
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. Welcome to this cross community working group on Internet Governance call of Tuesday, the 7th of March, 2017. The time is 15:05 UTC.

Let's have a roll call please, Desiree.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay. In the room we have, Berry Cobb, Julf Jelsingius, Marilyn Cade, Tatiana [inaudible]. And from staff, we have Nigel Hickson, Veni Markovski. And for the chairs, we have Oliver Crépin-Leblond and Rafik Dammak.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Desiree. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. I think I've also noticed Mandy Carver from staff, joining. Have we missed anybody else on our roll call?

No? Okay. So, the roll call is completed. This call is primarily going to be organizational in the run up to the next meeting that we will have in Copenhagen. We have two main documents to look at today. The first one is the review of the... Well, the final draft shared by [inaudible], which is the review, annual review of the working group activities.

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.

And the second document is the GNSO Council requests for the charter amendments. We have more time for the charter amendments than for the annual review, since I think that there is some discussion required, definitely, on the charter amendments, and the annual review has already been shared with the working group on numerous, on several occasions.

So, let's first have a look at... Well, first thing I was going to ask, actually, was if there are any additional points to be added to this agenda? The second part of the agenda is just the CCWG participation in the WSIS Forum, just preparing for this. We'll have a few minutes on that. Any other business in addition to this?

Marilyn Cade?

And you might be muted at the moment, you are muted, I think.

MARILYN CADE:

Sorry. Under AOB, I would like to give a very brief update from the recent RGF open [inaudible] ...meeting that I think will be relevant for the participants in this working group to be aware of.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks very much, Marilyn. We'll give two or three minutes at the end of the call. Hopefully, we'll have enough time for that. So, thank you. Any other other business? I see no one else. So, let's then plow straight to the review of our previous call's action items.

There actually is a gap between them. Just a kind reminder, the first one is the call on the 21st of December last year. Three action items remaining, one being to devise a process for the working group to respond to a consultation. One being a process to respond to a sounding board request from staff, and one to launch a discussion of what the working group is trying to accomplish.

I have launched these discussions on the mailing list. There hasn't been a follow-up, and of course, now in the run-up to Copenhagen, we've been busy doing other things. So, this is probably something we will be addressing again when we meet face to face. No real discussion required here.

On the call of the 16th of February, there were two action items left, unchecked. First was, check with the CSG for a time to meet with them. That, I believe, it was a request by the, maybe it was suggested by Marilyn Cade, I don't know. Someone suggested that the cross community working group chairs should meet with more than just the GNSO Council, and the ALAC, and the ccNSO, but actually, go and meet with the different constituencies of the GNSO.

I'm not sure whether this has been followed through or not. Could I ask Desiree or Nigel, please, if there has been a follow-up on this?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Not... Good afternoon. Nigel Hickson. Not to my knowledge, no. And this is something which we can try and take forward if we have time in Copenhagen, but if we hadn't organized anything, as far as I'm aware.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. So, perhaps, if we can fire off an email to the different chairs of the various GNSO constituencies, and let them know that we would be available at their, well at the time of their choice, to speak to them about the CCWG on Internet Governance. I think that's probably sort of the way forward.

Okay. [CROSSTALK]

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right, thanks for this. Marilyn Cade says in the chat, "It is not too late to ask for a 20 minute update? 19 [inaudible] come from the three constituencies of the CSG." So, Marilyn, perhaps, could I ask you to work with staff and check on this? I'm not sure we have anyone else from the CSG on the call, and try to see if it can be arranged somehow.

Excellent. Thanks...

MAIRLYN CADE: I'm happy to do that.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead.

MARILYN CADE:

Yes, I would just say that, I'm happy to do that. I would just say that eight participants come from the registry and registrars. And I think, I really would urge us, yes, I was the person who suggested this. I really think we make the rounds, and be friendly and informative.

And so, I'm happy to work with staff. I'm happy to participate in organizing what a short briefing would look like, not only for the CSG, but for the contracted party house. I will leave it to you and to Rafik to focus on the ALAC and the non-commercials.

I think we must also visit the ccNSO. I think that's incredibly important to add to our priority. And I know that we have a vice-chair from the ccNSO, so perhaps we can just work on a four page PowerPoint that's an update, and then we're happy to collaborate on that, and then we're all giving the, we're singing from the same hymn book.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. In fact, Katrina [inaudible], the ccNSO Chair, has been in touch with the co-chairs of the cross community working group. So, as we send her the reports, then we no doubt will be offering to her that we can come and meet with the ccNSO as well.

So, it would be really helpful if you indeed could coordinate with staff when it comes down to contracted parties and commercial stakeholder group. Let's then look at the other action item, and that's for staff to build a face to face pages on the Wiki in preparation for the meetings. And I've seen that being built, just a few, couple of hours ago.

That, I guess, can be ticked off. So, let's go into the meat of today's call, and that's the proposal for the annual review of working group activities. In the agenda page, you will have a link to either a copy of the document in .docx format, so Microsoft Word format, or in PDF format.

