DESIREE CABRERA:	Okay. Go ahead.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you, Desiree. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. The is the Cross-Community Working Group in Internet Governance conference call on Thursday, the 16th of February, 2017. The time is 14:03 UTC.

Let's start with a quick toll call, Desiree, please.

DESIREE CABRERA:	Okay. In the room – I apologize if I mispronounce your name – we have Aarti Bhavana, Adam Peake, Alan Greenberg, Judith Hellerstein, Julf Helsingius, Juuso Moisander, Marilyn Cade, Sam Dickinson.

From staff, we have Veni Markovski and Nigel Hickson. We also have Olivier Crepin-Leblond, and myself, Desiree Carbrera.

We have a couple of numbers with no names on them, so if you could identify yourselves, that would be great.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Let's start with the number finishing with 8845.

RYAN JOHNSON:	Morning, all. This is Ryan Johnson with Access Partnership.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Welcome, Ryan. And the number finishing with 5838.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Good morning. This is [Hiram] [inaudible] with Verisign.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Welcome. Finally, the number finishing with 8776.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Veni.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Veni. Okay. Super. Well, thanks very much, everyone. I already noticed that Marilyn Cade has put her hand up as we are about to adopt the agenda.

                           Marilyn, is this related to the agenda?

MARILYN CADE: In the future, can I ask, please, that, rather than reading out the names, everyone introduce themselves, identify their affiliation, and say whether they're participants? I think that's one of our challenges in documentation because some good [inaudible] designated participants, and then there's the view that they're not aware that [they're attending] because of how we're doing the roll call. So maybe for the future if we could call on people to introduce themselves, their

affiliation, and the assigned roles they have been given, if anything. We don't need to repeat that for today, but perhaps some improvement for the future.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Marilyn, for this suggestion. I'll circulate this for the list. One of the concerns is the time that it takes to do this. The other Cross-Community Working Groups often either have a roll call or have the roll call being taken from the participants list in the Adobe Connect, asking if there's anybody else, and then staff works out afterwards who is who, as in who is a participant and who is a member, etc., etc. But we'll circulate that proposal on the list.

Let's get moving. Let's go over to the agenda of today. It's mostly organizational topics. There is so much going on with the face-to-face meeting in Copenhagen, taking place not long from now. So we really have to dot the i's and strike the t's and go through, first, the proposal for the annual review of the working group activities, and then the work that is going on with regards to the GNSO Council request on the charter amendments, and then also a preparation of the face-to-face and the public sessions, plus, finally, a discussion of the participation of the CCWG in the WSIS forum. A lot of things to do, all in one hour.

Are there any amendments or additions to make to this agenda?

I see no one putting their hand up, so the agenda is adopted as listed. The review of our action items: there were two sets of action items from two different calls, one from the last call in December, and the other one from our last call in February.

You'll notice that most of the action items have been completed. The advisor process for the working group to respond to consultation and the advisor process for the working group to respond to the sounding board requests from staff are things which I have launched on the mailing list but there hasn't been much feedback on so far. I please ask you to look back and start some work on this, or at least bring some feedback on that, and then launch a discussion on what the working group is trying to accomplish. That's a wider discussion, and it's also high-time that we launch this on the mailing list so we can then pick this up in one of our future calls.

On the more recent action items, all of them are listed as complete. I haven't had a response from – I'm really sorry to be putting you on the spot here, Alan. I don't know whether you are able to speak. There was one action item, which was to inform the ALAC Chair of work going on and to ask about any time allocated in Copenhagen to discuss the charter amendments.

Since I have e-mailed you – and other Co-Chairs have received an e-mail from Katrina Sataki, the Chair of the ccNSO, asking about such arrangements and whether we would be ready to make any presentation or discuss the charter, all of this coming, of course, from the GNSO charter amendment request. I'm not quite sure what the status is when it comes down to the GNSO Council and whether there is time that will be made available, but we will need to do something about this and follow up with them.

Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. We haven't done the detailed scheduling of our sessions yet. There's certainly the potential for doing that. I'll make sure staff is aware of it so we don't forget it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. So that's all of the action items for the time being. Are there any comments or questions?

I note Marilyn Cade has put her hand up. Marilyn, you have the floor.

