'd like some feedback on this and for us to devise a process that can be both flexible, that will allow us to gauge the feedback from our community as well, but at the same time stay within the time limits that are often imposed by these external consultations with a very, very fast turnover time.

Are there any comments on these two agenda items? I don't see anyone putting their hand up.

So then, next Marilyn Cade to work with staff to produce a timeline for internet governance activities in 2017. She has indeed worked with staff, and we will be touching on this later on in this call. The co-chairs to work with Nigel Hickson to put the annual review report together, and that's again part of today's call; you will have an update on this. Draft outline on annual report to include adding sessions and events, adding the discussions and the various calls of this year's timeline and next year's is all in place. There's actually a link in our agenda that will take us to this draft outline.

Mark Carvell to check with the GAC chair on the statues of GAC with regards to CCWG charter; is the GAC a chartering organization? Mark has come back to us and told us that the GAC is not a chartering organization and the reason for this being that the GAC did not want to be a potential barrier to the working group coming up with the recommendations or statements due to the complexity of the GAC's

---

consensus process. And then, launch discussion on what the working group is trying to accomplish; this is yet to be done.

I think that's probably the next thing we'll have to do after this call. And I also asked for volunteers to populate the sub groups to work on the Cross Community Working Group charter and the annual report. The annual report, for the time being, is not that much of a priority because we have someone who's picked up the pen, a staff member, a consultant who's going to produce a first draft, so it's more of a case of feedback on this, and I think that we'll probably have that from the whole working group. The CCWG-IG Charter probably requires a few more people to help out. So, they'll touch on this in a moment.

And finally, build a comparison table taking current CCWG-IG Charter paragraph by paragraph in order to compare step by step with CCWG guidelines from GNSO. Rafik is leading on this and we've had Greg Shatan very kindly putting this together, and we'll see that in a moment. Is there any feedback on the action items?

I guess that most of them will be dealt with in the current call. Seeing no hands up from anyone, and monitoring the chat, having no further response on this, I would like to ask now if we need to swap the policy topics with the organizational topics and find out from Nigel Hickson if he is able to speak on this call or if he is currently taken up elsewhere. [AUDIO BREAK] I trust that Nigel is taken up elsewhere, not being able to hearing him. Oh, someone has just joined. Could this be Nigel Hickson?

---

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Yes, this is Young-eum. Hi!

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, hello, Young-eum Lee, co chair. Welcome! So it's not -- I guess Nigel is unable to speak. Could I ask if there are any objections to us swapping the policy topics with the organizational topics, so we can move forward first with maybe the GNSO Council request for a Cross Community Working Group internet governance charter. And may I also ask Desiree, is Sam Dickinson likely to be on this call, as well? Or is she not?

DESIREE CABRERA: I don't know, unfortunately. Nigel will be able to speak better to that, when he can.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So with Nigel unable to speak, I hope that Rafik is able to speak. And we're going to move -- I don't see anyone objecting to moving the agenda around, and I do apologize for this, but this is just things that have come up in the past five minutes. So we will move to agenda item 4B, B for Bravo, GNSO Council request for CCWG-IG Charter amendments. And you will have on the agenda page two links: one to a comparison table that Greg Shatan has put together, and one to a work space, which contains all of the documents, including Charter and other details. I'll hand the floor over to Rafik Dammak to take over this part of the call. Rafik, you have the floor.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks, Olivier. Can you hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, very well. Welcome.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks. Thanks for switching or swapping the agenda items, it's quite late here. With regard to the Charter amendment, as you said, Greg created the comparison table and the basic idea here is really to kind of highlight what is missing or the difference between our current charter and the Cross Community Working Group principles framework. So, the comparison table is using the template for the charter from the framework and it's already showing that we have some overlap, but also some parts that we need to add or to amend to be aligned.

We get a small group of volunteers, and to move forward, we are scheduling a call early next week. In terms of timeline, we have to kind of really act quickly. We have a few weeks remaining before the Copenhagen meeting. And if we put the outcome of our work, it should be aligned with the schedule for the GNSO. So if I'm assuming that we have to prepare a motion and the report, that should be shared 10 days before the public meeting of the GNSO Council in Copenhagen, and I think that will be -- I think the meeting will be on the 16<sup>th</sup>, so it should be the 6<sup>th</sup> of March. So we have like around one month to finish the work.

So, the idea is really to continue the comparison table and start editing and adding the amendments. And if needed -- I mean, while we did the

---

call for volunteers last time, we really got a few, and so I want to use this particular opportunity this time to ask for those who want to join, in particular having experience with Charter drafting to come and help us with this work.

Also you can see a link which is the work space, that includes several documents, I think, like the current Charter, a document from GNSO listing a different structure they are using, and the report from the Cross Community Group on Cross Community Working Group principles framework.

So, this is the kind of reference we are using for now. Yeah, that was kind of the briefing about the current status and our plan for the next steps in the coming weeks, having in mind that really we have a tight schedule to deliver to the GNSO.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Rafik. It's Olivier speaking. Are there any comments or questions? [AUDIO BREAK] I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I have a question for you. The table of -- so you've got a charter and you've got the Cross Community Working Group charter template. How do you expect moving through this? Will they be on the call, you will go line by line and compare one and the other? Will you be making amendments on the fly, or what's the sort of work process for this?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, that's really a good question. So, while we tried to work kind of in a [inaudible] way, through a mailing list -- I mean through a mail thread,

---

I don't think that we are moving quickly enough. I will take the list [inaudible] try to add, and that's why also I am asking the members of the small group, is really to start adding in the Google doc what we think is missing. And use mostly the call really kind of to work in any contentious point or to agree on next steps.