And I invite you to open that document. Do we have Sam Dickinson on the call? I don't quite see her in the participants list at the moment. But Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON:

No, she's not, to my knowledge, she's not on the call. The version that we should be looking at is the version that I sent around early this morning, well early this morning, so it was sent around about two o'clock UTC, or something like that. So, that's the version that I agreed with Sam in the early hours.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thanks for this Nigel. I believe it is the same version. [CROSSTALK] Because I did make the agenda up this morning.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yeah, yeah, it's the one... I'm sure it is, yeah.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

You think it's the one, yeah. So, I'm not sure who is going to take us through this. I could certainly say a few words about it, quickly, and

mention first that I think it has been put together rather well. We've got an executive summary that provides details of the chartering organization details, and when the charter was ratified by the different organizations.

And then, in the table of contents, you can see there is a little bit of history of the establishment of the working group, help navigating where the different CCWG materials are, and immediately going into then the summary of the activities in 2014 and 2015. And then, of course, we are looking into more detail of the activities in 2016.

First, the CCWG engagement with the wider ICANN community, and that's of course, a list of all of the different meetings that it held in Marrakech, in Helsinki, and in Hyderabad. In most cases, it's just been a case, by the way, of taking the agendas that we had and perhaps bring them over to this document.

Then, CCWG participation in external events, where we covered the WSIS forum in 2015. The [inaudible] 2016, the IGF. And then CCWG internal work, which lists the agendas of the face to face meeting. Then moving on to the list of the teleconferences that it had, again, with a copy of the agendas being displayed on the screen. And then finally, the mailing list discussions with statistics for not only the number of posts, but the topics of discussions that were held.

Afterwards, in section 2.3.4, there is a listing of other activities of how it has been involved with the dialogue with the government engagement, ICANN government engagement department. And then, we have a list of the CCWG members and participants. I did, I can't say that I cringed,

but I did think, well, one of the problems with this is that it doesn't seem to be completely up to date, and that's something that, of course, will be addressed when we work on the charter, and tighten the charter membership requirements, and get the chartering organizations to send active participants.

So, that really is just here for reference, as such. There is then, a quick section on staff support, and then looking forward to the activities in 2017, with a graphic listed in the annex B of the timeline of internet governance activities of relevance to the ICANN community. That's the whole report, 19 pages, and I now open the floor for questions or comments.

And it would have been good, by the way, to have the document on the agenda, the draft agenda page, it would have been good to share this, but I gather that you've all been able to open this document in PDF or in doc form on your computer.

So, Marilyn Cade, you're first in the queue, and you have the floor.

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you. Perhaps I [inaudible] make a recommendation for all future meetings. Could we make sure we always do a roll call, not by the staff, but by the participants? Saying who they are and who they're affiliated with. That would be my first request. And then, I have a question for you, before I go to my comments about the report.

I don't see our consultant on the call. Is she on the call and I just don't see her?

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. No. I did ask, and no she doesn't appear to be on the call today.

MARILYN CADE: Okay. So, how are we documenting...?

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Have we lost Marilyn?

MARILYN CADE: ...because I have a number of suggestions.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We have appeared to lost Marilyn Cade. It's Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. So... [CROSSTALK] ...part of the question, Marilyn, but you've broken up a little bit.

MARILYN CADE: Sorry. I've just asked, how we are going to make sure the consultant understands the suggestions we make in this call?

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. So, two things. First, I say that she can listen to the recording of this call, but secondly, Nigel or

Desiree, would you mind taking notes? Or maybe Deirdre would mind taking notes on the points being made? Is that okay?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Olivier, this is Nigel. The process we've been doing is that we've been providing direct updates on the text itself. We've been directly updating the report, so if there is any further comment on the report, and of course, it has been in the front of the wider group. If there are any further questions, we can update them.

I mean, Sam will probably want us take later on in her time. She's obviously in Australia. And you know, for consistency, she might want to look at what I'm doing. But that's what we've been doing, and that's why we did last night with the updates to the report that we did.

So, if there are any points, we can take them down and then we can [inaudible] few hours.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks for this Nigel. So, back to you Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE:

I just started to say, Nigel, I'm really not satisfied with that approach. When we have a consultant doing work, I expect the consultant to be on the call and paying attention. And that's feedback for the ICANN staff. Let me move to my comments now.

This report is a basic report that needs to be significantly improved by assuming that people who read it, are not familiar with names. They need consistently titles and affiliation. I'm not going to say that... I guess I will say, the executive summary needs to have page numbers, that seems like a simple thing, but it's pretty important.

But throughout this report, there are references to names without titles and affiliation. That is a standard process in any official document. I'm just going to say, under two, we refer to [inaudible], but don't say who she is affiliated with or who she is.

In some places, we get the titles right, but there is a lot of places where we refer to people by name, and we don't have their title. And I think that's really, really, you know, a simplistic understanding of how we are going to market the success.

