
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is the Cross-Community Working Group- on Internet Governance call on the fourth of April, 2017. Today we are a Tuesday, I believe, and we will start with a roll call, please. Desiree, you have the floor.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay. In the room, we have Erich Schweighofer, Farzaneh Badii, Jim Prendergast, Julf Helsingius, Matthew Shears, Michael Oghia.

For staff, we have Nigel Hickson and Veni Markovski as well as myself, Desiree Cabrera.

For the Chair, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond.

We also have one person of the room with the initials A.W., so if you could please chime in and let us know who you are for the record, that would be appreciated.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No response. Okay, and there are two numbers as well that I note here. One ending with 8776 and one ending with 4849.

VENI MARKOVSKI: One of them is mine.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Veni. Veni Markovski. Okay, well, I think we can take the initials and find out from our call records who A.W. is. And in the meantime, if you are A.W., please type in the chat who you are.

Welcome, everyone. I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond, and today's agenda is going to be mostly about planning for future conferences and input that we need to work on.

First, we'll be speaking about the WSIS Forum at the ITU that will take place in June. We have a draft agenda that hasn't been published, or proposal for a workshop that has been accepted, and we will be looking at the proposal directly linked to the agenda.

The next thing we'll be speaking about is the IGF. This year's IGF takes place in Geneva as well. There has been some discussion on the mailing list regarding whether we would be interested in submitting a workshop or maybe a day zero event, so hopefully this call will bring some good input for everyone.

Then, we will be looking at the face-to-face meeting of ICANN 58 and taking any action items from there forward for our future work. There were, of course, two face-to-face meetings. There was the actual working group face-to-face meeting, and the Internet Governance public session. The links are all in the agenda as well.

Are there any additions or amendments to the agenda that are necessary at this point? If there are, please raise your hand. Farzaneh Badii, you have the floor.

FARZANEH BADI: Thank you, Olivier. I would like to [inaudible] the state of the charter amendment for the CCWG. If it's not appropriate to discuss it during this call, then I totally understand, but I think we need an update.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks very much for this, Farzaneh. We'll add it to the Any Other Business part of this call. I don't know if there's very much feedback. Rafik, unfortunately, is not able to be on the call but we'll find out when we're discussing where we are now. So, thanks. Let's add this. Is there Any Other Business to add? I don't see any other hands up, so this call can then proceed with the second agenda item, the WSIS Forum at the ITU.

We have in the past submitted – well, two years ago – a workshop on the actual Cross-Community Working Group on IANA Stewardship Transition, the process that was taken, and discussing the multi-stakeholder model approach that was used then.

Last year, we had a workshop, again about the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability, and much discussion and explanation as to what that was all about. I think that also brought some people in the room, and certainly maybe more people in the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability work.

This year, the proposal that we have discussed previously and that we submitted was a workshop entitled From Theory to Practice. Capacity Building programs at ICANN and elsewhere. The session itself will look at the range of programs that are used for Internet governance capacity building, including many of the programs that are now in place at

ICANN. Looking at the fellowship, looking at the NextGen, and even looking at the leadership training program.

So, it's a good showcase. There is a link in the agenda which goes to the description of the workshop, and also a proposed set of panelists. And these panelists are just put there for the time being. I'm not quite sure who will be traveling to Geneva for the WSIS, but the current list, I think most people will be or have already indicated that they will be there.

So, that's where we are. The three main questions to be addressed – the first one, how do these programs fulfill the ongoing requirements for more active stakeholders in the Internet governance space that is becoming increasingly busy. Secondly, are these programs successful at balancing the diversity of active stakeholders? And thirdly, what is the funding model for these programs?

And [they're] very much between the summer schools, all the ICANN capacity programs, the summer schools, the various examples that we have out there, and including also the diplo work. So, that's the position at the moment. I'm not quite sure about the actual status of what that proposal is, and I'm going to turn over to Nigel Hickson for this – if he is now able to speak – to let us know what are the next steps for this. For us, specifically.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. Good afternoon, Olivier. Hello, everyone, and good afternoon. Nigel Hickson, Government Engagement. We've put in the proposal for the workshop, and it's been allocated on the Thursday as Olivier has mentioned from 9:00 to 10:45. We've put a certain amount of

description in there, but we need to obviously uptake it and finalize it in due course.