And so I think at the first phase we can really go like line by line, if we take a long time, and so I would prefer, for myself at least, in the next days before the kind of small group call to populate as much as possible and to start giving shape to the kind of amendment charter. And that's why I will send a reminder to the volunteers to start looking at the Google doc and making edits that will be [inaudible] just to avoid any kind of messing with the document.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Rafik. Olivier speaking. I currently note the document seems to be in editing mode, not in comments mode, so perhaps we have to be careful.

RAFIK DAMMAK: [Inaudible], yeah. So Olivier, taking the opportunity since -- to ask you a question. Why are we trying to deliver this to the GNSO? Because it's coming as a request by the GNSO, which is taking initiative in terms of kind of reviewing our charter and activities. But from the ALAC or [inaudible] standpoint, is there any expectation or how they will deal with the deliverable that we are trying to get in the coming weeks?



---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Rafik. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. On the ALAC side of things I have certainly not asked ALAC any question regarding this document. The question I think was originally a GNSO request. So, the working group is working in response to the GNSO request. I gather that if the charter is to be amended in any way, there would then need to also be ALAC approval for the amendments of the charter and there would obviously also need to be a ccNSO approval for the changes.

I guess so far, the ALAC in its annual meeting during the last ICANN meeting just re-conducted the group for another year. And as I said, so if the charter is to be changed, yeah, there would probably need to be -- the ALAC would have to look at it. But I guess the ball really is in the GNSO's court at the moment, and I will, I guess as an agenda -- sorry, as an action item -- and it's a good point that you have made -- I will inform the ALAC Chair of the work that is currently going on and to expect that there would be some changes. I guess the default is that there would be some changes. Is that correct, Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah, I think so. Just I want to check, as you say, it's a request from the GNSO, and so we are responding to them. So I am not expecting that they will kind of vote for a new charter at that time, but they will kind of review our response; just maybe taking kind of maybe some steps ahead and think what will be the process to be followed. I will reach the GNSO Council and maybe taking more clarification about how they will proceed. So that maybe adding as an action item for me to do so.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Rafik. And what I will do then as an action item for me is to inform the ALAC that the process has started and that perhaps there should be some time allocated in the ALAC's own agenda in the Copenhagen meeting to be discussing the charter amendments, so that at least there wouldn't be just a discussion in the GNSO Council and in the GNSO, but the ALAC would also be aware of the things that are taking place. I don't expect the ALAC to spend a significant amount of time on this issue. But certainly putting some time aside for this to be discussed is a good idea.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Also I think the same should be done also at the ccNSO level just to keep all the [inaudible] organization aware about this activity.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Young-eum Lee? Young-eum, will you be opting the ccNSO then as well?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: The ccNSO actually is expecting to see a revised charter as well, so if we start working on it -- I mean, I think once we start working on it, I will also try to contribute and present the results to the ccNSO.. They haven't set a specific timeline that they are expecting something very similar, I guess, to what the GNSO is asking for.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Young-eum. So that's fine. Anything else, Rafik, on this topic?

RAFIK DAMMAK: No, nothing.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well, thanks very much for starting this work. And as I mentioned earlier in the call, if there are any other volunteers to help with this process, you now have a link to the table. Obviously you can comment directly on the table, but if you would like join the small group that is working on this, please let Rafik know.

We can then continue with -- well, now that Nigel Hickson has arrived on the call, we can probably move on then to 4A, the proposal of the annual review. I note that Sam Dickinson is also on the call, and Sam Dickinson is the consultant that has been retained to help with this process. I'm not sure whether I should give the floor over to Nigel or to Sam?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, good afternoon. This is Nigel Hickson, can you hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, very well. Thank you, Nigel.

---

NIGEL HICKSON: I apologize for joining the call late. Yeah, so as we discussed in our previous call before Christmas, this is an urgent piece of work, following the discussions and meetings in Hyderabad and going on from there. And we're embarked on it and Sam Dickinson is no stranger to many of you. She's worked for ICANN before in a number of different areas, including the IANA transition, etcetera, and she's helping out here with the report, taking a sort of input from staff, Desiree and others, and putting together drafts which she'll obviously share with the co-chairs and we'll go from there. Anyway, I'll obviously let her talk about where we've got to. So, thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [AUDIO BREAK] Thank you, Nigel. Sam Dickinson?

SAM DICKINSON: [AUDIO BREAK] Hi, I've sent Nigel a copy of the draft earlier, I'm not sure if he's passed it on to the co-chairs?

NIGEL HICKSON: No, I haven't.

SAM DICKINSON: Okay, so I have a draft in my --

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, go ahead, Sam.

SAM DICKINSON: [AUDIO BREAK] Okay, yeah. So I've got a draft at the moment that Nigel has and he will pass on shortly. It's at the moment, and this is not the complete version, because I still need to add in things like an Executive Summary, the summary of the 2014 and 2015 material. But I will make that as brief as possible. So it's 14 pages long as it is, so I can give you an overview of the sections, if that's useful?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, it's Olivier speaking, that would be really helpful. There is a link in our agenda to a Google doc page that had a very first draft overview of the structure of the report and it had some comments on the side. Did you take that into account?

SAM DICKINSON: Yeah, so based on that and the comments I've sent through, before the call that I had with you and Nigel -- oh, when was that? A few weeks ago. I've modified the structure a bit just to make a little more sense for the CWG is trying to use this for. So, rather than being or looking like an annual report, some of the sections weren't fitting as a strict annual report, so it's more brief. The new title draft is "Report on the 2016 activity group on internet governance".

So it will have an Executive Summary, an Introduction which includes a description of why a report is being written, a brief overview of the establishment of the working group, including some -- and I would really appreciate some double checking on the dates, if what I've done is try

---

to list the dates that the mailing list for the working group was first created as well as the final draft process. But I've had trouble finding references to when chartering organizations may have formally approved the document. So if you have any of those dates, that would be fantastic.