On the other hand, I will say that I think the... I appreciate seeing the timeline that the consultant prepared, but if you're not... I've done a lot of timelines myself, I would ask that you ask the consultant to improve this timeline. It's not readable to someone who is not really familiar, maybe making a connection between the list of events to the month would be helpful.

That timeline needs to be a major selling event, and it would be better to have it not horizontal, it would be better to make it across the full page. We did a lot of work, and that's not really... The timeline is a major potential selling document, but it doesn't really come across as something that we can use as a tool to convince people that we have done major, major work.

The second thing I'm just going to say is, this is a... What we've done is just say, we did this, we did that. We did not identify the impact that we had, and we have got to do that. So, let's think, in this call, how we summarize what is the impact that the CCWG IG has had?

I'm going to give you a for instance. We now have a Board working group that didn't exist before we existed. Why aren't we trying to take some credit for the achievements that we have accomplished? The fact that we have informed members of the ICANN community and encouraged them to attend the IGF. We have brought information into ICANN about risk to ICANN that occur at certain [inaudible] meetings, or the CSTD working group on enhanced cooperation.

We need to capture those messages about how we are defending and protecting and enhancing ICANN in this report. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thanks very much for these points, Marilyn. I gather that Nigel is taking note of this. Are there any other comments by anyone else on this call on this?

I don't see anyone else put their hand up at present. What I would suggest then, is that we... I mean, I gather, I'm not sure if anybody else has read the paper so far, but of course, time is of the essence, and we do need to send this as soon as possible to the different chartering organizations.

Could I suggest that we take the next 24 hours or so to integrate Marilyn's comments on this? I don't see anyone else wishing to add

anything to this. I don't see anyone disagreeing either. So, I gather that everyone who agrees on these, on the points made, and integrate on the points made on this.

And perhaps, Marilyn, would you be available to work with Sam on this in the next 24 hours or something? Is that a possibility? And Nigel, if we can arrange somehow to maybe share the document again, or somehow to have a collaboration here, so the points are integrated in there.

The point about the names is well taken, Marilyn. And I think that we, that's a pretty straight forward thing to fix. It's just a case of going through the document with a comb and changing their names to their full name, and perhaps amending the agendas a little bit. I realize that it looks as though, for most agendas, it has just been a case of taking the agenda on the Wiki page and pasting it into the document.

So, it's [inaudible] obviously for an audience that is not our usual audience for face to face meetings. We do need to have something a bit more formal and certainly getting those agendas polished, moving forward. But the other points you've are also very valid, and I therefore, if we can fix this within the next 24 hours, then that still gives us time to send this before people are in Copenhagen already.

I realize some are already flying as we speak, but we obviously need to get things to them very quickly. Can we work this one out, Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, yes, we can certainly look at this, but I mean, I mean, there is only so much we can do. I mean, this has been opened for some time, so suggestions could have been made before now. But we'll certainly look at the factual accuracy of it, and also try and build in a few of the important point about the Board working group, which I thought was mentioned, but we ought to perhaps just mention it more succinctly.

So, yes, we can certainly take this form. And you're right, Olivier, there was a request that has come from the GNSO to you and Rafik in the last couple of hours to forward it today for their consideration at their Council meeting.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thanks for this, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. So, perhaps we can let the GNSO Council... If we look at it on a 24 hour basis, so by tomorrow 15 hours UTC, we will have that sent over to the Council, and take that last 24 hours to have a last look through it. And Marilyn, would you be able to make some time and work on this in the next 24 hours?

MARILYN CADE: Of course. I think this is the most important thing we need to do. We need to market ourselves and explain ourselves, and we have not done that. And frankly, Nigel, I do not agree with you at all that this has been out for comment, so we cannot improve it, it is [inaudible] to improve it.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Right. Well, let's then have the action item as immediate follow-up after this call. We'll share this document. Let's put it again on a

Google Doc in its current form. If everyone is okay with working on a Google Doc? Can I get an indication? Marilyn and Nigel?

MARILYN CADE:

Hold on. It's Marilyn. We're just talking about improving... I don't want to be involved in asking the consultant to go through the document and add titles. Nigel can do that with the consultant. What I want to focus on is, what have been the achievements? I think that we need to get that together, then work on, so what did we accomplish?

And I see Matthew is on the call, Tatiana, others, you know, what have we...? Greg Shatan. What have we accomplished? That's the thing that is missing, in my view. Fixing the titles, surely, the consultant can handle that. And I don't need to be involved in that.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

If I could please... It's Olivier speaking. If I could please ask you then to make your suggestions by email. So, draft a few lines of the points that we should also advertise we've accomplished. I've known that you mentioned it on the call here, but it takes a little while for the transcript to come out, and we haven't got the time for that, and then follow it up immediately afterwards by email, on the mailing list.

