
DESIREE CABRERA: Okay, it looks like the recording is going right now. In the room we have Collin Kurre, Greg Shatan, Judith Hellerstein, and Olivier Crepin-LeBlond. We also have two numbers, one ending in 2855 and another ending in 7708. For staff, we have Adam Peake, Dierdre Sidjanski, Laurent Ferrali, Nigel Hickson; and myself, Desiree Cabrera.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Desiree. Do we have any apologies? If we could please record these as well.

DESIREE CABRERA: The apologies we have are from Jim Prendergast and David [Mayer], as well as Veni Markovski.

VENI MARKOVSKI: This is Veni. I made it.

DESIREE CABRERA: Oh, you did make it. Wonderful.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Yeah, 7708.

DESIREE CABRERA: Perfect, thank you.

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 CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for identifying yourself.

MANDY CARVER: 2855 is Mandy Carver.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mandy. I was trying to catch who it was from your um, but that didn't work out. Great.

We have a full agenda today. It's only a one-hour call and the first thing we're going to be looking at is an update of all the different Internet governance activities that have been happening since our last call which seems to be a number of months ago, so there's likely to be quite a lot in there. We've got about 20 minutes for this.

After that, we'll have a discussion on the cross-community engagement group. Probably not even a discussion. Probably just an update on this. Then afterwards we'll be looking at whether we should prepare for a workshop proposal for IGF 2018.

And also, something we do know that we have to do which is to prepare for our face-to-face meeting in Panama, including the time. A quick discussion about the time when this will happen.

Let's get going. Are there any additions or amendments to the agenda that anyone wishes to add or change? I'm not seeing any hands up, scanning up and down the list.

So, let's get going then with the Internet governance activities until today. For this, I'll ask Nigel Hickson to please provide us with an update. Then I'm also going to ask anybody who is on the call and has attended some of these activities to chime in as and when desired to. Nigel, you have the floor.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thank you very much, Olivier. Good afternoon and good morning. Yes. I'll try not to speak for too long because many people might have views and questions.

The Internet Governance Forum is at the top of everyone's lips at the moment and we'll obviously come back to the specifics of the workshop part of this in item four. I think suffice to say that we are expecting an announcement later today or tomorrow on the venue of the IGF. There were some press reports last night that President Macron or his office will make an announcement today to confirm that it will be in Paris from the 11th I think to the 15th of November. That's not absolutely confirmed yet.

On the call earlier, the secretariat confirmed that there are still, until confirmation is made, the other option is Bangkok in the second week of December. So, those are the two options, but we should have confirmation in the next 24 hours also.

On UN activities, perhaps I could briefly report on the Commission for Science and Technology. For development last week, this is a CSTD. The annual plenary meeting which takes place in Geneva. There's an annual session of the WSIS process at this meeting, a three-hour session where

we discuss progress made under the WSIS process, the WSIS agenda. Nothing particularly controversial there. It gives us an opportunity to talk a bit about wider developments. We mention the IGF in that. [inaudible] is on the panel as well, so that was excellent.

The main focus of the CSTD was – well, for ICANN was – the WSIS resolution. This is a resolution that goes to [inaudible] and then to the General Assembly. It's debated every year. This particular WSIS resolution had to take into account the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation which had failed to reach any conclusion when they had its last meeting back in January this year. So, we had to reflect on that in the drafting of the resolution, and that was done without too much of a problem. Just noting that the working group had not been able to reach a conclusion on this issue, on this [inaudible] issue of enhanced cooperation and that it was hoped that discussions of some nature would continue as appropriate. That's the CSTD. Nothing too alarming there.

The ITU Plenipotentiary, obviously we'll come back to this on a further call because the plenipotentiary is significant. It's the [four yearly] opportunity for the governments – 192 governments – to come together and to decide the work program of the ITU for the next four years. This meeting is in November in Dubai and there's a lot of preparations going on for it on a regional basis. ICANN will take part. CEO, Goran Marby, will speak in the opening of this meeting on the 29th of October. So, more to come on that in due course, no doubt.