MARILYN CADE: Thanks. My suggestion, if people are open to it, is that we [inaudible] to be a little more granular with the constituencies in the GNSO that are actively involved. I could ask for 15 minute-slots with the [BC] or even with the CSG, which would be three of the constituencies. I think that might be one of our challenges because the Councilors, at least in the CSG, work at the direction of their constituencies. So we probably need to offer to do a mini take-it-home discussion. I'd be happy to ask the CSG for a time slot. There are other items the CSG is dealing with, but I would be happy to ask if we would be willing to do that. That would be very helpful, I think, again, because the Councilors from the CSG work under direction.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Marilyn. I'm fine with going to speak to whoever wishes to speak to us. I'm sure my co-Chairs can also accommodate.

Perhaps we can have an action item and you can check with the CSG if there is time for us to speak to the CSG or any of us to speak to the CSG. Let's have it as an action item and follow up after this call.

Alan Greenberg, your hand is up. Is that a new hand?

ALAN GREENBERG: No.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. And I welcome also Rafik Dammak, who has just joined the call. I see he has just finished another call.

Let's then move to the organizational topics if I don't see any other hands. I do see Marilyn Cade having put her hand up. Marilyn, is that a new hand. No? Yes? Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Sorry. Just trying to lower my hand. Apologies.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. All right, let's move on. Agenda Item #3: organizational topics. As you know, we have been asked as a working group to review our activities and to provide a report to our chartering organizations. It's actually part of our charter to provide an annual report of our activities. ICANN has engaged a consultant for this to help us in our work. The first draft was put together my Samantha Dickinson. It's actually linked to

the agenda. We have shared the draft with the working group on the mailing list a few weeks ago.

Unfortunately, there hasn't been very much feedback on it. I think that Samantha has still worked on it and added more things. So I'll hand the floor over to her to take us through the report. I invite you all to have a look directly on the Google Doc. If you click on the agenda's link, that will take you directly there.

Samantha, you have the floor.

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: Hi. Good afternoon, everyone. Yes, basically there are still some questions in the report that I need information from group members for. If we can just get the bits that are in yellow finished, if there's no [call] on any of the other text that exists, I will just go through it in the next stage and check for typos, style, etc.

Okay. The executive summary I will add in at the last minute. It will just be a copy and paste of a key paragraph from the main body of the text. At the moment, I haven't seen any comments on any of the text itself, so I'm just going to assume that it's okay. So I'm just going to concentrate on the bits where I'm missing information.

In terms of the establishment of the working group, there's lots of material in the mailing list about the charter, but I'm not sure if it has ever actually been formally adopted by everyone and what that date is. If anyone knows that, I would love to know it, and we can add it into the report. That's Section 1.1.

Moving down to Section 1.2, I was trying to include some K links to some of the CCWG materials –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sam, I'll tell you what. I'll jump in. What I'm going to do is share my screen whilst you go through this because sometimes on a tablet or something you can't be on both at the same time. So I'll do that, and hopefully it might be helpful for people on the call as well. I'll do that in a second. Please go forward. Go ahead.

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: Right. Section 1.2 is about K links to some of the CCWG materials that you would like people to be aware of. I currently have two links. If anyone has any other favorite pages on the wiki that you think would be great to highlight, please feel free to add a comment. Those can go in there.

Moving down to Section 2, fine – oh, it may not be fine but there's no comments on it, so I'm not going to worry about that.

Going down… Sorry. I'm just scrolling through an awful lot of Section 2 – okay. One of the things I have added since the report first went up a couple of weeks ago is a summary of the mailing list discussions. Section 2.3.3 is new. If anyone hasn't read the report already, you may want to just confirm that that section was right.

Okay. Now, one of the things that was pending last time –

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You are going a little bit fast. Sorry. I'm having trouble following you. So Section 2.3.3: mailing list discussions. You've basically gone on a month-by-month basis to post, etc. Yeah?

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: Yeah. If you don't like that format, let me know. It just seemed to be an easy way of summarizing because the summary of the teleconferences had been on a discrete basis. Rather than just trying to do a single year of mailing discussions, it just seemed easier to put it up by month. But, hey, if anyone prefers it in a different way, feel free to comment.

Section 3. Now, this is where it gets interesting: the list of members and observers. I'll just – ah, here we are. I took this from the front page of the wiki, except it turns out that that list doesn't seem to be accurate. I think that may be the original list because, as I was doing a summary of who has participated in calls, the names of people who participated in the 2016 calls does not match particularly well with that list.

