OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Good morning, good afternoon and good evening, everyone. This is the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance call on Friday, the 25th of April, 2017. On today's agenda, we're going to be dealing with the two workshops that the working group is finding proposals for, the first one being the Internet Governance Forum proposal at the end of the year and the second one being the WSIS forum that is due to take place in June, so it's slightly closer and obviously at a more advanced stage of preparation. But our focus today will be primarily on the IGF proposal. And finally, we'll have a quick rundown on the latest announcements of forthcoming ICANN Board activities in Geneva with just a quick announcement on that.
	Any Other Business? Is there anything else to add or are there any amendments to make to the agenda?
NIGEL HICKSON:	Olivier, good afternoon. If we have time under Any Other Business we might just touch on the – just a few words about ICANN 59.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Yes, sure. Let's do that. Let's add this. Thanks, Nigel. So, in Any Other Business we'll add a few more words and a little bit of a discussion on what we will be doing at ICANN59 and the preparations for that. And since I've seen no other hands up, the agenda is therefore adopted as it is currently on your screen with the added point that Nigel has made, and we can now have a roll call, please. Desiree.

DESIREE CABRERA:	Okay. In the room, we have Alan Greenberg, Becky Burr, Erich Scheighofer, and Tatiana Tropina.
	For the Chair, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond.
	For staff, we have Nigel Hickson, Veni Markovski and myself, Desiree Cabrera.
	We also have someone in the room with the initials A.W. so if you could please either in the chat or [inaudible] please let me know [inaudible]
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Okay. Thanks very much for this, Desiree. A.W., who would this be? If you could please introduce yourself for the record. Angela from Singapore. Okay, Angela. I'm not sure I've got the full name here. Just put the full name, that will be just added to the records.
	But that's great. Welcome, everyone, and so let's move quickly then, swiftly forward with the review of the action items from our last call, and that's going to take just a minute – less than a minute indeed.
	Most action items have been effected, and the only one that's remaining is for the discussion to be launched on the mailing list for Johannesburg, and we're going to discuss a little bit of it today later on in this call.
	So that's the action items. Let's move back to the agenda, and now we have the discussion on the IGF proposal. There has been some

discussion taking place on the mailing list, first as to whether the working group should or should not file for a proposal at the IGF which will take place in Geneva.

The sense that I've gotten from the discussion was that after all if we do look at a specific interesting proposal, there was no objection to a proposal being filed and seeing if it would work or not.

Bearing in mind that there are this year very strong limits on the number of proposals that could come from a single entity, so the number of proposals that would come from ICANN are also very strict components as to how many workshops somebody can appear on.

I think it's three proposals and three workshops, so the MAG is tightening the screw a little bit because of the very large number of proposals that they're now receiving these days.

Of course, the usual geographical, gender balance should also be adhered to and there also needs to be an adherence to – or somehow an alignment with – the sustainable development goal. And in fact, the whole process makes you use quite a complex or an extensive online form which I hear from some people it is an absolute nightmare to navigate and it's very good at erasing all your work.

In the meantime, what's happened is that we've had a Google Doc that has been created by Farzaneh Badii. Thank you, Farzaneh, for putting that together, and that's where we are building the proposal with everyone being able and being encouraged to write directly on to the page and to effectively [inaudible] as a Google Doc.

I'm opening it at the moment. It's taking a little bit of time. I'm not quite sure what's happened now. Oh, here we go. That's interesting, so the first page of the Google Doc seems to be empty at the moment. What's going on here?

Okay, so the whole thing is being built as we speak. I'm not quite sure what's going on with the first few pages. I think there might have been an update from someone. But anyway, if we scroll down to page number four, that's where you have details of some of the discussions going on at the moment with the first question regarding the workshop format, which I think has been proposed as a roundtable, the duration of the workshop being a customary 90 minutes, and the title of the advantages of the multistakeholder governance in administering the domain name system.

Some are asking why only the DNS, why not widen this up to something else, but I guess we also have to be mindful of the fact that we are operating here under an ICANN guideline, so we have to have something that's relevant to the ICANN mission. We can't just start branching off at a tangent. And I get the amount of knowledge we have on this is quite extensive.

