RAFIK DAMMAK:	Let's start first with the roll call, see who is with us.
DESIREE CABRERA:	Okay. In the room, we have Becky Burr, Barry Cobb, Mary Uduma. For the Chairs, we have Olivier Crepin-LeBlond and Rafik Dammak. For staff, we have Laurent Ferrali; and myself, Desiree Cabrera.
RAFIK DAMMAK:	Thank you, Desiree. Thanks, everyone, for joining the call. This call is only for the [inaudible] to work on the new vehicle, supposedly to replace the cross-community working group on Internet governance. As you can see in the Adobe Connect, I just shared the Google doc that we are working on. There were some comments. I tried to resolve them, but there are some maybe that need more discussion.

So, if you can go to the Google doc, you can find in the beginning a few paragraphs. Mostly use them to guide our work on the draft document – the objective, the target, and also to give some specification of what we want to get from this new vehicle, and we can use that as kind of guiding of principles.

After that, what we used this to get previous [inaudible] charter and try to go through each section and to adapt it to the specification that we put.

So, what I would suggest is we can start maybe to go section by section and try maybe to see what are areas that needs change there and

maybe what we need to clarify or if there's anything that maybe needs some work.

Is everyone okay with this?

So, the first section is just an introduction, but we go from existing template. I don't think we need so much there, except maybe to remind that as first change we are doing is to use another name or label for the group and to call it the Cross-Community Engagement Group on Internet Governance. That moves us from the cross-community working group and the [inaudible] meaning it may have within the community. Engagement group is more open structure, something more flexible, probably less [loaded] than cross-community working group. Any comments here, any questions?

The next section is the [problem] statement, goals, and objectives and scope. The [inaudible] twice. Here we're trying to … I think it's an important section since we will … It's about the scoping. I do believe it's quite important to explain what we can do, and in particular we cannot do. This I think is important for our chartering organization and the community in general to make it clear that what we are trying to achieve in this working group and maybe to avoid any misunderstanding about the [inaudible].

So, [inaudible] first paragraph, it's just quite general about ICANN, and context that ICANN works within the Internet governance ecosystem, and in particular after the IANA transition.

I think what maybe matters more is the goals and objectives. Here we have a few bullet points. I guess the first question here, if those are

enough or we need maybe to elaborate more here or do you think that maybe we need to add more or drop some of them? I think this is open for discussion here. Olivier, do you want to make a comment here?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Rafik. I'm currently reading through the thing, so no point at the moment. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. If it's possible, I will try to share my screen. Maybe that will be more easy for you if you want to see, to be on the same page. Can you give me the presenter? Okay, make me a presenter. Okay, I think now you can see the Google doc from my screen. It's a little more easy.

Maybe first comment here. I see we have a mention about the charter to [inaudible] anticipate two-year mandate from March 2019. Maybe we can move this to more appropriate section, but not in the [problem] statement or in the goals and objectives. We put that into comment.

Back to the goals that we want to achieve. First, increase awareness about relevant [GIG] in the ICANN [inaudible] engagement function on Internet governance.

[inaudible] increase communication and collaboration with the Board Internet Governance Working Group, create more targeted and effective approaches to relevant Internet governance processes and issues.

I think it is quite broad in general. I think maybe the bullet point number two and three need to be more specific and to highlight that we are trying to work with the [inaudible] team and also with the Board on Internet Governance – the Board Working Group on Internet Governance.

What about making bullet points under one and four? Is it that clear? We maybe try to elaborate more here? [inaudible] to put more details in the scope activities regarding that. Any comment or suggestion here? Yes, Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks, Rafik. We currently have listed here four – can you hear me? Hello? Can you hear me?

DESIREE CABRERA: Yes, we can hear you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so maybe Rafik can't hear me. Alright, that's fine. Thank you. Looking at this listing, that's just four bullet points. Looking at what we have looked at with these specifications on the previous page, it mentions more controversial things like giving advices on drafting [inaudible] to different consultation processes and so on.