I've sent a copy of the spreadsheet that shows who has participated to Nigel. If somehow we can update who the participants are, help, basically in that section, because that list is possibly the same list from 2014.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sam, I think, in the course of redrafting or amending our charter, there's definitely going to be a refreshing of the membership and probably sort of a bringing together of the list of members with tighter rules. I'm not

quite sure how that's going to turn out, but we'll probably discuss this when we discuss the charter.

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: Right. Okay. If that's something that you're going to be [inaudible] –

MARILYN CADE: Olivier, it's Marilyn. I tried to talk.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's Marilyn. Please go ahead. You have the floor.

MARILYN CADE: Sam, this is really such a great document that brings us forward, I think, really exceptionally. I'm just going to respond about this particular section. I think we may end up having to have initial participants and new participants because, as I recall, we made an informal, internal agreement to be very open. Each of the chartering organizations were given the opportunity to identify designated participants. Later, I think we and Olivier and Rafik will need to check in on this. I believe later we took the approach of trying to be open to anyone who wanted to treat observers and participants equally in terms of contribution.

When I look at this, for instance, the GNSO, the first four participants are from the BC, but, actually, there's only one designated participant. Everyone else is encouraged to participate.

So I think we need to talk internally about whether we have to have these different designations – members, observers' participation – and you're quite right. In some cases, people only attend the meeting when they're face-to-face. I can look back at several of our meetings and I see that people like [Ellen from Disney] and Elizabeth from IPC are not listed here because they only attended – this is not a criticism in our record-keeping; it's just a comment – the face-to-face meeting.

So maybe we need to talk more about what the purpose of this is and how we then have a footnote or a description of what the role of participants is and what the role of observers is and how we treat them so it's clear about our openness and inclusiveness.

I see – one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight – nine identified participants from IPC that haven't been on all of our calls and in all of our face-to-face meetings. That's not actually who's taking the ball forward. So I don't think we need to think about escalating this in particular. I'm really glad you talk that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Marilyn. I was just going to add that, yeah, looking at the list that you've put there, it's not related at all to the reality of things today. I'm not quite sure why this is not up to date, but I certainly see that some names have been actually changed as well. So there is some big questions marks about the updating of our wiki pages and of this list of participants, and it has come up again and again.

Let's then move on, please. We'll certainly work this out later. But thanks for pointing this out.

NIGEL HICKSON: Could I just very briefly say something, Olivier? Nigel here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Nigel Hickson, go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry. Just briefly. Sam sent me a breakdown which she had put together of who has attended our meetings – not the face-to-face ones, but the calls – and that's what I circulated to you and the co-Chairs yesterday. If we're going to use that at all, then we need to attribute, if you like, where some of the folks are from. Of course, this isn't easy, as Marilyn has said, but I think the chartering organizations were looking for some sort of rough breakdown of who attends calls. I think it's useful for them to know because, even if a particular constituency group hasn't designated Fred, the fact that Fred takes an interest is useful to know, I think. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Nigel. I don't think anybody is disputing the fact that you need to show who is from where. It's just that the current participants and observers list is not up to date and certainly the participation lists, which Sam has been compiling, definitely need to show what constituency or independent or whatever we're coming from. It's very much in line with all of the other Cross-Community Working Groups and any of the PDP Working Groups as well.

                              Let's go back to Sam Dickinson.

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: That's a really great discussion. I think this shows the value of the report, even if, in the end, it's too difficult to get the list of participants and observers updated for this report. This is helping you in your work going forward. So we may need to take these sections out for this report, but hopefully it pays some dividends down the line.

The next section, underneath that long list of participants, is on the participation statistics. And as I understand it, the use of having some statistics as Olivier was saying is to be able to report back to the chartering organization so that they can see whether they're being represented or not, and potentially change their participant if they want to. That was the aim of that section, but if we don't have details of who is actually assigned, we can just take that off for now and perhaps use that as a placeholder that you can move to the next year's report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks, Sam.

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: And I can't unfortunately include any statistics about the on-site – Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, just jumping in again, Sam, I'll also note that the GAC has listed its participants, and the NomCom, and obviously, again, advisory committees. The only chartering Advisory Committee is the ALAC. The

GAC is not a co-chartering organization, and the NomCom is not either. So yes, there's some work to be done on this. We can follow up after the call. Back to you, Sam.