Concise description of the workshop has been put together underneath that and it provides details that ICANN is not an intergovernmental organization and it doesn't use multilateral approaches in the governance of the DNS, and it also illustrates a few of the past successes that ICANN has had into improving the operation of the DNS through various policies.

I invite you all by the way to review this and comment on it, or make amendments by using the suggest mode, because suggest mode will then be able to allow – I think it's Farzaneh who allows or denies the changes and so on, but it'll at least allow everyone to see the red line changes. And if you can add more successes, that would be helpful too. And then beyond that, it goes on to explain what the workshop will do, and it mentions here that the workshop will explore what the learnings from ICANN and its experience using the multistakeholder model could do to be used perhaps in other fora to promote and benefit from inclusive policy making.

So there is an element I guess of discussion, and there is also in there an element of – let me see [inaudible] – but there's an element of discussion and there's an element also of – I can't call it capacity building, but letting people know about ICANN and opening the door to having more participants come and be involved in ICANN.

So there's a public relations exercise on the one side to be present out there, and on the other side, there is a genuine discussion, strong, interesting discussion that can take place.

I think I've rambled on for long enough. Some of the questions that remain I guess are certainly to expand maybe on this description, make it a little bit more enticing for MAG members to – because you have to remember, the way that this is done is MAG members will read the proposal and then they will mark it as to whether it's something that they feel goes well with this year's IGF and which they like, they would like to see a workshop, and then we have to look at the proposed panelists.

At the moment, we've got Bill Drake, Matthew Shears, Grace Mutungu, Lori Schulman, Janet Hoffman, [inaudible], Markus Kummer, and Jordan Carter are currently listed.

I'd like to see maybe a few more people from the Global South. It would be a – certainly maybe from Latin America and Caribbean would be of help, and Asia as well is I guess underrepresented, although Jordan is there. And perhaps also more – well, gender balance. It's actually not an all-male panel, thankfully. So we're okay. Not great, but okay with gender balance, provided of course that all of the proposed panelists are able to make it.

The application I think at the moment asks for at least three panelists to be listed who have confirmed that they can make it, because they will have to be registered on the IGF system and they will have to confirm their attendance. If we just have three panelists listed, it doesn't mean that we'll be stuck with just three panelists. These can be modified and amended later on, closer to the date, bearing in mind this whole Internet Governance Forum is going to take place in December, so that's a long time from now.

I think I've rambled on enough, and I'd like to now open the floor for comments and for discussion on this, for any part of this. So, any of the – the topic itself if you would like it more defined, perhaps even for anyone to propose specific topics to be discussed in an agenda, and perhaps a suggestion of other speakers, and anything else that is required for this.

EN

And Nigel, I know that you've been following closely the submission process for these workshops. If there's anything that I've missed in my description so far – I'm working from the Google Doc at present, so I'm not sure whether I've missed anything specifically.

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, just very briefly, no, I don't think you've missed anything. The deadline has been confirmed of the 3rd of May. There was a MAG call and some people wanted it extended, but it wasn't extended.

So yes, you're right, we have to have at least three panelists confirmed. But we also have to give other – well, I think they're going to be called discussants because the proposal is for a sort of roundtable with the discussants, but I think we have to at least list eight or ten discussants and then have as many confirmed as we can secure by Wednesday evening. I think that's the idea. So as Tatiana said on the chat, it could be someone from Eastern Europe like herself perhaps, and it would be good if we could, yes, have a better cross-section for some geography.

On the actual proposal, I think to make it sort of more applicable perhaps – and I think this is in it already to an extent – is looking at the ICANN model and looking at how it might be applicable elsewhere for other types of Internet governance issues or whatever. But yes, anyway, that's just a thought.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Nigel. I've noticed that we do have a MAG member on the call, Israel Rosas, so I'm not asking for input on the

workshop itself, but if there's anything that I've missed in the current MAG process – and I unfortunately was not able to listen in on the last MAG consultation, so I'm just working from documents that I've read and second hand news I guess – then please chime in.