I think we have until roughly the end of April to do that. Certainly, we ought to make sure that soon after Easter we've finalized what we want. It is permanent, in that it's not just draft. Well, it's a draft agenda, but we had notification, we've got the topic. So, it's up to us to now work on it and decide how we're going to take it forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Nigel. I note that Farzaneh mentions in the chat that we need a good process for selecting the panelists. Farzaneh, you have the floor.

FARZANEH BADII: Thank you, Olivier. I feel like a broken record here. I keep repeating this, and it seems like no one is paying attention. I look at the panelists here, and they are great. And I understand that it's a draft, but I have seen these panelists a number of times on other panels [inaudible]. We have to do something about this.

I understand that we need experts and also it depends on the availability of the people, but think a little bit more broadly. Maybe we should just put some familiar names where we might [inaudible] up there, and also it's like we need total transparency in how we come up with these names. Who comes up with these names, who puts them on the wiki, and probably this has been discussed during the call. So, this is my first point.

My second point is that – I’m sorry if I missed the discussion on this Capacity Building program, but what a title. ICANN’s mission is really limited, and the people you have on the panel tentatively are very well aware of this, and I’m sure that there won’t be a problem. But when you put capacity building in the title, people will have totally different impressions.

They’ll think development, they’ll think – they don’t think domain name-related issues. So, we have to be very clear, capacity building in making domain name policy making. Something like that. Or to be very precise, because I’m sure people in developing countries and governments in developing countries will think that capacity building goes beyond domain names also. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks for this, Farzaneh. I can answer your first point on the process by which we ended up with the panelists. I think in one of the previous events that we prepared, there was a lot of traffic on the big mailing list which was going back and forth with names, suggestion of names, etc.

And we then received complaints that, really, we shouldn’t be discussing people in an archived mailing list that’s publicly archived, that we should have just a small group that works together and puts together the panels and chooses people. So, we did have a call for volunteers to be part of that small group, and we ended up with a handful of people who responded positively, and therefore built it from there.

On the names that are the usual suspects – I think that’s what you were alluding to – last year – and the previous year, but particularly last year – we tried having as wide a number of panelists as possible and found out – and that was, we had dozens and dozens of e-mails going out to people saying, “Would you like to be on this panel?” And most people are not going to the WSIS Forum.

So, we have a very restrictive set of people both from ICANN and from the people who usually come to ICANN who go to the WSIS Forum. It’s more of an outreach thing than speaking with our own people. So as I said earlier, if there’s anyone else who is going to the WSIS Forum who we know, then please, stand forward, and we’d be ever so happy to have you on the panel.

The ones who are listed here, as I said, are placeholders because we know that they will be or they’re likely to be at the WSIS Forum. That’s to do with the panels themselves. And I know it’s not easy to try and find the not usual suspects, but unfortunately, it’s always the usual suspects who end up in all these places. That’s why they’re the usual suspects, I guess, because they go to all these things.

So as I said, if anybody is on this call – and we can certainly issue a call on the mailing list as well – if anybody else will be at the WSIS Forum and is ready to share their experience, that would be really welcome so at least we don’t have just the same people.

I also note that the panel is unfortunately not very balanced, both geographically, and the gender balance is pretty terrible too. Again, geographically speaking, last year we tried to have a very balanced

panel and we ended up with a very unbalanced panel because most people coming from outside of Europe are not just going to go to the WSIS Forum if they're not funded to go there. And I have to remind everyone that nobody is funded to go there, we go there with our own funds. So, these are the sort of limits that we have.

Secondly, on the topic itself, I think that you've already dug into the discussion. It will definitely be a point that we need to make, or whoever's going to be speaking about capacity building at ICANN is going to say, "Well, look, we're not talking here about Internet service providers and about the web we want and about the wider Internet governance issues. At ICANN, capacity building is focused on the DNS, focused on the Internet's identifiers, and is limited by ICANN's mission."

And it's a good location to mention this, especially since I think a lot of people outside of ICANN, and I've heard them saying, "Well, why doesn't ICANN fund Capacity Building programs to help people use the Internet in developing countries?" And I think that gets quite a few people cringing within the ICANN sphere, especially when we are also subjected to a budget, etc., and we really need to focus on our mission.