Okay. I think that we've spent enough time on this. There is the charter to discuss now, and I hand the floor over to Rafik Dammak for this. And Rafik, you have the floor, because that's equally as important and equally as much as a pressing issue.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Yeah, thanks Olivier. So maybe just to plug it forward of the expectation. We get the CWAGR agenda item for the GNSO Council probably next week, Wednesday, and we are supposed to give an update about what we did since Hyderabad.

And so, I think we have to share a draft of the revised charter, or what we think we should amend in our current charter to align it with the CWG principles framework. So, if you can open the document, we see we have a table, and in the right, we put the template from the CWG framework.

And in the left, the current charter. Then we started to go through and to make the amendments to align. So, in many parts, and in particular, at the end, with regard like the membership and so on, you will find it home of the same text, between the template and the charter. But what we spend more time, if you can go through the document, particular in this section with regard to the scope, problem statement, goals, objectives, scope, and so on, because we tried to handle, to clarify what we are trying to achieve in our working group, and what also we are expecting of deliverables.

So, we try to elaborate and to highlight what can be expected from us. And also, we try to clarify with regard to the... Because there is an expectation that any working group has a start and end and work plan. So, we try to highlight there or emphasize, how we will do that for the cycle of two years.

And then trying to provide a work plan and so on. So, I would like to ask the same, like for other material, we have to share them as soon as

possible, before Copenhagen meeting, to the GNSO, so they can discuss and they can review that. It's not... We are not... Just to be clear, we are not clear, the revised charter is a motion to be voted, but to give an update about the progress we made [inaudible].

So, we can share this table with our members and revised charter, and also trying to work on the table to compare the current charter and the amended charter, to highlight, let's say, the changes we made. So what I would like to ask, and to request... First, I would like to apologize, we didn't provide more earlier, a kind of, this draft version.

What I would like to ask for the members of the working group, is to review and come in and get this verified by Thursday, so a little more than 24 hours, to go through the document and try to view this. I think the critical part regarding our objective goals, scope, work done, deliverable, and so on, and to see if we have to elaborate more or maybe there are a place for some [inaudible].

So, we also share, Olivier, if you can, the document to the list, for those who are not on the call to review. So, also just maybe to highlight other parties. Also, we tried to clarify our relation with the Board working group, and I think that it is important [inaudible] from the discussion about the report.

So, this is something to kind of emphasize why we are relevant to make that crystal clear that we are relevant, and to [inaudible] what we are delivering. We had a discussion with the drafting team, in regard to the deliverables because we organized workshops and so on, but there was

an expectation in our current or old charter, to deliver position paper or a statement, but I don't think we did that lately.

So, this is... We kept some text around that, and give us a role to make, to submit based on the future, but it's something that we may need to discuss, and how we can do that the most succinct way, in the future, and does having this statement and getting our chartering organization support will be really helpful for us to keep the working group alive and relevant for the ICANN community.

So, yes, this is kind of the basic, the overview. There are, if you can check the document, there are several points that are not resolved yet. And to any wording or suggestion already helpful there. So, as the co-chair on the GNSO, I need to report, in the coming days, with whatever we have as the progress, just to show that we, as a working group, work to SO request, etc.

So, that's it, and looking forward to hear from the members.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Rafik. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. Any comments or questions on this topic?

NIGEL HICKSON: This is Nigel, Olivier. Just to note that, I think part of this small working group, and to thank Rafik for all of his work, one question, I think we had settled most things in the drafting group, and of course, there are others in the drafting group that might have points. But one question

was, how often we ought to report? How often the CCWG IG ought to report to the chartering organizations?

In the draft at the moment, which I think is the recommendation from the cross community working group, sort of template, is monthly, but I thought I would just raise that point. Monthly is quite often, but if we want to do it monthly, then we should do it monthly. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

So, maybe I can respond to Nigel? So, yeah, I think maybe monthly is kind of [inaudible] for us to report. I can assume we can make a report at least for every ICANN meeting. So, three times per for year. Or when we have, like for example, maybe something to share like if we are making the statement or a position paper, whatever, that is relevant, and we may need quick actions for our chartering organization.

But I think maybe having its monthly report may be too much as a co-chair, but feel like we have that discussion before is to create maybe more kind of regular information to share with the chartering organization, but also the constituency and the stakeholder groups of the key people informed and up to date.

Yes, Marilyn, I think the whole community [inaudible].

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thank you Rafik. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. I have a question for you regarding this topic of monthly report, because on the deliverables, it doesn't actually... It talks about position papers, statements. It talks about annual reports as a deliverable. But then the

report on progress, I mean, is that supposed to be just monthly reporting, rather than the drafting of a monthly report?

And is this not a case of each one of the co-chairs, or any rapporteur that any of the chartering organizations has appointed to the working group, should take themselves, the responsibility to report back to their chartering organizations? Is that more the case rather than having a monthly report that is just sent out?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay, thanks Olivier. I think Marilyn wants to be [inaudible] as to why, so maybe let her speak first, and then I would respond better. Marilyn?