The goals and objectives I think need to include the work that the CCWG currently is doing with government engagement department. If the four bullet points are really the four things that this working group or this

engagement group is going to do, forgive me for saying this, but it seems quite empty. Things like enhanced coordination between the CCWG and ICANN government engagement functions on Internet governance matters, what exactly does that mean, enhance the cooperation? It's very UN-type language, enhanced cooperation.

I don't know whether we need … I would've thought we needed to add a little more details to this or perhaps have a more complete mission than just those four bullet points. Thanks.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Olivier. Are you proposing some language to draft these bullet points or maybe just we can start with what we put in the specification because that's maybe more detailed, more elaborated there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. If I can jump into this.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, Olivier. Please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. I think there might be a lag or delay between you and me, which is the reason why we sometimes talk over each other. First, increase awareness about relevant Internet governance and policy issues in the ICANN community, that's a one-way process there. It's

EN

information that comes from outside that then gets disseminated across ICANN.

Enhanced cooperation [inaudible] [CCGIG] and ICANN government engagement functions on Internet governance matters is effectively a two-way process. I think that one might need to specify a bit more what this coordination is.

Increased coordination and collaboration with the Board Internet Governance Working Group. What's the difference between enhanced cooperation and increased coordination and collaboration? If we're going to be very picky on the words, I'd like to see if there's a difference between the two.

The fourth one, create more targeted and effective approaches around Internet governance processes and issues. That I get is … Yeah. I'm not totally convinced by it. Yeah. I guess we can work on that. What's the difference between enhanced cooperation and increased coordination and collaboration?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Olivier. What I was trying to say, if you think that we can use what we have on this specification, maybe it's more elaborated language, there are more details, more [substance] there and try to use that in the bullet points.

I agree with you. It's not that … What we have here in the bullet points is maybe too broad, too general, doesn't really say that much. That's what I was suggesting. I think we're on [inaudible] agreement. It's just

how we can achieve that. So just maybe start to use what we put before and try to work around that or if we can [inaudible] language.

Yes, Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Rafik. Should we just have enhanced cooperation … Enhanced coordination and collaboration with the ICANN government engagement functions on Internet governance matters, and then use the same language and say enhanced coordination and collaboration with the Board Internet Working Group. Because, in my mind, I don't know why we're using the two separate … What's the difference between enhanced cooperation and increased coordination?

Somewhere in there, and I don't know if those agree on the call, I'd like to see the function of providing the feedback loop to both the Board Working Group on Internet Governance and the ICANN government engagement department. Feedback loops. Now, some are going to ask and say does that mean writing statements and so on, which I know there's opposition to. But, the fact of the matter is that the ICANN government engagement department has passed whatever it had drafted for external conferences by the working group and has collected feedback from the working group on what was written there.

It's one of two things. Either we have to design a way where every time there is a consultation, then the government engagement department writes something, passes it by the working group, the working group has to pass it by all of its chartering organizations and then has to go all the way back. Or, it does it the same way as it's done it so far, which is

not to refer back to the chartering organizations. I know that some have been cringing about this. Or it doesn't do anything, in which case ICANN staff has full green light to not ask anything from the ICANN community, and the ICANN community is not involved in anything that ICANN takes part in as far as Internet governance is concerned – which I personally feel is wrong. I think that the ICANN community should be involved with what ICANN, the organization, does. That's the way I would frame it. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Olivier. I guess there was some comment in the document already about that. I also [inaudible] face-to-face meeting in Abu Dhabi. I think probably – we cannot say that we are going to work on position paper and all this stuff because it will be complicated, controversial.

I think we can provide input, let's say, maybe on what ICANN staff can provide – oh yeah, [inaudible]. Like giving advices [inaudible] input to different consultation process. This is when ICANN participates with its staff in the different consultation processes, I guess as engagement group we can give advices on those draft input. Maybe we can use that language maybe to start with.

Yes, Olivier? I'm not sure if an old or new hand, but please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's a new hand, Rafik. Thank you. That I think is exactly the term which we might wish not to use, giving advices on draft inputs to different consultation process is effectively providing advice, which in many

people's minds, including mine, is the work of advisory committees. This is not an advisory committee and it cannot take the place of an advisory committee. So, using the term "giving advice" is I would say rather dangerous.