Have I answered your comments, Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADI:

Yes, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. Nigel, did you wish to add anything to this? And could I ask, is there anybody else going to Geneva for the WSIS Forum who is not already listed there?

FARZANEH BADII: Olivier, can I suggest something? Can we make a call on the mailing – because CCWG-IG with the – this session description and everything else, and if someone is going, they can just put their name up, and that small group of yours can decide – I’m a member of that small group. Sometimes I am a member, sometimes I’m not. But then they can decide how to finalize it.

I think that would bring more transparency. So, you don’t have to discuss the speakers on the mailing list, but you can just make a call, “Who’s going to WSIS? We’re not funding anyone, but just put your name forward if you want to be considered to be on this panel.” Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. Thanks, Farzaneh. That’s very helpful, and let’s have this as an action item then, please, to publicize the WSIS Forum and ask if anybody is going there and if they’d be, of course, willing to be in that panel as well.

I note in the chat that Jim Prendergast is also going, but he has other priorities. So maybe, Jim, if you’re interested in stepping forward as well, that would be really helpful. Okay. Anything else on this? Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier, and thanks for Farzaneh and others contributing. We can certainly carry out the action item. I don't see a problem in that. On the scope, there are two issues on the scope. We've addressed it, but obviously, the scope we work to in the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance is one thing. This would be our charter and the scope of this panel itself.

I don't see a problem in discussing what initiatives there are on this panel, even if those initiatives cover more than the DNS. As long as they cover the DNS as well, I think inevitably, capacity building on Internet governance is going to cover non-ICANN issues. But it's flagging where the DNS issues get covered as well. But anyway, we can address that.

Just to note, as Jim has noted in the chat, this week is concurrent – or the first three days are concurrent – with the open consultation on the Monday and the MAG meeting on the Tuesday and the Wednesday, our session being on the Thursday. So, this might have a positive effect in that it might mean that some MAG members who wouldn't normally be in Geneva might be in town. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes. Thanks for this, Nigel. That's a very good point. And our session being on Thursday, that certainly helps then with not having clashes with the MAG meeting. I guess the MAG is only Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, is it?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It is. Okay, excellent. Alright, well that's a good thing. So, let's send out that call for volunteers to be on that workshop. I guess perhaps it will really fall down to the moderator of that session to try and focus perhaps – because this is an ICANN session – and ask the different organizations.

For example, asking Jovan Kurbalija about Diplo and saying, “Well, what part of the Diplo program – how do you address the DNS and ICANN? How do you teach this?” And maybe focus a bit more on the ICANN-centric topics than in sort of diverging out in tangents to focus on the wider Internet governance space and other topics there. But that will really come down not the execution of the workshop itself.

I don't see any other hands. We have important discussions to carry out, so maybe we can move on if all is well with that. Nigel, is that all you needed for today on this? Perhaps an agenda will be the next thing that we'll have to build. We've already got the three main questions, and I think that the flow is important, not having too much talking from the stage, but engaging more with the audience and with audience members. It's worked well in the past, and so we've had good attendance and certainly had some good interaction. And this really is a way for us also to project out to the not usual suspects.

The people who are attending the WSIS Forum are often not the crowd that comes to ICANN meetings, so it will certainly make ICANN look good in a various number of ways, and it might even get them to be

interested in perhaps taking part in some of these Capacity Building programs and have more input from these people.

Then let's move to the third part of our agenda, and that's the IGF 2017. There was some discussion on the mailing list about whether we should have a workshop proposal or whether we should wait for – well, and look at an alternative thing, perhaps having a day zero event or something like that.

I note that Marilyn Cade was quite against having a workshop proposal, having mentioned the hundreds and hundreds of workshops that are around this year. I don't see her on the call yet and she did say she was going to be slightly delayed I wonder, should we swap so that she can be on the call – should we swap agenda item three with four so we can take just ten minutes before that to just review the CCWG face-to-face meetings?

I see an okay from Farzaneh. I know it's a last-minute change to the agenda, but it would be good to have everyone on there. So, no objection from Jim. Farzaneh is okay with it. Let's then do that, and so have a quick review of the two meetings that we had in Copenhagen.