VENI MARKOVSKI   Olivier –

ISRAEL ROSAS: Hello, everybody. Yes, sorry, I was muted. Hello, everyone. Yes, the MAG call for the week, [was more] about some [inaudible] proposals, something like that about the workshop proposals. All the items are pretty clear I think with the work done by Nigel. Nigel has been following all the sessions, all the calls pretty close, so I think that you are not missing anything.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's great, Israel. Thanks very much for this confirmation then, and so we'll trust Nigel with his following the MAG process. That's good to hear. I heard Veni as well just before. Veni Markovski.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. I just wanted to – I'm looking at this from the UN point of view, so to speak, and the topic sounds really good and it will be interesting also for many of the diplomats, and we know that in Geneva there are a lot, to say the least, covering the UN and the UN agencies.

I just wanted to bring you to the multistakeholder model being used within the WSIS+10 outcome document, so this could be a good point for you guys for working on the preparations to take a look at this because the word multistakeholder is mentioned I think seven or eight times in this document, and it was built by including the multistakeholder community to the extent possible within the UN system that it allows such thing.

So, that I think would be very good for the speakers, the panelists just for talking points because the diplomats in Geneva who are new who have come there this year or last year may not be familiar with the WSIS+10 from 2016. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Veni. So we'll take note of that, and we can quote then the multistakeholder model being a strong topic in WSIS+10. And I gather by this – through this in the UN process.

I've looked at the proposal, and I'm not seeing two things. First is the relation to the SDG. I know that there is a question on the forum that asks for this. And the present document does not appear to have any response for that.

The second thing that I'm not seeing is keywords, and I note that there was a pulldown menu with several keywords that could be used for this. How are we going to do that?

Nigel, do you know offhand by any chance – turning over to Nigel or to Israel – what the different choices are in the keywords? Just looking at another proposal, I might have such a copy here.

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, I think this is very much like last year. If I remember correctly, I downloaded the form and had a look at it. Well, you can't actually download it, but you can put it on the screen. And yes, you're supposed to have some keywords and links, and then identify what sustainable development goal this most closely adheres to.

So, that is obviously something we can do. I welcome ideas on the actual Google Doc itself of what people think is the most appropriate SDG, but that's something we'll have to also contribute.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks, Nigel. I note here it says voluntary information, so sustainable development goals and then there's also connection with IGF intersessional groups [then] NRIs and then connecting with international or other relevant organizations.

Are you going to be filing this proposal then? Or who is going to be dealing with it? I think last year you filed it.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, we did and we can do it again in terms of the filing. The filing process is not particularly friendly as you note, but I think we've done it

here in the office the last three years, so we can try and cope with it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. And so we can leave the SDGs, the alignment with SDGs and the keywords to you.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. I think, Olivier, in your hands. But over the next few days – and depending on what people think on this call – I think it might be appropriate for some sort of message to go out for people to try and sort of refine the Google Doc a bit more, reflecting the notes of this call or whatever in some way.

So it might have a few additional names and elements in it by the time we take it and work with it on Tuesday or Wednesday. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Nigel. Let's see if we have any other comment on this call. I'm quite surprised that everyone is okay with the text as it is currently. I gather that perhaps some people are typing away on the document itself and making changes on the document. Is that the case?

I can see cursors moving around a little bit. Maybe people are just reading at present. Should I just give you all a couple of minutes? There are questions on the side as to for example the question from Robert Guerra asking as to whether – just reading this right now, sorry. I'm reading as we are scrolling down.

Okay. Yes, [inaudible] is thinking of developing a separate proposal for the IGF, but there was a proposal to bring security or technical experts and have them participate in this session for an additional perspective. How do we feel about this? How do we feel about the current people listed? I know it's a little hard to talk about people, so maybe if we have to add anyone, we can talk about it on this call. If anybody has suggestions removing people from the shortlist, you can do it in private if you wish to, if you have any objection to any of these people being on there. I understand that the people who have been put forward here have either volunteered or have been nominated by others and should be aware of their nominations, but we'll check that immediately after this call.

Tatiana Tropina, you have the floor. And you might be muted. You still are on mute.

TATIANA TRPINA: Oh, sorry. I'm sorry, I got this new iPhone and I've got so many WhatsApp messages coming, so I just couldn't find out where do I get to the mute. So, the major problem I have with this proposal – and this is why I didn't edit anything or didn't do anything – is the title of the workshop is like advantages of the multistakeholder governance in administering the domain name system. Cool, so we are all going to get together as a cheerful crowd and talk how awesome we are.