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: That would be fantastic. Okay. I have not in that spreadsheet that Nigel's passed on to you been able to include the participants at the face-to-face meeting, because there's not a list of attendees given to those face-to-ace meetings. Unfortunately, we don't have those statistics, but it might be useful for future meetings to include or record that sort of data for future reports.

Okay, section four, looking forward to this year's activities. I don't know. I suppose that's what you're still kind of discussing at the moment. If there's anything you want to me add there particularly, I can do that. Otherwise, I'll just put in placeholders to things like WSIS, IGF, W3C, [inaudible] looking back at the previous ones and just adding some stuff.

New section is the annex A, so I've done a very brief summary of what happened in 2014 and 2015. I really haven't concentrated on this too much, because the focus of the report is 2016. But if you want more material there, let me know. Annex B is the timeline which will be added last thing, because it's a graphic and it would make the file very large online. So, back to you.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this rundown, Sam. Just one quick question before I go through the queue. The timeline of Internet governance activities, is this one that you will put yourself together or...?

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: No, this is the one that you're producing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. So we need to get Nigel to work on that then.

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: That's the [last] one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, because the last one that we had was one which was forwarded to us by Marilyn Cade, but ICANN produces a list themselves as well, and it's – I guess it's one of the action items that ICANN needs to follow through. They have a slightly different format to things.

Let's go through our queue, and first we have Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. I put the charter approval date in the chat for the ALAC. My records show that when the charter was approved, it was approved with a change in terminology that we would not have participants or rather observers, but the term participants would be used instead. So, presuming that was actually done in the text. I don't

have a copy of the revised version. There should be no observers, just members and participants.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Alan. Indeed, you're quite correct, and this is actually all recorded somewhere on the wiki in one location where we would find out. Marilyn Cade, you're next.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I agree with you, Alan, and that was one of the things I was a little concerned about in our – some of our documents we hadn't caught that change. I'm really glad you had the details on it. Constituencies who think they designated somebody to be active -

ALAN GREENBERG: Have we lost Marilyn or have we lost me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think we might have lost – Marilyn is back. Sorry, Marilyn, we lost you for a few seconds.

MARILYN CADE: Oh, it's so hard to be lost by you guys.

ALAN GREENBERG: We lost your voice.

MARILYN CADE: Oh. Just real quickly for Sam, I'll just [inaudible] this because it'll be easier. Under Advisory Committee category, GAC includes both GAC and SSAC, and I was just thinking that needs to be broken out into two categories.

On the participation statistics, maybe we could do a call to our own list with a spreadsheet and ask people to identify which of the face-to-face meetings that they attended. It could be an informal survey, but it would help us I think to then show under participation statistics we could have call statistics as one category, face to face meetings, and I think most people would tell us if they – quickly in a kind of a survey mode – if they attended our face to face sessions, and just put the ICANN 55, ICANN 56, ICANN 57, etc. Maybe just do that for one year, but that might be helpful for us.

Then on the timeline, I sent a couple of times to Nigel and to staff the timeline that I keep. I keep noting it's not complete, that ICANN will want to include the RIR meetings, the IETF, etc. So, I think if we can get the data down, then that timeline for 2017 could be circulated for all of us to take a look at, at least in a rough form. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. And I'm going to turn over to Nigel to ask on the timeline, how are we doing with the production of this timeline so far?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, I do apologize. I know it's an outstanding action item. There's an awful lot going on, and we will produce it in the next week or so, because it needs to go as an annex – or not necessarily as an annex – but it needs to go in the report to show what issues we are looking at moving forward.

I think this is quite an important issue, and of course, it'll be discussed also at the IG public meeting. But as an indication of the sort of issues that have been – perhaps our people need to include it, so we will certainly do that. It's just another action item indeed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks very much for this, Nigel. I'm mindful of the time. We've spent more than ten minutes on this. I'd like to thank Sam for the great work that she has produced so far, and to ask everyone to please have a good look at that report and share your comments with Sam on the document.

How many days do we have, Samantha, to get that feedback to you?

SAMANTHA DICKINSON: Well, if we aren't going to have the timeline until – for another week, we've got another week.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so we'll keep this open for another week. That's another action item. Keep this open for another week, because then we will have to

have this finalized and sent to the chartering organizations in advance of the Copenhagen meeting.