I've added in a section on the highlights of the charter, so looking at the objectives, scope of activities, so the fact that it's meant to write reports on progress and key links to CCWG materials, which the new section is just easy for anyone who hasn't followed CCWG to easily go to the hot topics within that CCWG wiki.

I will include the 2014 and 2015 activities as an Annex so that it doesn't interrupt flow, because the next section in the report looks at what the CCWG has done in 2016. So, I've separated that into the engagement by the CCWG with the wider ICANN community, so that's looking at ICANN internet governance, public sessions, etcetera.

The second section is on the engagement of the CCWG in external events, so that's things like the forum, WTSA, IGF, and in the third section is about the internal workings of the CCWG, so the focusing at ICANN meetings, teleconferences, and the mailing list. When you do have a look at the teleconference section, it's long and so in the outline that was on the Google docs there was a request to include a summary of the discussion that was held.

What I've tried to do is use the materials [Audio breaks] and the action items, but condense it, so it's less specific for the chartering organizations that don't need to know more administrative matters like

---

we'll go and do a Google poll, for the next meeting. So that has reduced a lot of the material that way.

What's next? Then I still have to do a summary of the mailing list discussions, because that's a bit more detailed, followed by a section which lists all the members, and then under that a section looking at the participation by -- they call the group SO, or is that AC/SO? So I'm still waiting on those statistics. And a section that looks at the CCWG-IG activities in 2017, but that's just a very brief section which is going to be discussing, basically, what you're discussing on the current call, what you're planning to do for the next year, with a link to the annex, which will have a timeline of internet activities that are in your line of sight. So we get to just two annexes, which is the activities -- can you still hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, we can still hear you. There's a ringing from somewhere. I don't know where.

SAM DICKINSON: -- activities for 2000 -- okay, good. First is the activities for 2014 and 15, I don't think -- I've still got to that and then a page, and then the timeline. Just the second annex, so in all it's probably going to be at least 18 pages, but you'll be pleased to note a lot of bullet points and white space, so it doesn't look scary and difficult to read. So it should be quite accessible for the chartering organization to understand.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, well thanks for this, Sam. It's Olivier speaking. Unfortunately, I haven't got a copy of the report, so it's a bit difficult to comment on it, but I'm looking forward to see the first draft, and I guess maybe one thing that we should do, would you then share it on a Google Doc so we can all comment on the document directly between now and the next call?

SAM DICKINSON: I can't. It's going to lose the formatting, so what I might do is also make it available as a PDF. Because one of the things is to make it easily readable, but that doesn't translate easily into Google Docs.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: All right, okay. Yeah, that's well understood. I mean, the first thing, I guess, is to send the first copy of it over to the meeting list in PDF mode and then also have it on the Google Docs, so people can comment on it directly. If it's 15 pages, I find it pretty hard, often, to collect people's responses when they say, well, page 5, paragraph 4, especially when some are watching this or reading it in a format that might be a letter format, and others in A4 format, which those make it a bit different, especially with page numbers and so on. Are there any comments or questions on what Sam has taken us through at the moment?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: This is Young-eum.



---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Young-eum, please. Young-eum Lee.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Yes, thank you. I agree with Olivier's suggestion that we comment on the document, but I would suggest that we set a date, a deadline for comments on it, so that we can have a more definite timeline to move on.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks Young-eum. It's Olivier speaking. As I said, I haven't got a copy of the document. When can you make that available, Sam?

SAM DICKINSON: Right after this call.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, perfect. So then what I would suggest is maybe give it a week for our first comments, so starting from today, the 2<sup>nd</sup> moving all the way to next week, Thursday the 9<sup>th</sup>, which then gives us a little more time, just for the initial comments. And then the ball will be rolling on this, and hopefully within a couple weeks then we can have a final document, I guess.

There's an echo now. Any thoughts or comments from anyone? A week? "One week sounds good," says Young-eum. Okay.

---

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: I'm so sorry, Nigel here. I was off for a few minutes. Sorry, a week for what? I went off half way through Sam's presentation. Are we going to give her information? What's the action? Because I think there is still some further work to do, and we need to provide her with some further information, still, before it's complete. So, anyway, you were mentioning something.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Nigel, it's Olivier speaking. So the idea is for Sam to have a first draft of this document put online on a Google Doc, and also send a PDF copy to everyone on our mailing list, and then give us a week to come back with feedback on what's there, for her to be able to pick it up and make the necessary amendments. Whilst I gather there will be some parts that will still say, probably in square brackets, and say, "Something else needs to be inserted here, and this part needs to be added and expanded," et cetera.

NIGEL HICKSON: I understand. So, I'm with it, yes, thank you very much -- well, I'm not very with it...

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Nigel. Any comments or questions on the call? [AUDIO BREAK] I'm not seeing anyone putting their hand up, so that's an action item for this document to be sent to everyone, and thank you very much for working on this, Sam, and looking forward to see the first draft and to come back to you with some feedback.

Let's move on, 4C. C for Charlie, Forthcoming Activities. There is a timeline that Marilyn Cade has shared with Nigel Hickson and the co-chairs of this working group. There is a link to this timeline now, that you can see. *UN Specialized Agencies and International Organizations - Related WSIS+10, SDG and Internet Governance Events for 2017*; and boy, does this look crowded. A lot of things in that document. Certainly, if you feel like you have a spare year, you might as well get engaged in this. It's just one event after another. The thing I get that we will have to do with this document is to first look at what we want to be involved in and to what extent, and I guess a lot of these consultations and meetings, face to face meetings, et cetera, we will receive reports on from Nigel Hickson and his crew.

"Can we post the link," asks Judith. The link is on the agenda, Timeline 2017, Version 2.1.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, I found it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, I found it, I found it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So that's the forthcoming activities. But having this on this call, I guess it was a twofold idea. The first is, of course, that we can all have a look at this. Desiree, is it possible to share this on the Adobe Connect? It would certainly help.