MARILYN CADE:

Thanks. Yes, thanks. So, let me see if I understand, because Greg is on the phone, he may be able to help us. My observation, from being an observer, to whether cross community working groups is, they publish updates to their work, when they have actionable work. It's public, but it's not a, you know, it's not a formal report to the chartering organization.

It is a public acknowledgement of... Good, Matthew is on the call too. It's a public acknowledgement of the work they've accomplished, or undertaken, but it's not a specific report to a SO. It's just a public report on what they're doing.

I'm going to ask maybe we ask Matthew, who is on, one of the other CCWGs and also Greg. I'm looking at the list here of who is on the call.

We do a lot of work, but our work is incidental, it is driven by an ICANN meeting, or an outside event.

So, on a monthly basis, what we might report on is, here is what happened externally, here is what we did within the ICANN community to respond. We monitored or we did something else. So, perhaps we can hear from... Oh, Nigel, welcome. Greg, Nigel, Matthew, about what other cc, what other cc. Sorry, Nigel, I mistook you for a different Nigel.

We could hear another cc working group on how they handle the reporting structure. So that would be Greg, perhaps, and Matthew. Matthew has posted in the list saying, maybe every two months would be reasonable.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Marilyn, it's Matthew. Rafik, can I jump in?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, Matthew, go ahead.

MATTHEW SHEARS: So, I think Marilyn raises an interesting point, which is typically the CCWG's report is an ongoing work product, and the development sort of happens in what has been achieved today. That doesn't quite work for us, so I like the idea of reporting.

I think that, in some ways, the work that this CCWG does is likely to follow more of a kind of fits and starts, rather than an ongoing, based

upon four issues as they arise, rather than ongoing, steady states of work.

So, I think possibly a two month report, a report every two months might be a reasonable way of capturing what's happened, and progress has been made on whatever issue might be. I think if we get to a point where we are developing statements and position papers and things like that, that, you know, it will obviously necessitate probably more frequent reporting of what the status of that is.

But I think, the two months is probably a reasonable timeframe within which to work. Thanks.

RAFFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks Matthew. Maybe, I think we can do that. If I recall, for the CCWG and CWG there was like [inaudible] and have many updates and [inaudible] and so on. So, I think we can do that. Just maybe to be clear about the resources used for that, because the CWG, I don't think that was work done by the working group members, but there were enough staff and even, I think, they hired consultant and so on, to write down all of those kind of updates and newsletters and reports.

I'm not talking about the work itself done by the working group, so maybe, I think that was a certain height of it, and there was some insurance at that time that we would get some better report. Am I mistaken, Nigel, or I'm just [inaudible] about we get staff report for sessions and updates, everything?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, sorry. Nigel Hickson here. I think this has been very useful. I think if we are basing it all on two monthly report, and essentially we're highlighting, you know, what has changed in those two months... I think Matthew is right, two month period, one would just say further preparations are ongoing for the WSIS, or whatever.

Whereas in another two month period, we'll be able to say we've responded to consultation. We've organized a CCWG panel session at X or Y. So, I think we can certainly agree to do that. I don't see that to be too much of a problem, thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thank you. I'm not sure, Marilyn, if it's an old or new hand, but go ahead.

Marilyn? I'm not sure...

MARILYN CADE: I think, I just wanted to say something really quickly, and thank you for giving me the mic again. I'm looking at who has shown up for the calls, and I'm going to give a bit of feedback, because I do, as some of you know, acted as the substantive coordinator of that NRIs last year and the year before.

And I agree with the participation of the NRI funding seven to 76, and now to over 90. And what I'm going to say is the following. We have, under section three, the list of the participations from supporting organizations, but they are not on these calls.

And the reason I mention that is, we need to enlist our best advocates. Whatever we're talking about here, I see five from the ASO, four from the ccNSO, 19 in total from the CSG.

I would go on with the numbers that, you know, what can we do? And I would love to be helpful. What can we do to make sure that all of our calls in the future, we're putting forward our best face so that we can be continued? And yet, we don't have all of the representatives of our participants.

So, my only comment is, whatever we decide today, we have to in the next 24 hours, enlist all of our supporters to be our best advocate, to sell and market and confirm continued support, for the CCWG IG.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks Marilyn. [Inaudible] and we need them to get back and to be active again on the working group. Okay. So, I don't see anybody in the queue, but are there any questions for further comments on this?

Okay. So, yes, Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah, thank you Rafik. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. I wanted to echo what was mention by Nigel and thanking you and your team for putting this together. Having been involved with the first drafting of the charter, I definitely think that this new version is an improvement on the previous version.

It has more definitions inside it. It certainly has more, I wouldn't say more concise because it has more information in there, you know, sometimes people say, well, it's more concise because it's more compact. And I don't want to use that word, it's more compact, but it is certainly more explicit in what the working group does, and I personally think that we should give it a go in passing it now to the chartering organizations.