How's the suggestion that we use the feedback loop rather than providing advice?

RAFIK DAMMAK: We can use another term.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'd be interested in hearing from others on the call what they think of it. It feels a bit like it's a two-way thing at the moment.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I added now the new bullet point. Probably we will have more comment later about this. But, this is something we can start with.

So, I think now we add some new language to this bullet points, but [inaudible] that's not final. We probably need more comment here, but I guess we are adding more [substance] around.

There is no further comment here. Maybe I can move to the next section and start working on that if there is no objection. Okay. So, let's go to the scope.

First, we have this [inaudible] that we feel is goals and objectives. The [CCGIG] will identify Internet governance and policies [inaudible].

Coordinate, facilitate, and increase awareness [of ICANN created] participation on the discussion and processes pertaining to Internet governance as appropriate and within ICANN's mission and mandate. Work with ICANN governance engagement team and global outreach or other parts of organization as appropriate to identify appropriate Internet policy and governance related fora and meetings in which ICANN should engage. Align the ICANN community approaches to IG issues within the ICANN mission and align with the strategies of the ICANN Board Internet Governance Working Group. Draft position paper and a statement as deemed appropriate. Within the goals and objectives and in accordance with the rules of this charter.

So, any comments on this? I'm not sure. It seems [inaudible] repeating what we said before. I think maybe we can start with the difficult part, but the first one – the last bullet point about trust, position, paper. This is maybe [inaudible] rise maybe some alarm.

Any comments or suggestions here? Yes, Olivier, please go ahead. Sorry, I didn't see your hand.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rafik. In the ICANN context, I do not think that a position paper has … I'm just trying to write in my mind at the moment. I don't think that a position paper has the defined meaning in the ICANN context. Advice has a defined meaning. Statements I believe also have a defined meaning, certainly in the Advisory Committee context. I would suggest that we say draft position papers and other documents as deemed appropriate. That doesn't then make it as a statement as such.

Second, I believe that this still needs to remain in there and I'd like to hear the feedback from the chartering organizations on this specifically. Perhaps they could come up with language that would be appropriate or that would be – well, appropriate is not the word. That would be agreeable to them. Yeah, draft position papers and other documents as deemed appropriate within the goals and objectives and in accordance with the rules of this charter. That's what I would suggest. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: So, maybe Olivier we can say draft position and other documents as deemed appropriate by each chartering organization. I think to make it fair that it's our chartering organization who can give us the green light or the approval. As you know, there was always that concern that maybe we're trying to talk in the name of the whole community in our organization without going back to them. I guess such language will elevate any concern, if deemed appropriate by this chartering organization. Any thought of this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm fine with that. We appear to have lost your document. Might have lost you. It seems we have lost Rafik altogether. A bit of a problem. Adobe Connect crashed on him, okay. I'm now I think sharing my screen on this. In the meantime, anyone else have a comment to make on this? I'm not seeing anybody say anything in the chat.

We're over in this sentence here: draft position papers and other documents as deemed appropriate by the chartering organizations within the goals and objectives and accordance with the roles of this

charter. Are we okay with that? If I'm not hearing anything, then I think we can move on to the next paragraph.

Okay, let's go to the next thing. With regards to—

RAFIK DAMMAK: [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, you're back. Okay. Rafik, I'm sharing my screen at the moment. If you want, you can—

RAFIK DAMMAK: [inaudible], you can continue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So, with regards to working with the Board Working Group on Internet governance and ICANN's GE team, the [inaudible] shall undertake the following. We've got more details here.

With the coordination on a regular basis, [inaudible] agreed, and invite the Board Working Group on a regular basis. No – [inaudible] members to the [CCIG] meetings, calls, etc.

I know that there was a question as to whether we would invite the members or we would invite the Chair. I think that we can say the Board Working Group Chair and members to [CCCG] meetings. We can certainly invite them if they wish to come or not.

Share updated appropriate and key IG threats and opportunities and initiate discussions on how to respond to such threats, including an assessment of the appropriate level of Board and community response allocation to [inaudible]. Agree as appropriate levels and scope of representation and key in-mission IG fora and processes. Meet in person at each ICANN meeting.