Why don't we put some challenges? Why don't we discuss the difficulties? It's not only clouds and rainbows. Maybe we can add at least one sentence into this proposal like what are the drawbacks, what

kind of difficulties we're experiencing? Don't you think it would be good to add? Because otherwise, it just looks like, "Yes, hey-ho, let's come together and say how awesome we are." You know what I mean? I don't know if it makes sense, but I would have added at least one sentence that, "Hey, we also want to discuss the difficulties, not only the advantages. What kind of efforts shall we take to make it work properly? Is there still something missing?" You know what I mean? Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Tatiana, for this excellent, amazing comment from an amazing community. That's very helpful. I agree with you, we do need to have some discourse in here, and we're not just having this session to pat each other on the back.

Okay, so we've got the resulting success stories here. Should we have a list of potential challenges that we have? The challenges of the Empowered Community, the challenges of the Policy Development Process, the challenges of – I don't know. I can think of quite a few challenges around ICANN. Should we perhaps list some of these, and things that still need to be worked out? There's a whole human rights discussion, the CWG Accountability discussions, some of which seem to have gone on for a very long time. Should we touch that terrible topic of jurisdiction? And I'm saying terrible as in it's just gotten people to huff and puff and talk so much and not that much movement on that either. There are challenges, should we touch on these? And how?

I note from the list of people there that not all people who will just be selling ICANN as such. I can see at least a couple of people who will say, "Well, wait a minute. There might be other ways to do things and ICANN is not perfect."

But perhaps we can also introduce some agent provocateurs in the lineup of people who can take the floor and who can discuss things.

TATIANA TROPINA: Hi, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Do you have any other specifics that you can focus on? Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes. I think that we also discuss challenges just one sentence would be fine. You can also say that the moderator will ask tough questions, for example. So just to make the discussion hard. So instead of listing all these accountability, jurisdiction and whatever for MAG members who don't really have to go into these details, we can just write one sentence that, "Hey, we are also going to be discussing challenges, and this would be achieved by tough moderation and also having a couple of speakers who are well-known ICANN critics.

The latter can be dropped off, but you can say that we are going to discuss the challenges and we are also going to kind of, yes, maybe provocative moderation so for any good statement, there would be also a question and do you think – what do you think? Is it going to work like

that, or do you think it's really good? What about this and that? You know what I mean. So just say that there would be also discussion on the challenges and any benefit would be challenged. Could be achieved by moderation. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Tatiana. How does everyone feel about this? This is not a discussion of Olivier with the different people on this call, it's discussion with everyone. So, I'd really be interested in hearing other points of views and whether there's support for this. You can type it, you can put it as a checkmark or a red cross if you disagree, and best of all, you can take the floor.

Tatiana, you're putting your hand again up, or down? We had a few challenges putting our hand up.

TATIANA TROPINA: I thought my hand was down, but actually, I think you're right. We have to listen to other people what they think about this. Maybe it doesn't make sense at all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Anyone else? I guess silence is consent. I don't see anyone saying no. I note that silence is gold, says Tatiana. Alan tends to agree on what you've said, so maybe, shall I just ask – Tatiana, if you could just put the couple of sentences that you were suggesting on the doc directly.

That's the great thing of having the Google Doc, and see if we can then get some feedback or some buy-in from the rest of the group over the weekend. Perhaps even suggest moderator. We haven't even got a moderator yet. That's the other thing: we need to choose a moderator.

In the past, for IGF, we have had Bill Drake for one of the times. I think we've had Matthew Shears as well as a moderator. Both very good moderators, very excellent sessions. We have had – have we had other people? I can't remember who else we've had in past years. We've done three. My memory fails me, but anyway, we've had very good moderators. Or we could just bring someone else new, or a non-ICANN person. We could bring an ICANN critic and then they could spend the whole time trying to spread discourse over the whole discussion. Not much movement at the moment on the call. Okay.

So Tatiana, you can put this on the Google Doc. I can certainly see cursors moving around the Google Doc, so people are probably adding their points. If I can just ask you all if you have any changes to add to this document, please do them as soon as possible. Certainly try and do them Sunday or Monday so that Nigel and the co-Chairs of this working group can spend at least a day looking at the document, polishing it up and then filing it. It takes a little while to file it, so the earlier we receive the input, the better. I certainly see the document is taking shape. I haven't seen any objection so far to any of the points made in there, so if there are objections, I'd be interested in hearing them earlier rather than later.