There are links from the agenda to the various meetings. First, the face-to-face session that was very well attended, and it had the whole Board Internet Governance Working Group that attended as well. We had Markus Kummer join us, and there are notes that Nigel Hickson has drafted an informal note and summary of the discussions that we had.

The agenda was mostly just internal issues, so looking at the Internet governance – preparing for the Internet governance public meeting,

looking at the work of the CCWG, and certainly the report that was drafted, and we briefly discussed that report. And I think that hopefully has provided enough feedback to our chartering organizations for them to understand what this working group is about.

What I did note, however, is we haven't had any feedback yet from any of the chartering organizations of this working group, so it will be interesting to – I might perhaps ask for an action item for a note to be sent to the chartering organizations and find out their feedback on the report.

Then we had discussion about the charter again, and I think this comes in line with what Farzaneh was asking. Has there been any follow-up from the charter? And so far, I certainly haven't seen any feedback. I haven't received any response. But Rafik is following through with this, so perhaps Rafik will be able to let us know if there's been any feedback.

Certainly, on my side, none from the ALAC so far. The ALAC has been busy with other things at the moment. And I'm not sure whether there's been any feedback from the ccNSO, but I certainly haven't seen any sent to the co-Chairs of this working group.

And then afterwards in that face to face meeting, we had a discussion with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance, and Markus Kummer noted the work that they've been doing and has explained that it's becoming an increasingly crowded Internet governance world with so many more issues coming up, including some that are particularly important for ICANN because they can be direct threats to ICANN, as we have seen in the World Telecommunications Standards Assembly and as

we've seen in other conferences that are taking place where there are some blatant calls from some countries to ask the other organizations to take part in the running of the domain name system.

So, that was one thing. Markus also mentioned the discussion in support for the IGF, and I think that's something that's quite important. ICANN is supporting the IGF in various ways, so certainly, there was some good explanation from Markus Kummer on that.

I'm just scoping through the different interventions that we had around the table, certainly with [George Sadowsky] being staggered by the proliferation of new initiatives that are coming out at the moment, and not all under U.N. There are many under other parts of the Internet governance space, and we have to perhaps not only track those, but also I think probably make a choice to which ones we need to track more closely than others. Thankfully, staff are keeping a close eye over this and we often get the heads up on things that are coming up.

Finally, there was a question to Tarik Kamel in regards to what the funding was, the support for the main IGF funding. His response is that it was about \$150,000 and also \$50,000 contributed to the IGF Support Association. Needless to say, none of this money comes to the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance, but there you are.

And finally, the working group priorities. Certainly, the mapping of the future work that we have is something that we've shared with our members here, and so we really are working very much in a responsive manner, as in seeing – well, our activities being somehow directed by the calendar of events that are coming up, and the work that is due and

the various consultations that we are asked to answer or that people are asked to answer, and whether we want to take part or not in those consultations.

Nigel, did you wish to add anything to this regarding this face-to-face meeting? And I'm not sure – I didn't see any action items as such in your notes, so I wondered whether there were any specific action items.

NIGEL HICKSON:

I try and avoid action items. Just very briefly, I think it was a very useful session indeed, and the Board Working Group have reflected on it in various communication. The Board Working Group are actually making a presentation to the Board at the Geneva retreat. The Board are having their intersessional meeting, as I think we explained in Copenhagen in Geneva in the beginning of May.

There will be a presentation to the Board on Internet governance priorities, reflecting some of the discussions we had in our face-to-face meeting on the different categories of Internet governance events and how they affect ICANN, also in relation to the IGF priorities, as was mentioned. And we will certainly report back on that. So, I think it was a useful meeting in that context. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks for this, Nigel. Any comments or questions on this face-to-face meeting? Farzaneh Badii.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you, Olivier. So, the face-to-face meeting on – this was because I was quite confused. We were supposed to have a CCWG-IG session where we would sit and talk about CCWG-IG and how we function, instead of having a public meeting that we talked about everything. Of course, it was supposed to be open, I don't think that happened.

I attended one. We received the speakers list on the panel like a day before, after I sent e-mails. And I think if we want to do anything like a meeting in Johannesburg, the preparation has to start now, and we have to have a very clear agenda on what we're going to talk about.