I'll perhaps mention two other things for now. The OECD has a [inaudible] policy, digital economic committee, which means every six

months and ICANN take part in that as part of the technical community, the technical and academic community. This is a multi-stakeholder committee and it is unlike we found last week at the CSTD where we had some pretty bad chairing in terms of stakeholders, contributions from stakeholders. At the OECD, stakeholders are very much welcome by the [Korean] chair. We are able to contribute to the main policy debate at the OECD is all in the [digital] agenda. You can't hear me?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We can hear you.

NIGEL HICKSON: Oh, good. Right. Sorry. The OECD, the main debate is on the ... There's a big program of work at the OECD ongoing digital which is all about the digital agenda [inaudible] and we've been contributing to that work. I'll also [inaudible] note of what happens at the OECD. It's not too controversial, but on the other hand, it's extremely [inaudible] work in terms of the economic and social dimensions of the information economy.

Finally, WIPO is just worth mentioning. The World Intellectual Property Organization has a trademark committee which again meets every six months and ICANN take part in that. This trademark committee discusses things like geographical names and geographical indicators. In the same way as ICANN, find it difficult to a single opinion on the status of geographical names and indicators and other names. So does WIPO. There's not a meeting of minds between the member states. But, there are policy proposal before WIPO put forward by Switzerland, Korea, and

others to actually get down to the nitty-gritty in some sort of WIPO document, in some sort of WIPO recommendation and sort out the whole issue of names, geographical names and domain names at WIPO, which for many I think would perhaps be appropriate and not for others. That's an interesting piece of work which is ongoing. I'll stop there for now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Nigel. I open the floor now for any discussion or questions to you. Whilst people gather their thoughts, I have a couple of questions in the meantime. First, with regards to the CSTD. We are all well aware of its work and its challenges. What has been seen now is the next steps for CSTD because clearly we're going into a new ... We seem to be going into a new cycle, don't we?

NIGEL HICKSON: The Commission for Science and Technology Developments, the CSTD itself is a body that carries on. The WSIS part of it is only part of it and the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation.

If you recall, there was a working group on enhanced cooperation set up in I think 2013 which reported in early 2015 was unable to reach any conclusions. And at the WSIS+10 discussions in December 2015, part of that outcome of the WSIS+10 review was to establish a new working group on enhanced cooperation to come forward with specifically recommendations on this issue.

This issue, for those of you that find this particularly difficult, which many of us do, essentially what enhanced cooperation is about – and people can argue [inaudible] – but essentially what it's about is how governments can legitimately fulfill their policy responsibilities in multi-stakeholder and multi-lateral processes. For some governments, it's a way of effectively saying that the only way that governments can fulfill their policy remits if you like on Internet matters is through some sort of inter-governmental structure, whereas other governments and stakeholders like ourselves in the technical community and in the business community argue that in fact governments can fulfill their mandates in terms of contributing to the public policy discussion through institutions like ICANN, ISOC, and the RIRs and other areas.

This debate is what enhanced cooperation is about. Specifically, Olivier, the UN will perhaps discuss this in the second committee in the fall again, and of course it's possible that a recommendation could be put forward to set up a new working group or do something entirely different.

But, there are other developments taking place as well. There's a UN panel being established, although we don't know the full details of this, by the UN Secretary General, a UN panel a bit like a sort of blue ribbon panel to look at the whole issue of Internet public policy and to come up with some recommendations, a multi-stakeholder panel. We don't know exactly what that will recommend. Then there's other proposals, say, from Russia in terms of proposing a cyberspace type treaty at the UN. So, there's a whole number of moving parts. Then of course there's the proposals that will be before the plenipotentiary.