And now is the time to make that proposal and to build it up, so I'll give you another chance. I don't see anyone on this. Oh, Rafik, I didn't note

that you were on the call. Are you able to speak, Rafik? Is there anything that you wanted to point out on this?

It's a pity we haven't got Farzaneh, since she was the main penholder on this document.

Rafik Dammak, are you able to speak, or are you… You don't have a microphone next to you? Nothing to add. Okay.

Alright, well look, let's not just agonize over this. The proposal is there, you all know where it is, you've got a few more days if you'd like to mull over it and add a few suggestions. I'm hoping we'll get the input, then come Monday, Tuesday – Nigel, Rafik, Young Eum and I will be looking at it with Farzaneh and polish it up and file it. And then we'll see if it works and if we manage to get a workshop at this year's IGF.

Let's then move to the next part of the agenda. That's the discussion on the WSIS forum proposal. Oh, just one last thing before we move to that. If you don't know where this Google Doc is, you can either go back to our agenda and there's a link to the wiki page that has a link to that Google Doc, and that wiki page will be regularly updated, so when we then file the workshop proposal, etc., all the details will be then added on to the wiki page and you can also see prior year workshop proposals also linked to that wiki page with the menu on the left.

It's the same thing also for the WSIS forum proposal, and the link that's in the agenda will take you to the WSIS forum wiki page for the proposed submission. I think that the main text in that was agreed already, and seems to have reached – well we haven't heard any opposition to the text, but there was some discussion regarding the

actual participants, trying to have something that's a little bit more geographically and gender balanced.

And so far, whilst I've heard people say, "Well, we need to have it more geographically balanced and gender balanced, and perhaps have more people outside the civil society space, so more business, more registrars, registries, industry, governments involved in this panel." So far, I haven't heard any names suggested, so it would be good to have suggestions on this call, please, and any other comments on this workshop.

And Nigel, if I can call upon you in the meantime to let us know what is the timetable for this, when do we need to file this proposal by, and what other information do we require on this current list.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. I was afraid you'd ask that question. So, we had a communication from the WSIS organizers which are the ITU a couple of days ago saying that each of the submitters – so people like myself who have submitted these proposals – would receive a sort of link in the next couple of days allowing us to amend the proposal for a limited period of time. And after that period of time, as in last year, they cut it off so to speak and you can't amend it anymore. So I guess we've probably got another couple of weeks or something, or a bit more, perhaps certainly into mid-May – perhaps a couple of weeks, let me put it that way – to amend it. But then after that, we probably can't, so we ought to think about – as you say – whether we need to add extra

panelists and whether we need to put anything into the description for it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Nigel. I note that on our mailing list, we did make a call for additional volunteers for different stakeholder groups to participate at the IGF. I wonder if any of these volunteers would also be at the WSIS forum.

One of the problems that we seem to be faced with is the WSIS forum is very heavily influenced towards governments and civil society, and a lot with people from Europe and Africa. We haven't seen a lot of involvement form North America or Asia, and certainly within ICANN circles, there hasn't been such a large number of people, of ICANNers – one can call them this way – going to the WSIS forum already. I remind you all that there's no funding to go to the WSIS forum. This is just for people who are already going, basically. So, any suggestions? We have a couple of weeks then hopefully to make any amendments.

What I would really like to see is to have maybe some suggestions for other people – I might suggest someone from a regional Internet registry. I have no idea whether any registrar or registry is going to the WSIS forum, is going to attend. I suspect maybe some of the larger ones might have a representative who goes there. If you do know, please ask them. it would be good to have someone from the industry in that forum, and especially when one looks at the funding models for these programs.

It's all about capacity building, so this is whole workshop is very much a showcase of what we're doing at ICANN and what capacity building programs are taking place elsewhere, and a comparison between them. So obviously, yes, it would be quite – the panel would have a majority of academics and people involved in capacity building, but it would be interesting to see how the whole model of how it's all coming together – and maybe get some feedback about the capacity building at ICANN from members of the GAC or from members of the Board.

I know that there are some Board members who are coming to WSIS forum. I'm not sure who, but maybe even people from the Southern School of Internet Governance or who have benefited from programs elsewhere and not just in Europe.