If we just go through the few points which are yet to be fixed on there, and I just note that there are a handful of comments on there. So, I'm happy to commit to help with resolving any of these few points that are remaining there. And I'm not sure where the next steps are. After this, what are your plans?

MARILYN CADE:

It's Marilyn. I need to make one other comment. I'm happy to talk with whoever is talking with the consultant later, but I just want to say, we need to do a little bit of explanation. I'm looking at 3.4, other activities. I work across the IGF ICANN and the UN bodies. I'm a member of the CCWG IG, as well as others on this call. I think we need to actually add an explanation about why the broader internet governance ecosystem is a threat to ICANN.

Because right now, this appears, 3.3.4, other activities, it appears with this kind of like [inaudible], here is what we're doing, but it doesn't state the risk that is going on. And I'm going to say, having just been, Nigel was with me, having just been at an IGF consultation, where China

announced a new intent, sorry, a renewed attempt to take over ICANN's functions, move them into a new body.

I think, I really urge us to be sensitive to the fact that this huge risk to ICANN, if we don't do this work, and I don't think we're conveying that. I see Veni on the call, could we perhaps ask Veni to comment about what he's seeing in New York?

VENI MARKOVSKI: So many [AUDIO ECHO]. One sec, okay. Do I have a couple of minutes now?

RAFIK DAMMAK: We can hear you.

VENI MARKOVSKI: No, okay. I mean, what Marilyn says about the Chinese in the IGF, I think it's not quite visible in New York. So, it's not public, but behind the scenes, there is a lot of expectations this year that not only China, but other countries, will step in. And it is related also to the activities that the US, within the US context.

Good thing is that the new ambassador, [inaudible] to the UN, [inaudible], seems to be very strong on issues that are relevant also to the internet, but she hasn't had the opportunity to talk publicly about it. At the same time, there is a big change in the UN with regards to the secretariat.

All of the assistant secretary generals are leaving at the end of this month, and the new one, who will be appointed, are not yet clear, that includes also the department that deals with the WSIS and the IGF. The undersecretary from China will be leaving, but he will be replaced by another Chinese, that's the expectation.

And that means that based on who is sent from China, from Beijing, will know what is the relevance that China takes to these [inaudible]. The current undersecretary, the former ambassador to Germany, so very highly, high position within China and leading the leadership, so we'll see how this will develop.

Also, one of the items that is being also very kind of discussed still in the hallways, because there are no formal sessions yet at the UN, is the other issue of security and cybersecurity. So, the governmental group who met in Geneva last week, are going to meet in June, actually just before, in the beginning of the ICANN meeting, from the 19th to 20th of June in New York.

It has to come with a report. And also, in the meantime, a new global commission on security in cyberspace, of stability in cyberspace, it was formed with a lot of people that we know from our kind of people Wolf [inaudible] is there, Jeff [inaudible] of ICANN, and [inaudible] who you guys know.

This group will be supporting the GG, the [inaudible] at the same time the GG ceases to exist. It may be used, actually, as a vehicle for all of these actors, governmental actors, to have a place to meet and talk about the security of the internet.

However, I don't think, Marilyn, or at least I haven't heard right now in the first couple of months of this year, somebody at the UN articulating clearly a desire to take some of the functions of ICANN. It's all [inaudible] and chat in the hallway. So, that's all I can say now.

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you for this comment. I just wanted to jump in here. Read the recent China document and look at the video, and I did meet with the new [MAG?] member from China. So I have a current understanding of their agenda. I think, let's move this away but come back to it later on the CCWG IG list.

There is a significant interest, and I want to move this away because I don't want to take over, but there is significant interest by China to return to old messages. So, perhaps we can move that away, not take up this call, but make it a topic for the future call. Would that be okay?

VENI MARKOVSKI:

That's fine with me, and I will check, in the meantime, before our next call, I'll check with the Chinese mission here to see what their views of this document is. So, you're right. I mean, in the document, there is a lot of items that are of concern for ICANN. [Inaudible] at the UN [inaudible] nobody [inaudible].

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Good, thanks Veni. Yes Olivier, go ahead.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much Rafik. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I think we somehow sort of went off on a tangent here, based on the, again on the annual review document. I think Marilyn was mentioning 2.3.4, other activities. So, if Nigel could take note of that and this could be some of the points made by Marilyn on sending ourselves the 2.3.4 should be beefed up.

Back to the charter, I have no further comments on it. Just one question, which is, how did you go around the concept of CCWG needing a start, middle, and an end with a final report? As is often being said of cross community working groups.

How did you go around this?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, thanks Olivier. Rafik speaking. The idea is, we are also existing to have Mondays for two years, and then at the end, after two [inaudible] give all of our deliverables, and then we do a review of the working group to kind of prepare for the next cycle for the working group, and that request suggesting work plan and so on.