And to be honest, I don't think everything should happen on these calls. We have to use the mailing list much more and discuss things on the mailing list. So we have to bring the issues that we discussed during these meetings to the mailing list and ask questions.

Now, the other thing that I'm hoping to be our action item – I know action items are not very liked, but – as Mathieu also mentioned, we need to make a stronger connection with this Board group on Internet governance, and we need to know what initiatives they have, identify to follow what new initiatives they have, identify to what follow and we should also identify these initiatives.

We need to have agenda items on what we want to do with the initiatives, how we want to follow them and what would be the task forward, because I think our charter was amended – I don't know if it was approved – yes, we approved it. So in our new charter, we are charged with kind of being the bridge between the ICANN world to the outside world, I would say. That's about it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Farzaneh. You spoke about our public Internet governance meeting, which is what we were going to touch on immediately afterwards. The face-to-face meeting I think – I'm not seeing anyone putting hands up on that, so we can certainly discuss the public meeting.

Again, yes, it was something that was – well, the panel and so on was again built without people really knowing whether they were going to be there or not. We asked quite a few people to attend that public meeting, and the discussions were going to be about the sort of various initiatives that were taking place outside, looking at the main outcomes on the IG front during 2016, looking ahead at the issues in 2017, and then having a discussion of Internet governance priorities.

The time that we were allocated was very tight indeed, because I think that we were slotted – there was a back-to-back meeting immediately afterwards. I see here from 9:00 to 10:30. It was very well attended though, and your point is certainly taken regarding the building of the panel, which was done, again, very last minute with people not being able to make it because of the conflicting schedules.

In Johannesburg, because it is a Policy Forum and it's only four days long – well, the last Policy Forum was in Helsinki and we were not given a slot for a public session. We managed to obtain a room for the face-to-face session, so the working group can do some work and is not basically without a home during the meeting. And I think that's probably what we will have to be asking for.

So again, a room for the face-to-face meeting so we can meet again with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. We can continue planning internally, but certainly nothing public or no public session as such. Also, working group sessions are open for everyone to attend, but it's going to be mostly internal discussions rather than explaining things to the wider public at ICANN.

There is a note from Jim that the slot was a huge improvement from the typical 6:30 PM slot, and yes, that's absolutely correct, Jim. The public meeting was also very well attended, which basically shows if it's at the right time, then people are interested. If it's way too late and people have conflicts, then it's not going to be well attended.

So in the future, we should ask for a better slot if we are to have a public session, and I believe therefore that the future public session will be in Abu Dhabi at the end of the year. I'm a little concerned that I'm the only person speaking at the moment. I'm looking desperately for hands up and not seeing anyone else wishing to chime in. Nigel Hickson perhaps?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Olivier, just very briefly, to the IG session, apologies for not sending around a note of the IG session, but I did take a note but my computer suffered a catastrophic whatever you call it. So I haven't got a note, but when I get a spare hour between midnight and 6:00 AM, what I plan to do is to go over the transcript of the IG public session and write a note from that, because I think that would give us a good flavor of what took place.

Because although the session was squeezed and we had extreme pressures on setting these sessions, I won't [inaudible] from that at all, being a member of staff and trying to plan sessions at an ICANN meeting is pretty frustrating. I've never known any organization like it. We're at the bottom of the pile – staff – in terms of planning sessions, so we're lucky to get a session at all sometimes.

For ICANN59, you're right, there will be no IG public session, because it's a Policy Forum. But as a chartered Cross-Community Working Group, we will have the ability to have – or apply for – a face-to-face meeting if the committee, if the working group deems it appropriate. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks for this, Nigel. Any comments or questions on this topic? I see no one putting their hand up, so let's take it to the mailing list and start preparing our next face-to-face meeting for Johannesburg. There needs to be a lot of planning.

I take your point, by the way, Farzaneh, that there needs to be a lot more response on the mailing list as well, and I hope that with the accountability tracks somehow slowing down a little bit now, there will be renewed interest in people taking part in the mailing list and responding to the e-mails that are regularly sent out.

Certainly, the discussion that took place about the IGF was an interesting one. And seeing that time is ticking and we are speaking about the IGF, I don't see Marilyn Cade on the call, but let's then move on to that specific topic and open the floor now.