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, if I may – and we could certainly do a bit of outreach to some people we know who have been involved in this and see if they want to come back on the list and say they would be happy.

One such person is Wolfgang Kleinwächter who I mentioned I think on the list. He's volunteered to be in Geneva for the Pacific day, and I think he would be good because he's a former Board member and also he created the first Summer School, really, [inaudible] which is obviously still going. So, perhaps we could add him if that's okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks for this, Nigel. It's not really my call. Let's suggest him on the mailing list, so Wolfgang. Again, well, one could always say it's the

same old group of people, isn't it? [Giovanni], [inaudible] Bill, me, [Matthew], Rafik, Tanya and Wolfgang, the same crew that you see regularly. I was hoping for new faces and others as well, perhaps even going back to the shadow myself, hiding again in the back of the class. But yes, Wolfgang would certainly bring a great discussion forward on this. Yes.

I'm not going to try and arm wrestle here and get something else of this call. It seems that everybody is okay with the list we currently have, or at least the people on the call are okay with the list that we have. If you have any suggestions, please just drop them on the mailing list and we'll have an action item to do a quick follow-up after this call on this.

Any other comments on the WSIS proposal? Okay, the silence today must be a late Friday for people or one of these Friday things before a long weekend.

Let's then move to agenda item number five, and that's the ICANN Board in Geneva. Something else in Geneva. Goodness, this seems to be the Geneva day today, and Board members are going to be meeting in Geneva later on this week or next week. Nigel Hickson, you have the floor.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much, Olivier. Just briefly, as a couple of people brought it up on the list, because there's been an announcement that two of the Board sessions in the next week or so are going to be public and that spurred some comments, so the ICANN Board is having an

intersessional Board meeting, and I know Becky is on the call and no doubt knows more than I do about this.

The Board is meeting on Friday, Saturday and Sunday of next week, it's starting on the 5th of May. Preceding that on the 4th, there's a reception in Geneva which the Board are turning up for, and it's a sort of community reception and we have a number of community members attending that that are based here in Geneva.

The executive team – so that's the executive of ICANN – meet on the Thursday. Also on the Friday, the ICANN Board or a considerable number of the ICANN Board are meeting at the ITU with the ITU leadership, so this is a joint meeting taking place at the ITU, a sort of roundtable discussion and a lunch.

And then in that afternoon, there's a further meeting with the head of the United Nations office for Geneva. And just while I'm speaking, the Board session finishes on Sunday afternoon, and on the Monday is the first day of the plenary of the CSTD, this is the Committee of Science and Technology for Development, and there's a ministerial roundtable on the Monday afternoon which Göran Marby is taking place on.

The Board session or one of the Board sessions that is in public, so to speak, is on Internet governance and in particular with a focus on the IGF. This is a topic that has been discussed at the CCWG face-to-face meeting in Copenhagen and I think previously as well. As you recall at that session, [Markus] outlined the sort of characteristics of Internet governance activities into three baskets, and really the discussion with the ICANN Board is a codification of that, how some activities are more

to do with the ICANN mission than others and therefore we have slightly different approaches. And there's also a focus on the IGF and ICANN's commitment to that.

So, thank you for the opportunity.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. And just to let everyone know, it has been announced that the marketplace dynamics session about registries and registrars on Saturday the 6th of May will be available for remote, listen only. So remote I would say listening in, a streaming perhaps we could call it, from 11:15 to 12:00 UTC. And on the Internet Governance Engagement Strategy, that is also a public session on Sunday the 7th of May from 9:00 to 10:00 UTC. And the Adobe Connect link is provided on that announcement page.

So, the agenda has a link to the announcement page and no doubt you can then participate in this. I don't know why there's a participant code, because Adobe Connect usually doesn't ask for participant code. Maybe on that occasion, it will ask for a participant code.

So yes, you'll certainly see me on that call. I don't know if any of our group are going to be in Geneva and will be able to participate in the cocktail on the Friday. I think you did say it was a Thursday or a Friday that there was a meet the local community.

NIGEL HICKSON: So Olivier, just to confirm, the cocktail reception is on the Thursday at 6:30 in the evening here in Geneva. There will be a number of the

community here, because there's also next week the meeting of the second or third meeting of the Enhanced Cooperation Working Group. So just a few things taking place in Geneva.