Let's move to 3B the GNSO Council request for the CCWG-IG charter amendments. For this, we have Rafik Dammak who has been leading this part of the work, and I understand there is a comparison table that was put together by Greg Shatan and a whole team of people has worked on this. So, Rafik, if you could, please now take over to let us know the latest developments on this. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, so thanks, Olivier. Yes, as mentioned, we have the comparison table where we put the current charter, and again, the template for Cross-Community Working Group principles rework. And we separate in different section in the way to highlight the area where we need update or changes.

And on first reading, it didn't seem that we have that much difference with the template, which is it was quite positive for us. So, for the Drafting Team, we had a call last week and we started going through the initial section. So, we focus in the area concerning the objectives, mission and the scope and so on, because we think that's quite important for us but also for the chartering organization to highlight what we are aiming to do exactly.

So, we are trying for now to have a call early next week to continue through the document and to have a draft to be shared with the whole group hopefully within next week, at least for our next call, so we can review it at working group level and get feedback. So, I think it's going

to be busy trying to populate the rest of the section, and as you shared the document, so it's now anyone can look at it.

It still needs a lot of cleanup, because we did several edits trying to tweak the text there, so we have to continue to work and add some kind of missing sections, in particular like the relation with the Board working group and so on. [inaudible]

I guess maybe this thing that maybe still not we didn't discuss that much, but maybe we can catch up on that later is if we have any suggestion in term of the structure that we can use for the working group. But I think that depends on how we end up with the current charter if we are satisfied with the changes, and I guess we can then share that with different chartering organization and let them have I think a discussion and to see what – about their feedback. Yes, Marilyn?

MARILYN CADE: Rafik, I just want to congratulate you – I don't know where that echo came from – and the team. I did have a couple of questions on... One was – and looking at the edited document, I may be missing something, but one was the question of, yes, we are trying to advise the community and Board Working Group.

I think those are two very important points. The staff as well, so the community, the staff, Board Working Group. I was trying to grasp whether we had identified clearly that we're also advising ICANN on the journal, the implications of the changes in the external Internet governance ecosystem. I just may have missed that, because I think that's a really important point since there's so much expertise in this

working group, the CCWG-IG that are engaging externally, that understand the risk and the opportunities for ICANN in the larger ecosystem.

Because I'll go back and look at it, but when I looked at this, I was thinking, "Hmm," I'm not sure I saw the language that would be clear that we should be developing a workshop at the IGF, for example, or workshop at WSIS forum for example, just two examples.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Marilyn. So, can you add those comments in the area you think appropriate, so we can [inaudible] resolve that and add the text? I'm not sure which section you think that [inaudible] was to your suggestion, but please feel free to add those comments.

So, what we are trying [later] for the group is really to go through all of them and to clean up, because now it can be somehow look messy with several edits. Okay, Olivier, and then Alan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rafik. And thanks for engaging in this vital piece of work. Just a quick question on the overall charter. Having been part of the Drafting Team for the first version one charter and so on and having had a great browse, I don't think there's that many huge number of changes to make to the charter, but the concern I have is the requisite or the need to have a start point, a middle point, an end point, deliverables, and then the idea that once the CCWG has done its work, then it needs to be closed.

Have you found any discrepancies on that? And how do you suggest resolving those?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Olivier. I don't think we worked on that yet and how to handle this timeframe issue. I think if there are some suggestions, we can work based on that. I'm not sure for example, can we use, say, a timeframe of one year and trying to renew every time? Or maybe using longer timeframe, or not. So, that's still in the discussion, and we have probably to find out by next week a proposal that we can discuss, at least within the working group [inaudible]. Okay, Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you. What's the timeline for having this ready for discussion?

RAFIK DAMMAK: At which level? For the group, or for the Council?

ALAN GREENBERG: Well, Olivier mentioned earlier that the chartering organizations were being asked to approve or discuss, when will we have it?

RAFIK DAMMAK: What we get is from the GNSO they want a report by Copenhagen meeting, so I assume that the time based on the timeline for GNSO Council to get topics in their agenda.