There have been two points of view brought forward. Well, two suggestions. The first one is to just go for yet another general workshop that's just like the ones that we've done in the past, which were very similar in scope to the workshops that were done in the WSIS Forum.

In a way, the WSIS Forum was providing a first run for a workshop that takes place at IGF afterwards. There's been some pushback from Marilyn Cade on the need for a workshop because there are so many workshop proposals – typically 250 of them – and [MAG] members cannot themselves propose workshops, and I understand that this year is going to be particularly difficult to compete for workshop time and space.

The suggestion then that was brought forward was that we could do a day zero event. And I'm not quite sure how that pans out either, not being aware of the MAG process and how these are allocated, whether these cost anything, whether one is able to use the already existing facilities of IGF or whether day zero events are completely independent and therefore cannot make use of any of the facilities.

So, I would – yes. Nigel, if you could please sort of chime in on this, and then I'll open the floor for everyone [inaudible].

NIGEL HICKSON:

My apologies, I don't want to dominate the conversation at all, but there is no day zero. So, the only way of doing something at the IGF is either through this call process – which ends on May the 3rd – to have a workshop or some other facilitated discussion, and there are options on the mailing list and we can discuss them.

You can have a roundtable, you can have a Q&A session, you can alter it a bit or there are open forums which the major organizations hold. ICANN usually has an open forum where the CEO or Board members are open to discussion points. But there won't be a day zero session.

In terms of the MAG, ICANN has a member on the MAG and Michelle, but that does not preclude us from making a workshop proposal. Otherwise, there would never be any workshop proposals from quite a few organizations, obviously. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. Next is Farzaneh Badii.

FARZANEH BADI: Thank you, Olivier. It seems like we are just dominating this session, this meeting. Anyway, what I wanted to say then, I discussed this with Marilyn on the mailing list, and Marilyn said that it was a good idea, that we submit a workshop proposal and if we get rejected go for the day zero, because we really want to discuss ICANN, and I would say you want to discuss CCWG-IG as well with the broader community, so it would be good to just propose the workshop proposal.

Oh, there's no day zero? Okay. That is interesting. Okay, so that option is out, so I think we just go for a workshop proposal. In coming up with the proposal description – and I can see a couple of people here from various stakeholder groups.

I can see Becky and David and Jim, and so I think if we can focus on how we want to formulate the workshop proposal description in a way that

it helps our mandate and the mandate of this group, and it also is inclusive, if all the stakeholder groups can participate in and discuss their issues.

So I created this Google Doc. I only put what is needed by the IGF secretariat for the information, and I think what we need to focus on really as a subject is how we work at ICANN. I don't know if we want to do this, but because we have been discussing the multi-stakeholder model, how fabulous it is and how effective it has been in the past proposal, so somehow we should come up with something new. Maybe various functions of various stakeholder groups and Advisory Committees at ICANN, what they do or how does ICANN work. Or I don't know if Nigel has any opinion or if anyone else has any opinion on that. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Farzaneh. It's a very helpful start to the discussion. We have one month to come up with the goods, but it's good to start here. And thanks for that link. I'll ask that perhaps we could have this link publicized on the mailing list and start building from there, if that's okay with you, Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADI: Yes, definitely. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, excellent. That makes it a much more open process with the Google doc. I've just learned – with all of you – that there is no day zero

this year, so that's obviously going to be a big change from the usual, and therefore I can only see then one issue. I guess it's to choose what topic this working group would like to focus on.

If it's an explanation of the multi-stakeholder model at ICANN, that would certainly be a worthy topic, I'm sure. And I'm just saying things up in the air at the moment, by the way. These are just suggestions. If anybody wishes to chime in on this, please.

We could have a similar topic regarding capacity building at ICANN and how we do it, and how the different parts of ICANN bring new people in the system and bring them up to date. I certainly know what happens at At-Large, but I have no idea what happens in the different constituencies in the GNSO and in the ccNSO, how they bring their new participants in, etc. So that could be another topic.

Are there any other topics that anybody else wishes to suggest? Jim mentions that we need to confirm the non-existence of the day zero. He was under the impression that there will be one. So there's no high-level meeting, but could there be day zero events?

I guess that from what Farzaneh has said, if we do get a workshop proposal accepted, then we do not need to have a day zero event. If we do not have a workshop proposal accepted, then we'll find out. And if there's a day zero, then fine. If there's no day zero, then there you go. There isn't one, there's not much else we can do.