So that we have to do the review before it was by the IGM, an annual basis, but we are trying to be here like more longer period of two years. So we can [inaudible] language to make that more clear, but that's the basic idea is we have to review up to two years, and then to prepare or plan to go in the next cycle and so on.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. So, I think we got more time than planned for the topic, and we have several agenda items. So, [inaudible] okay, we'll send the revised charter draft to the main mailing list, so people can review and comment. But regardless of that, we have to submit whatever we get to share it with the GNSO Council for discussion. So, we can share our funding, and also the question rises, give them an update of the work we will spend there.

So, I also see that Greg made a comment about [inaudible] okay. So, yes, Marilyn, I'm not sure if it's an old or new hand, but I see you are in the queue. Please go ahead.

MARILYN CADE: I just had a quick question. I think we're making a huge amount of progress, can we make sure that the staff is capturing this? Get a document that says, here is what we're going to do next, capturing this great work and then giving us a deadline. Is it 24 hours, okay, whatever. But just formally say, respond to this now so we can move forward.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Have we lost Rafik?

MARILYN CADE: Rafik, is that...? I just want to be sure that people are coming back to you in a very timely manner, that was my only...

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, thanks Marilyn. Sorry, I had a problem to unmute myself. Yes, so sending the email to share the draft and [inaudible] the deadline. And I think, yes, we still have, we should do a kind of working on the formatting and so on, to make, I mean, something really presentable, I mean, it's not just for GNSO but also for other chartering organizations. And any help is welcome here, so hopefully you can get some support in that regard.

So, okay, Olivier, I think we've got an action item here, is to share the document and to set a deadline for people to respond back, and that still have to work on the formatting and so on, because I prepared the draft, and thanks to Greg, you also, I'm going to keep, he created kind of this workspace with the different document.

So, I was thinking to create kind of another comparison table between the current and the amended charter. It's time for me, that we have few days set prior to Copenhagen meeting. [Inaudible] with the work. Okay. So, I think that's it, Olivier, over to you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Rafik. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. We have at least 15 minutes plus the any other business. On the agenda, let's try and fly through this at a fast pace. First, the public session agenda of the working group. That will take place on Thursday, March the 16th, from 9 to 10:30 AM. The agenda is linked to the main agenda of our call today, and that's probably going to be the place where we do this marketing of the working group.

Briefly, the three points in there, review main outcomes on the IG front during 2016, look ahead to main issues during 2017, and thirdly, discuss internet governance priorities for the working group. So, that is going to be our public session advertising, should we say. We still need to make up our panel of this.

I think that there is a rough panel that we've worked out, that we can certainly follow-up on the mailing list on this. The second one is the face to face session, that's actually happening before, on Wednesday, March the 15th, from 1:45 to 3 PM. And this one will have a discussion on, what does it say here? Public IG session notice of session. Then updates on CCWG. We'll be talking about the 2016 report, the status, the next steps.

We'll be looking at the charter amendments and explaining those as we discuss them face to face with our group, and then any other business afterwards. So, we'll have ample time here to prepare for our public session the next day, if there is a need for a specific preparation. I think that it will also be, our face to face meeting on Wednesday, should there be meetings with the supporting organizations, and stakeholder constituencies, etc. prior to this date, they will be a good time for the co-chairs of this working group to report back to our members.

Are there any amendments or additions that you think should be added to the face to face meeting or to the public meeting?

I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so I believe there are no amendments, fine, and finally, we can go to the quick update on a contribution for policy topics. We also had to arrange, to put together

an agenda for the WSIS Forum, that takes place on the 12th to the 16th of June. I like to thank Nigel Hickson for having, at the very last minute, managed to put together the submission form, which I understand is actually quite complicated.

The text of the actual proposal, because the proposal had tons of other stuff that needs to be added next to it. The text of the proposal itself is the second link in your agenda, and the discussion... We had the discussion, the number of people who had volunteered to work on this topic and to put together an agenda, took the input from the mailing lists, and there was a discussion on the mailing list, there was some feedback by direct emails, and we ended up with a session called, a proposal for a session called from theory to practice, capacity building programs at ICANN and elsewhere.

And we effectively would be looking at, or attempting to answer many questions about capacity building and internet governance, but looking at all of these programs which are out there, both in ICANN and also outside of ICANN for building the next generation of, building the knowledge of the next generations of internet governance participants. How do these programs fulfill the ongoing requirements for more active stakeholders in an increasingly busy internet governance space?

Are these programs successful at balancing the diversity of active stakeholders? And whether the funding model for these programs... These are just three of the questions. There probably would be likely more questions and more discussion on this. And as we know, they, I think an interactive session would probably be a good thing.

We've got a list of people given here. [Inaudible], William Drake, myself, Matthew Sheers, Rafik Dammak, Tatiana [inaudible], at the moment, these are just names that are placeholders. We haven't refined, we haven't even had the time to ask anyone so far, who can attend.

But we will be trying to do, to get something, a panel that will be geographically diverse. If you have any suggestions for names, and there have been some suggestions already made, then please forward them along. Any feedback on this proposal?

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, this is...