DESIREE CABRERA: Yeah, just give me one second.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. [AUDIO BREAK]

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Nigel Hickson, please. I guess this really is something that you've worked with and that Marilyn has sent to you, so I hand the floor over to you.

NIGEL HICKSON: No, I don't want to take credit for it. But, what I think will be useful, and whether we do it now or whatever, you're absolutely right, this is a very

---

---

crowded document, there's a lot of activity, a lot is going on. I think what will be useful is to take a view from the working group. Whether there's a part of it which they think is not particularly germane to our work, in which case we can depopulate it in some way. So if it was a basket of fruit, you know, do we need the apples and the pears, or just the bananas, so to speak.

On the other hand, of course, if this is a trail of work which our members are involved in and think it should be on it, then the opposite is true. These things are by no means perfect, it's very difficult to capture everything, and on the other hand, some of it may not be relevant to what we want to concentrate on. We can leave that discussion to Copenhagen, or whatever, it's in your hands, of course. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel, that's a good point. And I guess that's the reason why we're having it on this call, it's great to look at the graphics, but let's start work on seeing what we have to add and take away. I can certainly see a number of points in there which might not be the ones that we would be following, that are just very limited in scope, and that wouldn't be, well, certainly not in line with the ICANN scope. I understand, though, that you would be working towards producing an ICANN chart from this and with more input of what your activities are, isn't that the case?

---

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, that's right, indeed. It is one or two things that we would want to add to this. You know, [inaudible]. But really, it has a lot of information on it. So, really, it's a case of -- I mean, it's the working group's -- yeah, it's your decision then, thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thanks for this, Nigel. So, the floor is open. You've all got a copy of it now, because it's on the screen, or you could go into the agenda and click on the link which lets you download this. I can certainly see a couple of things that might not be particularly well, that I certainly do not recognize.

For example, "One Conf 16-17 May Hague, Netherlands," I must admit I do not know what this is about. ITU Council meetings is something that you probably follow. The G-7 is of course something a bit different for this year. I certainly know that some [inaudible] organizations are following this, and I gather that ICANN is also following this process.

The ECOSOC is a process we have used and we have followed in the past. WSIS Forum, obviously again. And then the G-20 is somewhat that we don't appear to have followed too closely last year. I don't know whether this year that would be the case. UN Global Compact Leaders Summit, I again claim total ignorance about this topic. The WITSA, we have followed in the past. And I'm only speaking out loud here, based on what this working group has followed in the past.

But then the Global Connect Stakeholders Conference: Advancing Solutions, is something which I have no knowledge of. The AfICTA Summit is also something I have no knowledge of, and the other boxes, I

---

think we have all followed in past: WTDC, UNESCO General Conference, and the UN General Assembly, UNGA, I certainly from memory remember having feedback from Nigel on this.

I ask anyone who is on the call to point anything out that you might wish to say, either has been forgotten from this graphic, or needs to be added. And Nigel, please chime in on this, because I might have said some nonsense about past ICANN involvement on any of these conferences. In the meantime, I see Judith Hellerstein.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN:

Yes, this is Judith Hellerstein for the record. Yeah, I was just wondering, since you have the G-7 and the G-20, what about the Global Symposium for Regulators? That also might, especially with the big push in WTSA which is Africa, that might come up there, too. Because I know they are planning on putting it in, into every place they possibly can. And so that's my question about that.

And the Global Connect is basically a US more focused event, starting out with what the US State Department had done, and now they've partnered with the World Bank and the IEEE, who are continuing it, and they're having it connected to the World Bank meeting, so that's why it appears twice in the year, in October and June. So if someone wants that, I can talk about that. But I just wanted to put that out there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Judith, how is this related to ICANN? The ICANN mission and ICANN issues?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I don't think the Global Connect issue is related to ICANN as much. It could be more related to some of the stuff that might be doing in the auction proceeds, but not related to ICANN. This is Marilyn's chart, what Marilyn is following. It's not necessarily what ICANN is following, it's what Marilyn is following.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct, Judith, thank you. And that's why, I guess I ask -- Nigel has been working with Marilyn on this. Nigel, you could perhaps point out the parts which ICANN is following, in addition to this, and which ICANN is not following, when listed on this page.

I note that Renata Aquino mentions, "Internet Freedom Festival and RightsCon are not on there, but relevant." I would probably ask, but we can't make decisions here, but I would ask that you make those comments on the mailing list and then get the feedback from everyone. I gather some people will absolutely support this, others might not. So, people-centric internet, also, people-centric internet projects for those people that are not aware, are projects that are developing projects for internet development. And whilst in the past we were following the NETmundial Initiative projects at some point, there are some similarities with the people-centric internet projects.

Jim Prendergast mentions in the chat that, "Yoran is speaking at RightsCon, so that might indeed make this an ICANN supported or ICANN related topic. And I can see here, same with Global Connect.



ICANN is sponsoring these conferences." Okay, if I could ask you all, once we share this on the mailing list, to please point this out.

The next question, of course comes, well, we have this whole list of events, how should this working group be involved? Should this working group be involved with every conference that ICANN is sponsoring and involved as in receiving feedback from both participants in this conference and staff that go to this conference, and whether there should be any input from this working group to the various processes.

That somehow links with our wider question, as to what our activities for the next few month are going to be. And our work process, looking at this, I will share my view, I'm a little concerned about the multiple number of processes that are out there and about spreading thin, following too many different tracks, and not having any impact on any of the tracks, due to being spread too thin. I'm also wary of any criticism from some of our chartering organizations who have been vocal in more than one way about this working group concentrating on issues which are really not ICANN core issues or ICANN related issues. But that's again a political discussion that we're not going to have here. Young-eum Lee, you have your hand up and you have the floor.