I note that Marilyn Cade has arrived on the call. And Marilyn, we were discussing the follow-up to the mailing list discussion. And apparently,

there is not going to be a day zero, so having a day zero event is probably off the cards.

MARILYN CADE: Can I be heard?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You can be heard indeed. Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Hello. Mary and I were just in the NRI call, so we're both catching up. I'm not sure who told you there was no day zero at the – we're talking about the IGF, right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Correct.

MARILYN CADE: I'm not sure who told you that. The Swiss government has proposed not to hold a high-level event, but they even pushed back from some government about the importance of a high-level event. So while the Swiss government is saying they're not going to do a high-level event, I wouldn't say that is done and dusted as we like to say in the [inaudible]

As to the day zero event, my conversation with the Swiss government are that there may even need to be a day minus zero given the timing.

The timing is very difficult. I think perhaps the confusion is that day zero might be held in a different venue.

But rather than speculating, since I'm in direct contact with the Secretariat and also the host organizer, if people would agree, why don't I just send an e-mail and copy the three co-Chairs to verify this? But again, I would be amazed. The travel is very challenging on the far end where people will not be able to get home for the holidays. And due to travel flight conflicts, I think a lot of people are going to plan to leave on day three. So maybe we just go back to talking about the proposal and we leave this question – whoever said there was no day zero, why don't we just park that, verify the information and come back? Is that okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks, Marilyn. That's fine, and so we'll wait for your follow-up on that. On the proposal itself, I don't know when you arrived on the call, but I'd be interested in others coming in and then letting us what ideas they had for a workshop proposal. A very silent bunch of people today. Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Sorry to take the microphone again. I think we should factor into our thinking the uniqueness of this particular setting. And maybe you've already talked about that. The idea is that there may be a very large attendance from the mission and from the IGOs and NGOs that are based in Geneva.

So, that is certainly the goal, and if that is the case, I think we should be responsive to the unique setting that the IGF would be in. We are in the home of the [play], but really, the question is, are we going to get a significant turnout from the Geneva-based NGOs and civil society? And the business that are in Switzerland are very different. It's largely the financial sector, the pharma sector, some other companies that are focused on research and agriculture that will be maybe attending more because of the [STG] linkage. So maybe we should think about what's different about this setting than the usual setting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Marilyn. Good start to the discussion. Next in the queue is Farzaneh Badii.

FARZANEH BADI: Yes, of course, the usual suspect. That's a very good point that Marilyn is raising. There are going to be a lot of IGOs and intergovernmental organization, international organizations, so we can be more subtle than what I said in the chat, but we can formulate a proposal that talks about what are the advantages of ICANN multi-stakeholder process and kind of –

Well, I don't know if this is a good idea. It might be a bit too controversial, but we can also address the concern of those who believe that the domain name system has to be administered by an international organization. We can say how ICANN overcomes challenges and why it should be multi-stakeholder run.

We could say that, but as I'm looking at what the MAG wants from us, it says that while it is not compulsory, but it says artificial intelligence, work in the digital age, law enforcement and encryption. These are the issues that are of interest. Cybersecurity, Internet of Things, these are not things that – I don't think we can discuss them within the ICANN proposal, so we have to kind of relate our proposal to the workshop as well, to the main IGF [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Farzaneh. I'm noticing in the chat some discussion regarding ICANN and the [STGs.] I think in the past, Nigel has managed to link some of the – well, whatever proposals we had with the [STGs.] I don't know whether that's changed this year or not. Have there been any changes, or is the linking still possible? I think that was for Nigel Hickson, except if I'm not muted.

NIGEL HICKSON: Oh, sorry. Yes. Clearly, a lot of work has gone on in terms of the linkages which the ITU and other organizations done, and it's going to be a feature at the WSIS Forum as well this year. So, clearly, we can take that forward depending on the wish of the group. I think there are some interesting ideas coming up, and we can explore them on the Google Doc.