I think in terms of this enhanced cooperation, this will probably take a back seat for a little while, but we'll see.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Nigel, just as a follow-up. Are there any indication that opening the front or the discussion in other fora or in other ways might be helpful in unlocking the I guess what some people could say the stalemate that was met in the working group on enhanced cooperation?

NIGEL HICKSON: Well, yes and no. I mean, clearly there is a stalemate, but the stalemate really comes down to some countries want inter-governmental structures to discuss Internet governance issues and other proponents don't. No doubt this will be taken up ... Possibly this will be taken up by this UN panel. I don't know. It will be taken up in the plenipotentiary almost certainly. There will be proposals for some kind of cyber treaty or whatever at an inter-governmental level.

So, yeah, I guess we're going to see this work go into other areas, and for some of us it was deeply disappointing. I'm trying to see if there's anyone on the call. We so nearly got it. We worked until 2:00 in the morning that night on January the 29th or whatever it was to try and secure recommendations. We nearly did it and we just failed at the end because people were getting tired and some people were just not flexible enough.

But, had we had got some recommendations on enhanced cooperation, at least it would have [inaudible] that particular boil for another five years or something. Anyway, we [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. I'm not seeing any hands at the moment so I'll ask another question. This one is on WIPO.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] in the queue.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so there's Marilyn and then there's Veni. Then we'll continue. Marilyn Cade, you have the floor.

MARILYN CADE: Thanks. So sorry to be late. Also, Nigel, I just want to appreciate what you just said, but I'm going to go back to I know we're being transcribed, but I'm still going to be relatively direct and frank.

The countries and some of the parties who were not willing to negotiate were the WEOG countries and even my own colleagues from big business. I think that we missed a really great opportunity. Those of us who were trying to achieve compromise and non-risky agreements, recommendations, as Nigel sort of referred to. I think we were ... We ourselves put this issue into a riskier context because not everybody understands that governments always have more venues that do not

include stakeholders than venues that do include stakeholders. So, we missed the opportunity to use this particular venue.

Before we go on, I wanted to ... And maybe either Veni or Nigel might comment. What's the present status on the resolution and this UN panel that the secretary general has created? I'm hearing interesting comments that this has been generated by people, including Fadi and perhaps Larry Strickling and others, who think that multi-stakeholder is failing and needs to be restarted. Do we have any insight on the real genesis on what's going on there?

VENI MARKOVSKI:

On your question, Marilyn, first of all it's not [just] established. So, until it's established, we wouldn't really know what's happening. It's coming. They're saying it's coming any moment. It may come in June as well.

On the second question, and [inaudible] ask Olivier to speak, Nigel mentioned some discussions at the UN and some cyber convention which was already put into the online system of the UN. I will send a link to the group in a few minutes. Cyber convention is [proposed] by Russia.

The second convention that they were talking about is the Cybersecurity Convention but it's not yet officially put on the agenda, the UN General Assembly. But, it's early warning for you guys in the Cybersecurity Convention [inaudible] among others, which say that the distribution and the allocation of domain names and IP addresses and removing them from the system should be done by the government. That's directly impacting what ICANN is doing. I'll send you the Cybercrime

Convention which is published, but I cannot send you the cybersecurity one because it's not yet published.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Veni. That's very helpful. Marilyn, any follow-up?

MARILYN CADE: Okay. I'm scared.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: This is all transcribed. Great. Marilyn Cade is scared. That's a new one.

MARILYN CADE: Hey.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Right. I have a question regarding or relating to WIPO. Nigel mentioned earlier that WIPO is being involved in any geographic names. How do I ask this? What is the jurisdiction of WIPO? To what extent is the work that WIPO could be doing in this likely to impact ICANN's work on this as we know work track 5 is looking at geographical names?

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you, Olivier. Well, I'm not an intellectual property specialist, but clearly WIPO is an intergovernmental body. It comes out with treaties which the membership of WIPO sign up to, so very much like the other

intergovernmental bodies come up with treaties which the membership adhere to. It's the same at WIPO. So, WIPO has various treaties and conventions its established over the years touching on intellectual property, trademarks, and industrial design and various other parts of intellectual property law.