ALAN GREENBERG: Alright, so the other chartering organizations will also have it in that same timeframe, so we can schedule something for Copenhagen. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sounds like you have a lot of work to do.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, that's an understatement. Thanks, Alan. Yes, so I think for this [inaudible] really to provide a report for the GNSO, but I do expect that they have to communicate with the chartering organization, and I think maybe Olivier want to add further comment here. Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rafik. And indeed, yes, it is a GNSO request, but we have been advised by the ccNSO that they're also looking at the same process. So, they would be also eager to see the charter [evolve]. That's why we're I guess basing our feedback and our work timeline on the GNSO request, but obviously, other chartering organizations would have access to the same data.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Olivier. The end, the document will be useful for discussion between all the chartering organization and I think it would give them guidance on how to move forward. Yes, Alan, you want to add something?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, it's rather moot in my mind who requested the changes. If the charter is going to change for one of the organizations, it has to be approved by all of them, or at least the others have to back out. So, it's not a question. We can't have one of the groups changing the charter and the others ignoring it.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes. Any further comments on this? So, other than that, we will send updates, hopefully by next week on the [end of] progress on the document and to put a clean version for discussion for the whole working group. And also, we'll check at the GNSO level to get more details on how we should proceed in terms of procedure, but yes, what we are doing here is kind of review of our charter to highlight the difference, and what we are suggesting.

So, it depends on how the GNSO will proceed from then, and discussing with the chartering organization. So, if they want to adopt that or they kind of ask to work more, and so on. But yes, if there is any change, the different chartering organizations have to approve and they will need to think among themselves on that front. That's it from my side. Any further comments or questions? Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No thanks, Rafik. I was just basically about to jump in and say I'm mindful of the time, so if there's no further commenting or no further questions on this call, what I would ask – and seeing what Marilyn has said on the chat that really we should alert the chartering organizations but also the subgroups in all the communities making up the ICANN community that this is a work that's coming up to them. So, they need to be aware of that charter and they can review it.

But I'd go further. I would actually ask for people who are on this call or perhaps or listening to this call or on the working group to help out with this. I'm a bit surprised that it's just the core. Is it three or four people that are working on this? It seems to be the inverted pyramid. Three people are drafting this and about 100 already to comment on it and to vote on it later on.

It's a very strange situation that we often end up in at ICANN. I'm hoping that you guys are going to get a little more help than just being the three people redrafting this.

So, if there are any volunteers, please get in touch with Rafik. As we said, the link to the Google Doc is on there and it doesn't take any more to volunteer than to start drafting and start writing and commenting on the doc. Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Just very briefly. I think this is a very important part of the conversation. This along with the report is certainly exercising the minds of

management, so to speak, in ICANN. Not that I'm saying that that's significant in itself but this is considered important.

I think in terms of the charter changes, if we're going to essentially outline and I think we have to do it to everyone, the changes we think should be made, then it's for holding on the GNSO and others to have a look at what the draft is and to come back with this.

That's what I thought we were presenting. We're not saying, "This is the chart. These are the changes we've made," full stop. We're entering into a interactive dialogue on this.

The GNSO have got to come back and say, "Look, thank you very much but we'd like you to go slightly in this direction or that direction." It's certainly not and it will be completely unacceptable for any chartering organization to come back to us after this drafting exercise and say, "This is just unacceptable, go away." We need comments. We need feedback. And then we'll do another iteration if necessary. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank for this, Nigel.

RAFIK DAMMAK: If I can respond here. We are acting here as a Drafting Team and suggesting otherwise the charter but always add to the chartering organization to approve or to send back the work and so on. What, at the end, we are trying to do is to amend the charter. And when we will send, we will send the document to show the changes between the existing charter and the revised charter and also comparing them

against the template on the Cross-Community Working Group principles.

Put for discussion for GNSO but also for other chartering organizations. From there, then we will see how we can proceed. We will get probably feedback and input from there.

ALAN GREENBERG: Sorry to harp on timelines but I really think we need to publish one. Clearly, we're not looking for approval of this charter in Copenhagen if we're just going to have the first draft and then need comments from the charter all of the potential chartering organizations on whether it's acceptable or what they find might need to be changed.

So, it would be really good to publish what kind of timeline we have, until when do the chartering organizations have to come back with suggested revisions and then the [inaudible] for probably the last iteration. Otherwise, I don't think we can plan this. If each of the chartering organizations presumes that they are the only one making comments and that their comments will simply be listened to, then we're going to have a clash. And that's always rather problematic.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Alan. The expectation is just really, for now, to send findings about after reviewing our charter and proposing to revise the charter. But I guess in Copenhagen, we can have more discussion about the timeline and what kind of process we will follow.