The 3rd of May was I mentioned on the site it says workshop proposals have to be in by the 3rd of May, so that's why I mentioned the 3rd of May. If that's wrong and there's a new date, then I stand corrected. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this. How do we feel on this call about the proposal of explaining at the IGF or discussing at the IGF why ICANN's model is a unique approach to multi-stakeholder engagement and it works? Perhaps preferable to other models for running the DNS, and certainly making policy. Would anybody be interested in expanding on this?

MARILYN CADE: I'm going to ask for the floor again.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Marilyn. Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. Even before Nigel joined ICANN, I was involved in Study Group 2 and Study Group 3 at the IGF, where significant challenges and misunderstandings and miscomprehensions came up about the role of ICANN, the RIRs, the root servers and the country code operators. And a lot of that confusion still exists, partly because government attendees and participants in the IGOs do change, often on a yearly to every two year basis.

I like the idea that we would present the model of multi-stakeholder engagement, remembering that ICANN is very unique. Not only do we coordinate the unique identifiers, we create binding policy, which is very different from the IGF. And that binding policy is managed through consensus decisions. So I think there's a lot that we could do in a

workshop, a lot of value that we could do in demystifying and authenticating the model.

I'm just going to throw out a factoid. When we launched ICANN, we had 20+ governments. Today, we have a much more significant number of governments, many of them from developing countries. Even just telling the story I think could be a very powerful, informative approach for us.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thanks for this, Marilyn. I think that fits along what Farzaneh was suggesting. It certainly builds on what she suggested, and I'm seeing some support on the chat as well, showing how ICANN works, how it works, how the policymaking works, how the advice, the open consultations that we regularly have for all of the policy development processes, etc.

If we can build a workshop that is clear and with panelists who are able to speak quite clearly without acronyms about all of these processes, and really explain the advantages of that compared to alternative models that might be proposed elsewhere, then perhaps we have a viable workshop.

Just speaking in the air, if there are any other points that need to be made on this, please make them. And then, of course, we'll share this with the mailing list. "And the role of the ccTLDs." Marilyn, yes, that's very important.

I've certainly noticed a lot of people are unaware of the independent nature of country code top-level domains, and the fact that ICANN is

not able to tell a country code what to do. It's been a big discussion in the ccNSO for many years, and it's something which ICANN absolutely respects.

I think we could perhaps even add some success stories about internationalized domain names, IDNs. We've seen the rollout come out very well, and perhaps we might even have – and I'm just throwing this out there – the root key rollover. I'm not sure when that is due to take place, but I wonder whether it will have taken place by then. Maybe some mention of that, saying that – well, hopefully it will have worked without too many problems. But one of those things that needs to be taken into account, because it's again a big thing but it hasn't been publicized so much.

Okay, I'm not seeing any other hands up, and I think that we are reaching the end of this call. There was just one item in the Any Other Business, and that item was to do with the follow-up or any feedback on the charter and on the report. And the simple answer is we haven't received any so far.

So an action item would be for the co-Chairs of this working group to go back to their chartering organization – each one, their respective chartering organizations – and find out if there is feedback, and where do we go from there.

We really are waiting for the chartering organizations to let us know if they like the amendments, and perhaps if they have any other suggested amendments to the charters before we can come back and then proceed with the amendments. And then we'll have to tighten up

the overall membership, etc., and of course clean up our wiki pages by then.

Any other Other Business?

NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry, just to mention the key rollover date is October, next session. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. So I hope that by then it will have happened and worked so well that we will be able to talk about it and reflect on it briefly so as to show yet another success for ICANN. I'm touching a lot of wood at the moment to make sure.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm absolutely convinced it will work out. They're taking great care into doing it, so that's fine.

Okay, I don't see any other hands up. I think we have a set of action items then that we have to pursue, and certainly much follow-up on the mailing list. Please don't just come to the calls and listen and then not make your points known and your views known on the mailing list. That's where we need some of the work so we have shorter calls, and apart from this, our next call hopefully should be a policy call.

It really depends on what's going on out there, but recently – in the past couple of weeks – there hasn't been anything of significance. But starting from next month, I think there are quite a few more things coming up, so hopefully we can have a policy discussion call and we'll just do the rest of the work to prepare for the IGF workshop proposal and to finalize the panel for the WSIS Forum on the mailing list.

I'd like to thank you all for being on this call, and see you on the mailing list. See you on the Internet. This call is now adjourned. Thank you, and goodbye.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you. Bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]