Quite clearly, they talk about domain names. I mean, it's part of the brief on intellectual property and they're quite within their rights to establish treaties concerning domain names. [inaudible] they haven't [inaudible] geographical names or whatever. Their work could impact on ICANN, yes. It could. I think in the short term it's unlikely to because there isn't an agreement within the governments on how you should approach the protection of, say, geographical names. As you know, some countries believe that to give protection to geographic names curtails the freedom of speech, etc., whereas other countries believe that protecting geographic names reflects the need to protect culture and heritage and other facets of a country's sovereignty. It's a debate that goes on.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Nigel. I guess the gist of my question was whether there was any mechanism by which WIPO could come up with some rules that would affect ICANN and ICANN policies directly.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Sorry I wasn't clear. If WIPO did move from discussion of these issues to some sort of treaty based instrument which talked about the

protection of certain types of domain names, then that would affect ICANN. Yes. I think that's true. But, I think it's unlikely.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Nigel. Marilyn and then Greg afterwards. Marilyn?

MARILYN CADE: Thanks. Nigel, I'm going to challenge your thinking that it's unlikely. I spent 12-15 years representing a major corporation at WIPO. I was on the Director General's Advisory Committee. I think where perhaps ... I do hope that everyone knows that the WIPO staff are actively attending and participating in ICANN, not in a negative way, in a positive way. But, the question that you raise of could there be a treaty that would affect how names are used, Olivier, I want to comment on that.

There could be a treaty, but treaties typically take 5-10 years to negotiate. But, the IGO issue is not a new issue. IGO and geographic names is not a new issue. As Nigel I think was referencing, when he said it's unlikely, I'm not so sure it's unlikely. What happens at WIPO is, particularly if sufficient numbers of the developing countries are concerned, then they can all work a treaty negotiation. That takes a while to accomplish, but it also is heavily dependent on the governments and the way ... WIPO is not as dependent. It's a rich organization. It's not dependent on funding as other organization are. It has its own financial resources and it's relatively independent of the WEOG countries. So, it probably depends on whether enough of the developing countries accelerate this. The timeframe would still be very long, but you just shouldn't ignore the fact that this is a venue for

governments and it's a better venue than actually the venue at the ITU which is also very often taking up these issues. WIPO is actually more friendly to the voice of civil society, NGOs, and business on a balanced way than the ITU is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Marilyn. Next is Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN: I think it's important to distinguish that in the area of geographic names what WIPO is primarily concerned with, maybe even exclusively concerned with, are geographical indications. In other words, geographic names being used as indications of origin of products and occasionally services, but primarily products, often agricultural products from a particular region or place and protecting it in that regard. They're not interested as far as I can tell in protecting geographic terms as such and just protecting the name of a city because it's the name of a city, for instance, unless it's the ... And if it's a source, it's the source only for that particular good and not protected in a more general way, although that type of specific protection often translates into more general protections when it hits ICANN.

I would say that there is there [inaudible] in WIPO on geographical indications, but at this point, the treatment of GIs is so all over the map – no pun intended – that we are relatively far away from any type of harmonized treatment. There's no treaties. There's no registers in any consistent fashion. Treatment differs very strongly from country to

country. In some places, it's dealt with as a subset of trademark law. In other places, it's [inaudible], etc.

I think that it is likely that eventually there will be some sort of confluence on GIs and WIPO is as likely a place for that to happen. On geographic terms, per se, there have been attempts to put that directly into the Paris convention which is one of the international trademark conventions. Those attempts have failed and I'm not aware of any current efforts in that regard. So we should distinguish between GIs specifically and geographic terms generally. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Greg. I note a question from Judith in the chat. Judith, do you wish to ask this on the call? I think this might be aimed at Veni and he is not on the Zoom.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. Veni, the treaty that you sent around on e-mail – and thanks for that – what conference was that sent in for? Was it in a regional group?