YOUNG-EUM LEE:

Thank you, Olivier. I kind of agree with what you just said, and that there seem to be a lot of tracks, a lot of different types of tracks. Can we first agree to focus on some of the tracks that we have been trying to monitor? Such as the CSTD working group on enhanced cooperation,

---

---

and the IGF, and some of the major ITU ones, such as ones that we are aware of that are discussing the internet governance issues in sort of a major way. They have the potential to influence the global communication on internet governance. So the ITU Council meetings on internet governance would be another one. I can see, I guess, three or four tracks that I think we should try to focus on more closely than others.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Young-eum, good points. It's Olivier speaking. I was going to ask for an action item for Nigel, because I understand that ICANN is going to produce its own timeline, and in producing our own timeline, if Nigel could identify on the current graphic, and not on this call, because it might take a bit too much time, and I'm wary of the fact that we have other agenda items today. Nigel, if you could identify what ICANN has engaged in, in the past, and that would be a good starting point.

And secondly, what ICANN has engaged in, in the past, and that is not on this list at present, and then share this list and I don't know whether you want to mark this by dots or whatever it is graphically, with the working group, and we can then start focusing on where we want to focus our attention specifically. And that, of course, requires input from more than just the people who are on the call today. Is that a good way forward? I note Glenn mentions a page of resources so people add, perhaps we can have this on the Wiki, create a Wiki page and add it like this. Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: So, a page of resources? I didn't quite understand what that referred to, but anyway I can follow up with Glenn on that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, the idea, Glenn mentions a page of resources so people add, I'm not 100% sure of this, we have several Wiki pages in our Wiki structure that follow specific processes. There is one in CSTD, there's one on IGF, there's one on WSIS forum, and in fact, not just one, but each time a family of pages on each one of these topics, and these obviously have to be updated, but I wish we had these virtual post-it notes, that we could all post on the different boxes, and then get a better idea which of these boxes we are going to be focusing on. Back to you, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah, thank you Olivier. I think the input on the chat and what people have said has been very valuable. I agree with you. The idea of this was not to come up with a list of activities as such. I mean, those are available on various sources like DICLO and a whole host of organizations put calendars out. So we don't want to miss conferences. I think we want to list events, like Young-eum said, where the input from the internet governance working group has importance, and so it is things like WITSA and CSTD, et cetera.

ITU Council is an important event, it's one of those events which portrays the claim of ITU to the multistakeholder. It's a completely closed event, you sort of almost have to give blood to even put your

---

hand up if you're an observer. So, certainly it's not an event we are going to have any input to, but things like WITSA and the council working groups, and other things we can, and I think they should be listed. But having taken this input and then further input, we can make a draft available. But I think, thanks to the consortium, thanks to Marilyn, obviously, for providing this for us. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Nigel. We will follow up after this call on this. I was just thinking of various ways to indicate the different boxes, whether we wanted to follow, I was looking at having dots, red dots, green dots, and orange or amber dots. The green obviously being, "Oh yes, we've done this in the past and we want to continue," orange being, "well, this is borderline," and red being something that we can delete from the list. But we'll work something out. I note the time is ticking. The last item, agenda item 4, is the ICANN58 CCWG-IG and face to face sessions, it's marked 10 minutes. I hope we can go a little faster than 10 minutes for this.

Well, I could really hand the floor over to Nigel Hickson for this, as we will have a face to face session and we will have a public session. Not a high interest session on this occasion, so that puts a little less pressure to align panelists and extensive agendas, and lets us decide on the agenda at shorter notice, than had we had a high interest topic session. Nigel Hickson, what's the status on these? Have the requests been made? Have we had feedback so far? I hand the floor over to you.

---

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much, Olivier. I'll try and be brief and focused, and not sarcastic or anything like that. So the meeting team for ICANN58 have been very helpful. They have provisionally allocated two slots, one for the CCWG-IG face to face, and one for the public session. So, the face to face is allocated 11:00 to 12:15 on Wednesday, and for the public session, 11:00 to 12:15 on Thursday. Now these are their suggestions, we can go back and we can ask for different slots, that's not a problem. We have a couple weeks in which to make the formal input to the meeting team on this.

But just as important as the timing for the slots is the agenda. This year, as you know, there has been a trend to make the sessions more professional, which is only good, and we have to submit fairly detailed agendas for both sessions in two weeks time, otherwise we simply won't get the slots. We can always change them slightly, but we need to have at least three or four agenda items for each one of those sessions, so we can put that on our application form. As I said, also we can review the timing, depending on the wishes of the working group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Nigel. Olivier speaking. When is the deadline, did you say, for submitting these forms?

NIGEL HICKSON: Someone else might know, Desiree might know. I haven't got it at hand. I had an impression it was sort of like the 12<sup>th</sup> or 13<sup>th</sup> of February, it's

---

something like that. Certainly we've got at least 10 days or so to work on this.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Nigel. Olivier speaking. So, what I would suggest is that we issue a call for topics for our public meeting in Copenhagen, we send that call for topics to our mailing list to obtain suggestions, and also, the face to face session is quite likely to be easier, as it will be a followup to the organizational topics, namely the annual review and the GNSO Council requests, and I would certainly imagine we would need to be looking at our forthcoming activities. It's always a good idea to be face to face when discussing this.

So really, the defining one the slightly more challenging way, is to get the agenda up for our public meeting, and it might well be that we wish to present the annual review of the working group activities as one of the topics, and then focus on something else during the rest of that public meeting. What I'm saying here is just a starting point. So please comment on this. Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah, sorry Olivier, I didn't mean to interrupt. We did have some exchange on the list. I put down a couple suggestions, and a number of people added to them, so we could circulate that as the starting point. I'm not saying that was the final outcome in any way, but we did have a couple suggestions.