There was a comment on this from Marilyn Cade: "Not expecting to have the Board Working Group take over our work." [inaudible] comment that Marilyn made.

Rafik, you're saying we propose some language on this. Maybe could you explain what you're looking for here in number four?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah. Just because I saw the language – I mean the comments – from Marilyn. I'm not sure how we can frame that because I guess just saying we can invite the Board Working Group members. Yeah, I'm not sure. [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Meeting in person at each ICANN meeting I don't see as a problem because we've done that so far. That is one thing. What was suggested from others was that there should be at least maybe one call between the two working group. I think [inaudible] who suggested this. And therefore mentioned that there should be at least one call between the Board Working Group and the Cross-Community Engagement Group in between consecutive ICANN meetings.

From a discussion I remember having had with Markus a few months ago – perhaps even a year ago – he had mentioned that it might be worth just having him on the call and any interested working group members from the Board, but not a formal meeting of the Board Working Group and the Cross-Community Group at the same time, just because of the workload that this would mean – additional costs or some of the Board Working Group members that are extremely busy already.

Rafik, I'm not sure we can hear you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I was not speaking. Still thinking. Okay. Coordinate on a regular basis, but we are not putting too much details, so we can adjust later and see how it works. I'm not sure that we can state here how we will do and so on without [inaudible] something the Board Working Group.

I guess basically the concern here is that if we have the frequent discussion with the working group that maybe arise some concerns within some parts of the community. So maybe that should be maybe not codified or [finalized] [inaudible]. Something kind of transparent just to be sure that we are not bypassing [inaudible] chartering organization and talking directly to the Board, something like that. I think it's about really optics here. In practice, I don't see a problem, but [inaudible]. Just say that we coordinate on a regular basis. I'm not sure what kind of language we can add here.

Yes. Olivier, please go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Rafik. I don't know how to put my hand down now because I'm sharing my screen at the same time. Look, we've already mentioned here coordinate with the Board Working Group on a regular basis and invite the Board Working Group members to the [CCGIG] meeting and calls. So, I say meet in person at each ICANN meeting, remote participation will also be provided I would write it. And the whole thing of saying, again, arranging one call between the two working groups I think is probably scrupulous due to the fact that we've already said that we're inviting the working group members to the meetings and the calls. We also have to keep this a bit more lean rather than repeating ourselves. So, that's four.

And five, publish at least one or two page update before each ICANN meeting to be shared with the SOs and ACs I think is entirely manageable.

Someone is punching things.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, Olivier. Yes, I would say we would need more participants to really provide us on [okay-ing this]. Maybe about the bullet point number five – publish at least one to two page updates before ICANN meetings to be shared with the SOs and ACs. [inaudible].

So, should we keep this here? Still relevant or should be in other place, since we are talking here [inaudible] SOs and ACs.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think we can keep it here.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. If there is no further comments, I guess we can come back later to this part anyway. But, [inaudible] can move to the next part. So, the [CCGIG] Board Working Group and the ICANN Government Engagement should, as appropriate, coordinate written, verbal, and other [inaudible] or external audience on IG matters.

So, this … Coordinate written, verbal, and other [inaudible]. So, this needs to be kind of [aligned] to what we said about [inaudible] group. And also to be sure if we need to get approval from our chartering organizations when appropriate.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm happy with all of those three sentences here. I suggest maybe we can move on, unless anybody else has got anything to say. I'm not seeing anything in the chat, nor anybody looking to take the floor.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Olivier, just because here in the first sentence they're saying that coordinate written, verbal, and other [inaudible] to consultation [inaudible] external audience. Before we are talking that we have been providing a feedback loop, but here it's more like we are talking about coordination. Maybe that's slightly different here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think that coordination is a good word that we used earlier, haven't we, on the enhanced coordination and collaboration. So that certainly goes in line with what we were speaking about – coordinate.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. So, [inaudible] additional comment.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It doesn't necessarily mean that it's the CCG that is driving this. In fact, I would expect the processes to be driven by the Board and the government engagement department, which is what's been happening. So, coordinate effectively means that the three are working together and in synch.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: How is everyone else feeling this? Okay, shall we move on, Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, yes. Let's move to the next. So, it's [reporting] deliverable – okay, this maybe looks redundant here. So, [inaudible] position paper as statement, probably we needs to change since we [replaced it] before with other documents.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, correct.