VENI MARKOVSKI: No, no. It says it in the document itself. That's sent to the General Assembly. They will be discussing it in the fall.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Oh, so it's General Assembly. Are they also submitting it in their regional groups as well?

VENI MARKOVSKI: What do you mean by regional group?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: For the plenipot.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Oh, no, no. The [inaudible], no. I don't think so because that's a UN convention, so it makes no sense to put it in the plenipot.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah, because they have been discussing something like that in the plenipot with the [inaudible]. That's why I was asking. That's a big topic in plenipot.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Judith, and thanks for the reply. Any other points on Internet governance activities? Greg Shatan, your hand is still up.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I think he just left.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: He just said, "I need to run." It's just come up online. [inaudible] active ICANN participant who can certainly provide further info. Marilyn, please go ahead.

MARILYN CADE: If Nigel is still here, Nigel do you have the resolution from CSTD? I really apologize. I was not able to attend, but do you have that resolution?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, I certainly have it. I was going to circulate a note around the group explaining the context of this and how it came about. I can circulate the resolution that was agreed. Yes, I can do that.

MARILYN CADE: That would be fantastic because I think as we prepare for our face-to-face meeting I think we will want to take into account the outcome of that CSTD Working Group resolution.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this. I see [inaudible] and we then need to get moving on our agenda. I actually have a hard stop at the top of the hour. Agenda item number three, update on cross-community engagement group. The proposed charter was sent to the different SOs and ACs. The feedback ... I certainly have followed up recently with each one of the SOs and ACs since we haven't received any formal response so far. The response from the ccNSO is that they're going to work on it this week. Certainly informal discussions with Katrina Sasaki at the last ICANN meeting brought to light that there were some issues with regards to the grammar and perhaps some of the ambiguities in the charter, so we're actively looking forward to the response from them.

When it comes to the GNSO Council, the response so far is that they are waiting to discuss this in a bilateral with the ccNSO as well comparing notes. So, at present, the focus of the council has been on many other things as you might [inaudible] when it comes down to GDPR and tons of other issues there. So, that's also on standby at the moment, and in the meantime we'll just continue operating as we currently operate.

My suggestion is that we wait until the next ICANN meeting and perhaps ... I did ask if there were any concerns or questions from any of the SOs and ACs and SGs. In fact, the notes that I sent to the overall SO, AC, SGC, and RALO list, if any community wishes to discuss this in the face-to-face, thinking about it in the face-to-face meeting in Panama and no response was received. So, it appears that there's no real interest so far to spend much time on discussing the charter.

As I said, in the meantime we can just continue operating as we currently are operating. I'm not quite sure how this leaves us for next year. I gather that because this group uses virtually ... Well, very, very few resources, they probably can just keep on operating as it currently does. Any comments or questions?

MARILYN CADE: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Marilyn. You have the floor.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. My comment is a more general comment. I'm quite concerned about the budget implications and cutbacks that keep happening and that may affect ICANN's engagement and Internet governance activities. I don't know if this is the place to bring it up or address it under AOB.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Marilyn. We can certainly add this on AOB at the end, if we go swiftly through the rest of the agenda. We probably will, hopefully. We will add this on AOB. Thanks. Alright. Then let's move to ... Not seeing any other hands. Let's move to agenda item number four. That's the discussion for the preparation of the 2018 workshop proposal.

As you know, the deadline for submitting workshops for the forthcoming IGF is going to be the end of this week. That said, there have also been some requests to have an extension to this because at present there no knowledge of where the IGF would take place. There are strong rumors that this—

MARILYN CADE: But, but, but, but. There's only two options.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Two options, but they're very different. One is going to be in Thailand and one is going to be in Paris, in France. At present, this is information hot off the press. As of about a half-an-hour ago, the MAG was still not saying anything as to where this was going to happen, so there is no official response yet. Perhaps in the past few minutes something has

come up. I note Israel Rosas is putting his hand up, so perhaps he has the hot-off-the-press answer to this question. I don't know. Israel, you have the floor.