---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, you received the note, I'm sorry, I'm following so many tracks. It's Olivier speaking, I can't quite remember exactly off hand what the suggestions were, but it would be good if you could indeed put them all in one email and then share them, and we can continue the discussion on those. Let's aim for a better idea in the next one to two weeks. You did say the 15<sup>th</sup> or so? We are at the 2<sup>nd</sup> of February at the moment, let's say for about week, 10 days.

Okay, thank you, I don't see any other hands at present, so we can now move to the policy topics for this call. We still have half an hour, as this is a 90 minute call. The policy topics are mostly updates from staff and from participants who have taken part in the different consultations and meetings that are listed on the agenda. First IGF committee public consultation, you will have noticed an email from Nigel Hickson on this topic, and Nigel has received some feedback.

There are three links on the page, one to the IGF Consultation page, one to the list of comments received, and there were quite a few comments received, although it's interesting to see that quite a few of the comments said pretty much the same thing. Finally, there is also a link to the ICANN Final Comment. Nigel, did you want to take us through this? I just looked at this, and it says, "Page not found," the ICANN Final Comment. Things have been moved around, I think, which is a bit unfortunate.

NIGEL HICKSON: I think it's pursuant to an executive order or something, but I might be wrong. Thank you very much for those that comments forward. We got

---

comments from the cross community working group, we also got comments from staff and board members that attended. So, that was useful, and we put a submission as you've alluded to, and there is a whole host of other submissions, I think, 50 or 60 submissions have been given by others, and these will be discussed at the MAG meeting, at the Multistakeholder Advisory Group meeting.

I don't know when that is, it is proposed that it takes place in the first week in March, but I haven't seen confirmation of what time, they're not on the MAG, so I'm not sure, but we will certainly go to the meeting and be able to hear what people say about the review of the last IGF. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Nigel. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And I have noticed that there were questions when it came down to the sort of format of IGF. Is there anything that came out, any trend that came out from the different points of view? Or did you not have a look at that?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, I'm just trying to gather my thoughts. There were a number of useful comments, and what there was, was support for a more focused agenda on particular issues that could be taken forward through an intercessional process and then develop more the IGF. Some people thought that some of the topics were interesting, but there were rather too many topics and too many workshops as such.



---

There was general, you're right in terms of the process, there was a lot of praise for the flash sessions, or whatever you call them, that took place in Mexico. So, some useful comments. But it of course does depend on the discussion that takes place at the MAG, and I think it wasn't mentioned, but it's confirmed now, perhaps the 1<sup>st</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> of March in Geneva.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Nigel. Olivier speaking. There was an error on our agenda page. The link was working yesterday, but it appears that the IGF changed the link, so I've amended it just now and reloaded the agenda, and I've sent it now to the chat, as well.

Okay, so that was the first one, I don't see anyone putting their hand up. Are there any questions or comments or anything that needs to be added to this? With no one -- oh, no, Renata. Renata Aquino.

RENATA AQUINO: Hi, I hope you can listen to me okay.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We can hear you very well.

RENATA AQUINO: Renata here. Oh, great. Just adding the information that the first working group of IGF 2017 has already been formed. It's the working group on the workshop evaluation process, and up to now it has nine

---

members involved. It may have, just like any other working group had, general members interested, enrolled in it during the consultations time. So if folks are interested in participating in improving workshop evaluations for the IGF, this should be an opportunity. Just a comment. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Renata. It's Olivier speaking. Has there been a call for volunteers yet? Or should we first wait for a call for volunteers before stepping forward? Okay, so there will be a call for volunteers on the 1<sup>st</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> of March, okay. "The call will go out during the consultations." Okay, thanks very much for this. I don't see any other hands up, so then we can go, if there is no further discussion on the IGF followup.

First, I wanted to just thank Nigel for typing the working group for input and for filing the ICANN comments on this. I think it pretty much reflected the varied views of our community and I agreed with the great majority of what was being said on there. So next is the CSTD Intercessional. I guess, Nigel, you've just been back from this, or you still are there?

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, thank you, yeah. Sorry, no The CSTD Inter-sessional was last week in Geneva, so it comprised of the CSTD Plenary session on Monday to Wednesday, and the Wednesday session was on [inaudible], so actually just the Wednesday morning, and I'll circulate a note to that, nothing too controversial, but a discussion on the WSIS process in

relation to the sustainable development cause. It was a good session, but nothing too controversial.

And then on Thursday and Friday was the CSTD working group on enhanced cooperation, so this is the working group of 30 or so members, member states and stakeholders, and we met, as you recall we did discuss this before, to look at a number of inputs, about 45 different inputs on the question of enhanced cooperation which were discussed in this two day session. I will circulate a note of the working group. It was a productive working group.

There was general agreement, but we always come up with a number of characteristics of what enhanced cooperation means, in terms of the way that stakeholders should work together in openness, transparency, et cetera, that was discussed. And then we went on to discuss a number of recommendations that the group might come up with. The group will continue to meet until around this time next year, when it has to report to the CSTD Plenary in May 2018, so we have a bit of time on our hands. But the recommendations varied from just ensuring that these high level characteristics are well known, to having some sort of new UN process to oversee internet governance type activities.

So one suggestion is that effectively we would have a UN committee that replaced the government advisory committee. So you still have ICANN, but the government input to ICANN that currently comes through the government advisory committee, would come from a UN committee. That's one idea, and there is a host of other ideas, as well. There was nothing that new in this, but we discussed and developed

---

---

and the recommendation will be forthcoming in due course. It's quite important work, and it was quite interesting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Nigel. Olivier speaking. And you mentioned something I was totally unaware of, the whole idea of replacing the GAC with a UN based type of committee. Would this require the agreement of ICANN if that was to be proposed? Or is that really just very early on sort of brainstorming that we are at, at the moment?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, indeed. I mean, as I said, we're looking at draft recommendations. I mean, it's no secret that some countries from time to time have called for a sort of UN committee to oversee the activities of ICANN, and the media has been a proponent of this for some time, even though the ICANN meetings and at the IGF, they talk about multistakeholder approaches and the submission to the working group on enhanced cooperation, they talked about a multilateral approach at the UN.