RAFIK DAMMAK: So, as a part of its activities, the working group may propose a position paper or other document in order to inform the participating SOs and ACs collectively, individually and others in a timely manner, that their endorsement and support for a position paper [inaudible]. The schedule for drafting and decision-making [inaudible] position paper or statement should be including in the work plan.

So, [inaudible] for a position paper, we would have to also include it in the work plan. Maybe it cannot be … Is what we may need to do. We need to plan it beforehand. It cannot be just a reaction to some new consultation, something similar.

[End of deliverable] [inaudible] workshop and reports of workshop, a key Internet governance forum. Annual reports, summary of activities, progress papers and reports.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is this a location where we need to mention the [inaudible] of progress papers? In other words, monthly, bimonthly, weekly?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah, I guess so. Yeah. I guess maybe the safest and maybe what we can do at least is to prepare maybe before every ICANN meeting, which means like three per year is a more safe way to put it. Maybe something is more doable for us than saying Mark or something like that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Ideally, I'd like it to be monthly, but now it really depends on the support that one gets in regards to the group itself. In other words, staff resources, etc.

RAFIK DAMMAK: So, that's why we need to be careful to not comment like something monthly. Other working groups, they [inaudible] that they have dedicated staff for that. Unfortunately, [inaudible] is not with us on the call today, but let's see. Maybe if we can add the language to be at least before every ICANN meeting, so we can at least … We can make every month if you want and we have the resources, but at least the minimal is before every ICANN meeting we should share an activity report, progress report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. I'd say, then, [CCIG] will report to the broader community on its activities and progress made at times set forth in the work plan, at minimum before an ICANN meeting. I'm not sure whether that makes sense.

RAFIK DAMMAK: At minimum. Okay, it looks [inaudible], but I guess [inaudible] in English.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And instead of saying before ICANN meeting, I'd say a minimum before an ICANN meeting.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Before every ICANN meeting or before ICANN meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Before every ICANN meeting.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. A question here maybe for consistency, Olivier, because we are talking progress paper, I think before we said about one two-page update to be shared with SOs, publish at least one or two-page update. Can we maybe, to be consistent, to select or agree on one term on how we describe this, just maybe update report, progress report, or whatever, but just to keep it consistent for the whole charter, to avoid confusion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Could we call it Internet governance update?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: IGU.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Update report, maybe? Yeah?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Internet governance update report. I note that it's four minutes. I have a hard stop at the top of the hour.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, we can finish early. We don't need to … I think we at least [inaudible] this section. It still needs maybe some work. I think also more discussion about if we should put what we mean exactly by deliverable because workshop and report is deliverable or not and this maybe needs some discussion. I guess we can just [inaudible] here and agree on next steps since we didn't have several of the active participants.

I guess what I will do just probably after – usually we send the recording and transcripts and we send an e-mail with the link to the document to ask everyone to go through the document and check the new edits and changes. Also that we are going to continue and maybe …

The problem we [inaudible] organize more calls, maybe one or two extra calls because we had the holidays. We need to submit by February, so we need to finish the work in January, next month. I guess I will send e-mail on this matter to the list.

Yes, Olivier. Do you want to comment on this?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I think I was muted. Should we circulate a Doodle for the second week of January?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, yeah, we can do that. Anyway, we ask for people to comment on the document in the meantime. Yeah, we can do that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [inaudible] I'll leave you then to follow-up and let the list know about it. Excellent.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay, I think that's it. Thanks, everyone, for joining today's call. I guess it would be our last for this year. Happy holidays, Merry Christmas, and Happy New Year. It's quite an [inaudible]. But that's it. Thanks and see you soon. Bye-bye. Let's adjourn the call for today and stop the recording.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rafik. Happy Holidays, everyone. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]