This is a three-day meeting to look at the enhanced cooperation recommendations, which I'll try and circulate. I've got some problems with the classification of this document, but I'll do my best to circulate it over the weekend.

So, this is a list of recommendations that are being discussed in that meeting, so a number of community members will be here for that meeting and will hopefully come to the reception. If there are any other people who are in Geneva and we've forgotten, then of course, they're more than welcome to come to the reception.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Nigel. They should drop you an e-mail to get further details, I gather.

Are there any comments or questions on this topic? And if there aren't, I was going to ask for a few more details on the CSGD. You did say that these were taking place – was it Monday and Tuesday? Are these open sessions, or are these going to be closed sessions as well?

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, just to clarify, the meeting next week on the 3rd, 4th and 5th is the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation which falls under the CSGD agreement, and so that working group is not quite open, but people can

register for it, and if you're registered for it, you can then log on virtually and follow the discussions.

And then the following week is the – and we can circulate the links. I just can't do it all at once. The following week is the CSGD Plenary, which is the annual plenary of the CSGD and that goes on all week. That goes on from Monday to Friday, so all week from the 8th to the 12th.

And on the 11th and the 12th, we negotiate the so-called WSIS resolution that goes from the CSGD to ECOSOC and then onto the committee that Veni is on in New York, the second committee I think. And so that resolution talks about the WSIS process and Internet governance developments, and touches on the IGF, etc.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

NIGEL HICKSON: So it's a busy time. That meeting is closed, unfortunately, to CSGD members or observers. Yes, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this update, Nigel. That's very helpful. No doubt, we will receive further details from you on the mailing list in due course.

I don't see any other hands up at the moment, so we can move to Any Other Business and Nigel, you had asked to speak about ICANN59 in preparation for ICANN59.

NIGEL HICKSON: Well, I [don't] want to speak too much. Only I just wanted to confirm that we will put in for – as discussed on the chat – a Cross-Community Working Group Internet Governance face-to-face session in Johannesburg. There is no Internet governance public session because this is the policy forum, the B meeting, the smaller meeting and we don't have sort of public sessions as such. But we have got the ability to schedule a face-to-face meeting, though as I think you've observed and others have observed, it's a very packed agenda. But we'll do our best to schedule it at a time that doesn't clash with too many other sessions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Nigel. It's just worth noting that Nigel and myself have been in touch with Tanzanica and also with Gisella from At-Large regarding the process by which scheduling of such face-to-face meetings takes place during the B meeting.

We'll use the same process as we did in Helsinki, so we won't have a huge room, but one thing that we do need to find out as soon as possible is for the members of this working group, what your preferred times would be. There are a number of cross-community discussions, official, large scale cross-community discussions that are taking place that will actually be exclusive, and in other words, the different SOs and ACs are encouraged not to have activities at the same time so that we can get a better participation and more participation in those main cross-community activities.

The rest of the agenda – it being a four-day meeting – looks very packed indeed, so if you can let us know when – and I'm going to try and work out with the other co-Chairs, work out when the GNSO, when the ccNSO and when the ALAC has some space of some sort. We might get three or four different slots, and then we'll ask Tanzanica for a slot at that point and see if there is a room that's available. And I gather since this is a face-to-face meeting, it doesn't need to be a huge room. It can be along the lines of the rooms that we've had in the past for face-to-face meetings.

The agenda for this face-to-face meeting also needs to be built, and one really important thing is going to be the follow-up to the feedback that we hopefully will receive from the chartering organizations. So we'll definitely need to discuss that, and the second thing is to do our year planning. Focus on what we're going to do. There are so many things going on now, and I realize time is flying by. We are getting more and more in this reaction mode rather than action mode. We need to really work earlier and start our work earlier at tackling whatever challenges are coming when we foresee them, rather than having things appear on our table, and then we have to react very quickly and often are not able to react fast enough.

Okay. I don't see any hands up. Any other Other Business than this, or are there any comments on what we've just been discussing? I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so I'd like to thank you for being on this call, and we will do a few follow-ups by e-mail over the weekend.

Please bring in that input for – I guess the really sort of high importance thing now is to bring that input for the IGF proposal over the weekend on the Google Doc.

I'd like to thank you for attending this call. Have a very good weekend, everyone. This call is now adjourned. Goodbye.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Olivier.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]