As far as I recall, I think, for example, one of the topic in the joint meeting between GNSO and ccNSO will be about our working group. So, I can expect that maybe when we communicate with our chartering organization, we should emphasize that we have to synchronize between them, among themselves and more about the revise the charter proposal to them to ensure that we have a synchronized discussion among themselves. Okay?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much, Rafik, for this work. And I'm very mindful of the time. We have about 5 minutes remaining and we still have 20 minutes of discussions on the agenda. But they might not take as much time as this.

3C is about ICANN58 activities, the face-to-face session and the public session. I'm going to ask Nigel Hickson to let us know just of the times at which these are now going to happen. Or, I believe, is the final block schedule finalized? Would we have where some proposals which clash directly with GNSO Council sessions and also ALAC session especially on the Thursday. So, we've had to move things around. I think that we might have things. Everything clashes with everything anyway in Copenhagen. But we've tried to reduce the clashes to a minimum. If we can check this, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you. I'll be very brief then. Yes, we're now finalized. We've had to do all the changes onto the website in the last 48 hours. The face-to-face slot is at 13:45 on the Wednesday, so 75 minutes. And the

face-to-face public session is on the Thursday at 9:00, that slot. We all agreed between this.

The agendas which we agreed on the mailing list have been submitted as well. What we need to do and know that you can come onto this and we can discuss this perhaps on the list or whatever, is decide who is going to take forward the agenda for the IT public session, who is going to, if you like, be involved as discussions or whatever in that agenda. That's about something we can agree on this as soon as possible.

The other thing, might as well as I've got the floor, so to speak, is on the face-to-face meeting. One of the agenda items was, if you like, feedback and potential discussion with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. This is the working group that's met with us before chaired by Markus Kummer.

Really, the question is, do you want me to reach out to Markus and ask if he might be available to come along. He might not be but at least we should ask him if you want to ask him. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. In response to your first question, I think that we can issue a call for volunteers who wishes to run the public session in Copenhagen.

In response to your second question, I wasn't at the impression that a past action item was for either a member of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance or the Chair of that Board Working Group to

attend our calls at regular intervals. I thought that this was also extended for them to attend the face-to-face meeting.

I might be wrong or it might have not been recorded but I would certainly be very much inclined to invite Markus Kummer. But let's open the floor and have a quick discussion on this. Marilyn Cade, you have the floor.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I think that was my recollection. In fact, I thought we issued a very warm welcome to Markus as the Chair but to the members as well to attend the face-to-face sessions and even to consider being aware of our calls. I don't know if they'll be able to attend the working calls particularly because when I look at this, this is the working call that may not be the best use of their time. But certainly, for the face-to-face, I think it'd be really important for us to be issuing a standing invitation. And also, consider inviting the CEO as well when the topics are appropriate.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Marilyn. I guess you've taken notes, Nigel. I don't see anyone else putting their hand up so I gather that this is the only feedback you're going to get on this call.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thanks very much, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Let's please build the wikis. I like to work with things that we can find easily and with clear information. Could we please ask another action item for staff to build those wiki pages for these face-to-face meeting? So, we can then make amendments and prepare things, have relevant documents at our hands. And of course, when inviting Markus, rather than just saying, "Please turn up with your hands in your pockets," then turn up before that, "Hey, this is what we're going to be talking. You might need to be prepared for it."

That's one thing. Now, I realize we have one minute until the official end of this call. If we can extend by another 5 to 10 minutes for anyone. I apologize. It's been a very packed agenda. The last topic we have to deal with here is the CCWG participation and the WSIS Forum. That takes pace this year in June. It's about a month later than when it usually takes place.

There's a link to the WSIS Forum website. There's a call for topics and for workshops. So far, we haven't filed anything. Last year, we have filed and we have presented, as a group, the discussion on the process around CCWG accountability. And we had members of the CCWG Accountability Cross-Community Working Group that went and thus spoke to the people and the attendees in WSIS Forum.

The year before, we had one on CWG IANA. So, this year, the question then goes as to what topic we should have. There has been a discussion on the mailing list with a couple of threads and ideas. But Marilyn Cade has come back to us with a specific point about the need for aligning of any topic that we have with the SDGs.

Do you want to say a couple of words on this, Marilyn? Because the other question I had was when was the deadline for submission of topics, and trying to converge a little bit towards a topic rather than diverge with many different ideas too.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. The good news is the deadline has been changed. It's now March the 1st. It was usually February 20. I spend a lot of time on the WSIS follow-up activities and as well as do many of you. I see you saw on the call, Nigel, a few others that are very actively engaging yourself, the co-Chairs.