So these ideas come up from time to time, and are discussed. I suspect they'll be discussed in great detail, and obviously a lot of countries would be very much opposed to any real organization as the way that the GAC is formulated.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Nigel. Are there any comments or questions? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. I have one request to ask to you, Nigel. We have a Wiki page that is dedicated to following the

---

WGEC, so the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, and the United Nations CSTD, so two Wiki pages. If I could ask that these get updated with the latest, that would certainly help our members and communities to be able to see where we are. [AUDIO BREAK]

Okay, have we lost Nigel? Is that okay? [AUDIO BREAK]

NIGEL HICKSON:

Sorry, Olivier, you haven't lost me. Yes, of course. We'll do notes on this and circulate them and put them on the Wiki pages, and we can update, we can put the agenda on the Wiki pages, as well. Yeah, no problem.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

That would be great, thanks. Because the reason for me asking is, of course, at the moment, the last update was the 26<sup>th</sup> of November, and that looked at the consultation, the original consultation was of high level characteristics of enhanced cooperation, taking into account the work of the previous WGC and the agenda, particularly paragraphs 69 to 71, what kind of recommendations should we consider.

So it says here the deadline is the 1<sup>st</sup> of December, obviously you've had that input, you've made those recommendations, and you've made that input into the process, it will be good to track this, and Wiki pages are good for that. Judith Hellerstein, you have your hand up.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, this is Judith Hellerstein for the record. Nigel, the question I have for you is, with the people who made the comments on the GAC, who made the after comments on the IGF or on the other areas, was it different people? Sometimes who comes to some of these, like the council working groups, or to the other ITU stuff, are different people than will come through the ICANN or IGF. Could that possibly be the case which you mentioned with the [inaudible] and others, or maybe you could elaborate on that.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you, Judith. I don't think it's really for me to sort of interpret individual government positions. Suffice to say that, yes, the CSTD working group on enhanced cooperation usually would have input from a foreign ministry of a government, because that's where the general call goes for these UN committees. Whereas the IGF and the ICANN meetings, it's not always the foreign ministry, it could be telecommunications ministry, or someone else. So one can get a different nuance on these issues. Everything is positive for discussion, and it's always very nice.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Nigel. Other questions? I note that Renata mentions in the chat, "I'm also in a bit of a shock on this idea." I gather this is regarding the GAC and UN process. Well, thanks for following this up. Young-eum Lee, you have the floor.

[AUDIO BREAK] And you might be muted at present, Young-eum.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: [AUDIO BREAK] Oh, I'm sorry, I'm sorry. I was speaking -- I'm also very surprised at the idea of the GAC being replaced by a UN something, because that seems to be actually a very realistic way for the UN to be involved in the internet governance issues at ICANN, and so this is something I think we should really follow very closely. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Young-eum. There seems to be agreement, and certainly concern on this call. So we'll look forward to that written update on the Wiki page, Nigel.

Next is the ITU-ITR expert group. There are no links to anything because when you built the agenda, I wasn't quite sure where this was going. It would be good to have an update on this, please. I think you mentioned that this needed to be included. ITU-ITR expert group?

NIGEL HICKSON: This is Nigel. I can say a few words, but there might be other people on the call who want to say something on this first.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: [AUDIO BREAK] It looks as though it's just you Nigel, at present.

NIGEL HICKSON: Essentially what this is, at the last Plenipotentiary in 2014 there was a resolution that an expert group be convened to look at the international

---

---

telecommunication regulation that was adopted in 2012 with the WCIT. As you recall, it was adopted there by a majority vote, but at least a third of ITU members did not vote to adopt it. So one of the issues before the expert group on international telecommunication regulations is to look at the problems, if there are any legal business problems between having 2 sets of ITRs, one which some countries adopt and another set, the 2012 set, that other countries will adopt. So that's going to be looked at in this expert group.

There were also a number of other questions concerning whether the ITRs from 2012 need to be adapted or modified in any sense. It's going to be a fairly open discussion. It's chaired by a fairly leading government person from Mexico, who I think will be very good. The working group is open to IGE members states and to sector members, there will be lots of governments, I think, represented next Thursday and Friday at this working group. I'll go along, thanks to the generosity of ISOC, who have allowed me to be part of their delegation. So you'll be able to update this working group on those discussions.

But suffice to say that these are initial discussions. The expert group will probably meet four or five times before the next Plenipotentiary in 2018. It has a mandate to report to the ITU Council in May or June 2018, so it's fairly early days. But you will recognize the sensitivity of this topic and the fact that different governments will have different views about what should be taken forward, if anything at all. Thank you.



---

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this update, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. Perhaps we could create a Wiki page on this topic, as well. It looks like this is really the beginning of a long process, as well, and it certainly is something that we need to keep track of. So, let's have an action item on this, and I'm happy to create the Wiki page myself. If you have any pointers to documentation or web pages, that would be helpful.