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, go ahead Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah, I'll be brief. So essentially, we submitted this just beyond the deadline, but I've had a response from the ITU that it has been acknowledge, and they'll be coming back to it. So, it's not for certain, but we've got this [inaudible]...

They had 150 applications.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Nigel. It sounds like there are more and more applications for more workshops. And everyone then complains that there are too many workshops and too much work during those conferences.

Great, okay. Well, let's hope that we get it. And you know, we have had interesting topics in the past years, and hopefully this one will also be deemed to be interesting, and therefore be chosen. Any other business? We're now reaching, seeing no comments on the policy topic. And Marilyn Cade had brought forward the question on update from the recent IGF consultations and the MAG meeting. Marilyn Cade, you have the floor.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. To my regret, I [inaudible] the next open consultation and MAG meeting is at the same time as high level track and workshop days at the WSIS Forum. I will say I did object to this, I'm only an observer, I'm not a MAG member anymore. I did object to this overlap, but I was not supported by others. And so, there is a direct, competing three days.

The open consultation is, I think, very, very important for this working group to be aware of, as the MAG is supposed to listen, not speak. They don't excel at listening, but perhaps with further coaching, they'll get better. So, I think, you know, it's really important for us to advise the CCWG IG about this overlap, and encourage virtual participation, even for those who cannot attend the open consultation of the MAG, sorry, the [inaudible] consultation of the IGF.

We can post those dates, and perhaps we can encourage more remote participation on the open consultation day. The MAG will then be evaluating workshops. They have an agreed upon new format for evaluating workshops. They are not taking public consultation on the format. They've moved ahead without public consultation. It's a very internal process, but hopefully it will be more neutral than it has been in the past.

Many participants from the ICANN community are very interested in the workshops that IGF, and perhaps can, want to contribute. The main thing I want to say is, the IGF 2017 is in Geneva, the 18th through the 21st of December, which is an extremely challenging time to be in Geneva. It's both highly expensive to come to Geneva in that timeframe, and highly expensive to leave Geneva in that timeframe, as many flights are not, they're already filled by people who are exiting Geneva.

But, this IGF is an unique opportunity for engagement with the IGOs. There is an effort to try to even bring the Secretary General of the UN, United Nations, for day one. But certainly, there will be, at least the first couple of days of the IGF, very significant opportunity for engagement of the IGOs, expected to be very, very different, but very useful to ICANN, because ICANN's participation will be much more visible to the international community by our participation.

So, I bring this forward so that we can start thinking about, you know, normally ICANN does an open forum, perhaps we should be thinking, ourselves, about doing an open forum sponsored by the CCWG, not just

ICANN's open forum, but our own open forum. And I just throw that out as something to think about.

Many of the NRIs, the National and Regional IGFs, where ICANN is a sponsor, will be coming to this event, and that may be another way for this working group to partner. Thank you.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Marilyn. Oliver Crépin-Leblond speaking. And perhaps it would be worth addressing this topic again at our face to face meeting in Copenhagen. I don't know what the timelines are for submission of workshops, etc. I also wondered, because you mentioned, okay, so we could also have an open forum for, organized by the CCWG. Are you saying in replacement of the ICANN open forum or in addition to the ICANN open forum?

MARILYN CADE: No, no, no. We should not replace the ICANN open forum. That will be very different. That's about ICANN. I think we should think about an open forum to consider applying for an open forum about our work, which is different from ICANN. ICANN has other broader agenda items. We focus on internet governance.

I think we need to be distinct about that.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Marilyn. Thanks for planting the seed, and have an action item to follow up on that, so we don't drop the ball.

I'm very concerned that we are 19 minutes past the official end of this call. I think this is only... Was that supposed to be a 60 minute call? I think it was.

So, let's, well, I think we have to adjourn here. But please, let's follow up by email immediately after this call for the annual review. Staff have taken notes of this. If I could ask Desiree to please try and get the recording of this call online as soon as possible, so any of us who have missed part of the discussion, or things were going a bit too quickly to take notes, can refer back to the recording.

And also to circulate the action items immediately after this call, then we can agree to them, and strike the iron while it's hot. A part from this, Rafik, you know what you have to do as well, so we're, for both documents, both the annual review and the charter amendments, we'll be working frantically in the next 24 hours, and freezing time about 15, was it 15:00 UTC tomorrow?

Then we can send those to the chartering organizations. That's all from me. Any other other business?

NIGEL HICKSON:

This is Nigel. No, only to say, I'll circulate a note to the, of some of the discussions that took place in the open consultation, which Marilyn referred to earlier.

OLIVER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thanks. Thanks very much for this Nigel. With no further business, I would like to thank you all for being on this call, and for your

hard work, especially those people who were involved in the drafting of the two reports. Well, the report and the charter. And with this, I look forward to see you all, or if you're not travelling, then to see you on the internet, but otherwise see you all in Copenhagen.

Safe travels everyone, and this call is adjourned. Thank you and goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]