I suggested the idea of focusing on what we are doing at ICANN related to capacity building and focusing on Goal 9 and Goal 17 so that we are able to specifically identify that we are talking about how we contribute to achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.

Goal 9 is industry innovation and infrastructure. Goal 17 is partnership for the goals. The reason I propose those two is I was thinking about the capacity building activities that we are engaged in at ICANN, the Fellowship program, the support of attendance of the GAC members, the Mentoring program, the support that ICANN engages in on DNSSEC training and other forms of capacity building.

I think sometimes when I read the comments, I think that people are not really aware of who attends the WSIS Forum. And it is a very different crowd than we are used to. We are very small microcosm but we have the opportunity to influence the thinking of those who do attend and improve their awareness about what ICANN is doing.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Marilyn. Now, there were other suggestions that were made on perhaps discussing further aspects of accountability. Does anyone wish to make the case for the other topics or are we okay with the topics such as the one that Marilyn had mentioned here? The showcasing effectively the capacity building that is taking place in ICANN.

Since we do have until the end of this month, we don't need to make a choice during this call. But if there's anyone who wishes to contribute here and provide [various] views, then now is the chance. We have another couple of minutes for this.

MARILYN CADE: I would ask Nigel to also come back and inform us if ICANN itself is going to separately propose a workshop as they did last time. That was the workshop on new gTLDs. There were some concern on the part of some parts of the community like the one I come from about why ICANN was trying to build market awareness when there haven't been a resolution. There was also a proposal for workshop on auctions, the expenditure of auction fees. And I will say, again, I think that just shows a disconnect on who attends the WSIS Forum and the immaturity of that particular topic.

But the final comment I would make and I hope Nigel can help us is to verify whether the CEO will accept one of the high levels and be nominated by ICANN for one of the high-level track speaking roles or the opening session speaking roles. Last year, he did not do that

because he was brand new but I think, my own view is these high-level speaking roles can also benefit from some ICANN visibility.

NIGEL HICKSON: If I may, Olivier, very briefly. I'm conscious of the time. I've also got a meeting here at the UN. Just a couple of points. I attended the open consultation meeting on Tuesday I think it was. And I also quite note, it was a productive meeting. All the deadlines have shifted to the 1st of March. So, ICANN is considering to do perhaps a workshop on where we are on the gTLD process, on the PDP or something like that. But this is for consideration and we haven't decided that.

The attendance of the Göran Marby, of course, is something that we'd actively consider as well. As Marilyn, there was the ministerial segment on the Tuesday and the Wednesday. We are partnering with the IT and the other UN bodies for this WSIS Forum. We would potentially get a slot about that agenda.

Just on the suggested topics, one issue that several people liked on the list was to look at ICANN3.0, if you like, how ICANN is moving forward close to IANA Transition on such things as accountability and the Work Stream 2 issues as well. And also, sovereignty was raised as an issue.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. Could I just ask because I also see that what SDG could this be supporting?

EN

NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry. What were the discussion on ICANN3.0?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: 3.0, yes, because I'm concerned at the moment having to align ourselves with the SDGs. I'm not sure how strict the Selection Committee is but I understand it's not one of these transparent open Selection Committees. It's just a small group of people and they might be very stringent in their decision this year to only go for topics that are directly in-line with an SDG so that's why.

NIGEL HICKSON: There's no criteria as such.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: There's isn't? Okay.

NIGEL HICKSON: No, there's not. No. It was very, very clear that as my note show, there's a whole range of issues that might be discussed at WSIS Forum. Certainly, the linkage with ICTs and SDGs is something that the IT have focused on and is focused on quite rightly in the UN environment. But that's not a criteria for workshops, I think.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Nigel. Because we've now run overtime by eight minutes, I thank you all.

Any Other Business? I don't see anyone putting their hand up so there's no further business. We'll follow-up with the discussion about the WSIS Forum topics on the mailing list. We have a number of action items which I'm sure Desiree will share with the list and will add to the wiki page after this call.

In the meantime, I'd like to thank you, all, for having participated. The work continues. We certainly have a very tight schedule until Copenhagen. So please continue to get involved on the mailing list. We might need to have another call before Copenhagen. We'll probably have to send a Doodle out to see everyone's availability. I know a lot of people are already traveling to so many different events taking place.

Thanks, everyone. Have a very good morning, afternoon, and evening. This call is now adjourned. Good bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]