I think this is interference. Is there somebody who is trying to take the floor? [AUDIO BREAK] No, that was just interference, it's okay. Well --

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, sorry, it might have been me. But one thing I should have said, of course, is that this is an ITU Council working group, which are closed. So we can certainly post the agenda and we can post any other documents that are in the public domain. But the contributions, and there are a number of contributions from different governments, including the UK and the US, are confidential to those governments. And obviously those governments can decide to make them public if they so wish. So, we're a bit limited what we can post, but we'll post what we can. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. I was hoping that there might be some WCIT leaks documents out there lingering about, and I've just checked on their website. For those people that do not know, the WikiLeaks.org was the organization, I guess, or the website that was sharing those documents that were locked behind the ITU ties system, and sharing them with the rest of the world. Perhaps someone from

---

WikiLeaks will wake up and start leaking more things. Of course, I wouldn't agree with any of these leaks at all, and I certainly would not want to push for this to happen. I have nothing to do with this. Right. Judith Hellerstein, you have a hand up, then we'll move on.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, this is Judith. Nigel, can you also talk about the ICANN comment that you put in for the open consultation that's happening tomorrow? The physical meeting is happening tomorrow, but there was an open consultation on development and ICANN put in a comment on that.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, so I think we touched on this on a previous call. Tomorrow is the open consultation that ITU has every six months, and the subject is development and there is a number of contributions, I think probably more than 50 or 60, and they will be discussed tomorrow in the group.

I'm not sure how it's going to work, exactly, but I can circulate the ICANN contribution, it's something we worked rather late, it was based on some material that we develop before and we had discussed in this group on some of the linkages between development and local access, et cetera. But, I'll certainly circulate the input we gave.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. Olivier speaking. Now, with only three minutes left on the clock until the end of our call, let's have a look at 3D -- D for Delta -- CCWG Participation in WCIS Forum. As you know, we have

---

participated for two years running in the WCIS Forum and this year the WCIS Forum takes place in May 2017.

Let's have a look -- I guess the main question really is, is this working group going to participate in presenting a workshop? The theme this year is information and knowledge societies for SDGs, as in Sustainable Development Goals. I don't think we have enough time on this call to brainstorm on a full idea or topic.

I note that there is a deadline for the workshop proposals, you've got a link at the moment on the agenda, Phase 1, opening of the open consultations on the 1<sup>st</sup> of September, Phase 2 the first physical meeting, this is for the preparation groups, Phase 3, the second physical meeting, the 14<sup>th</sup> of February. The submissions deadline for workshop proposal is the 20<sup>th</sup> of February, so yet again, a short timeline for us.

What I would suggest to launch the process for that is to send out an email to our mailing list and find out if there is any interest for the cross community working group to stage a workshop there. Two years ago we had a workshop on the CCWG IANA process. Last year we had a workshop on the CCWG Accountability process. I frankly do not know this year, and would certainly welcome some suggestions.

Nigel, just as a side, is ICANN going to participate as ICANN, and if yes, what type of sessions will it organize? And I'm saying here the ICANN, not the CCWG.

---

NIGEL HICKSON:

Ah, how many days of the week? Yes, thank you, Olivier. The good news is that it's not May, it's June. I'm not sure if that's good news, but it's the 12<sup>th</sup> of June, the WCIS Forum. And the other piece of good news, I suspect, is that the middle of February is not the deadline. I suspect it will be slightly later, that's just my gut feeling, and I might be totally wrong, but it seems a rather early cutoff.

But we should certainly perhaps before the 14<sup>th</sup> of February, because that's when this open consultation session I think it is on the 15<sup>th</sup> of February in Geneva. We should perhaps think about what we might want to do, just from a general point of view. I mean, ICANN staff is an [inaudible]. We haven't suggested anything yet or thought about any particular session ourselves on [inaudible] or anything like that, so I think the scope is open for this working group if you wish to have a session to put something forward. And of course, we could review what's happened on accountability, or we could do something else. Whatever, anyway.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. So let's just again launch another discussion on the mailing list for this. We are reaching the end of our call. Any other business? Agenda item number 5? No one pointed anything out earlier. I guess what we need to think about is when our next call will be. But first I see Renata has put her hand up. So, Renata, you have the floor.

---

RENATA AQUINO: We should also -- Renata. I noticed that WCIS will have a TED.. Before it was TED at Geneva, but maybe it is in [inaudible 01:28:01] even. Anyway, I think we should suggest Nigel for TED speaker, he would make a fantastic one.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Renata. Nigel, I know you've got a lot of space tightings.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much, but I'm sure there's people that are qualified.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. Just mentioning, Judith mentioned the WCIS website says the deadline is showing on the WCIS Forum website as being February the 20<sup>th</sup>. So maybe we need to check on that, if that's the case, as well. Nigel for TED speaker, if you agree, then let's start a campaign for this.

And our next call, I would suggest perhaps not next week, as we have quite a few action items and a few things to do, but in two weeks' time. So we are today Thursday the 2<sup>nd</sup>, the next week is the 9<sup>th</sup>, the week after is the 16<sup>th</sup>. Could I suggest that perhaps we have a double call that spans both the Thursday on the 16<sup>th</sup> and the Thursday on the 23<sup>rd</sup>? Is that something that would work out?

[AUDIO BREAK] And it really depends, I guess, on the things that are taking place in the meantime in the rest of the world. But I'm not seeing any meetings taking place exactly then in February. The ITU

Council working groups there is, the ITR extra group meets on the 7<sup>th</sup> to the 10<sup>th</sup> of February, but the latter part of February doesn't have any meetings. Are we okay with this? Which dates again? We are looking at Thursday the 16<sup>th</sup> plus or minus one day, and Thursday the 23<sup>rd</sup>, plus or minus one day.

I'm a little concerned of doing it too late. I'd rather do it two weeks from now, so that we have one week to comment on the documents that will be shared on the mailing list and then speak on the call, so give it a two weeks [inaudible]. Are with okay with that? I see no objections.

I'd like to thank you all for being on this call, and would like to thank Nigel in particular for all his hard work in providing us with feedback, and of course, Sam Dickinson for working on this proposal for the annual review.

And with this, we'll do a couple doodles, or doodle with a few days, and see how we go. Thanks, everyone. This call is now adjourned and speak to you very soon, and let's follow up on the mailing list. Thank you.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**