ISRAEL ROSAS: Thank you. Well, as you know, the rumors say that, but the official response for the matter is currently the two host countries doesn't have formal proposals, so there can be a formal announcement. However, it seems to be a matter of days to have a formal announcement. That's the [inaudible] information in the MAG list, but of course the rumors are pretty strong. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Israel. Judith also notes that one will be in November—

MARILYN CADE: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And one in December. Go ahead, Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: None of that matters. What matters is there's likely to be a one-week extension. In the meantime, we need to talk about what the content of the workshop proposal is. That's all. That's what we should be focused on, not rumor mongering about where it's going to be.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's what I wanted to ask and that's what I'm asking here. It says hear discussion for preparation of IGF 2018 workshop proposal. Bearing in mind we only have a few days left, so first question, should we propose a workshop? And secondly, if so, then what would you suggest? What topic would you suggest?

MARILYN CADE: I have a proposal, that we propose a town hall about the status of Internet governance since 2006. So, really make it a highly participatory ... If you remember, and I'm sure Israel will, I organized a main event. We brought two senior ambassadors from the UN – one from Latvia, one from the UAE. We did a town hall main session. Why don't we propose a workshop main session and we think about this as the lead-up ... 2019. I don't want to eat their lunch. 2019 is ten years after NETmundial, right? But, we could easily do a town hall event so we're not talking heads. We're doing something [inaudible]. Hey, let's invite those two same ambassadors from the UN to come and take stock of where we think Internet governance is 12 years after the first IGF.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this suggestion. Are there any thoughts on this for anyone on the call? I note that Judith is saying Marilyn is correct. We need to discuss the status of Internet governance since 2006. I gave a presentation on this at the North America School of Internet Governance.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: I like Marilyn's idea a lot. I think it's good. It will be good to have the two facilitators who are very good to come back, and maybe we could think of some other sort of people that were good and try to also to do have a lot of audience participation because otherwise people will get bored. It will be the same format. So, we need a little bit either a lot of questions in the audience or a lot of other different speakers that are very engaging and thought-provocative of looking at where do we go from here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Israel had his hand up.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm not seeing anybody else with their hand up at the moment. Oh, yes. Now I can see Israel. Israel Rosas, you have THE FLOOR.

ISRAEL ROSAS: Yes, thank you. I agree with the proposal of having a review of the status of Internet governance mainly because in recent years and months, we have some comments about [inaudible] new issues and new topics that could be or could not be part of the Internet governance landscape.

So, perhaps in this review, in this session, we could also tackle that issue of ... I mean, is artificial intelligence an Internet governance issue or not? Or even block chain or crypto currencies. If so, in which sense? Even taking into account that ICANN has a very specific and very narrow mandate area of interest. Perhaps we could help shape the conversation around which are the most important Internet governance topics regarding the ICANN community. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Israel. I note that Collin Kurre is saying taking stock X number of years later. It's the recipe that's been done many times in the past. What would make this ICANN-specific? Are there any thought on this? Again, we need to—

MARILYN CADE: Whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa. It's Marilyn. Sorry. I'm sorry, I need to understand what do you mean? What's ICANN specific? We're at the Internet Governance Forum. We're not ICANN specific. We are what is relevant to ICANN about Internet governance, but we're not ICANN-specific or tell me more, why are we ICANN specific? ICANN lives in a larger Internet governance ecosystem. We are not a cloud that exists by itself, right? The rest of the UN organizations, etc., affect us.

Are you saying that we have to say we can only talk about what ICANN does, what ICANN does, what ICANN does to justify? We're about Internet governance and how it affects ICANN, so help me with what this comment is about because I don't get it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Marilyn. Let's hear from Collin Kurre. Go ahead, Collin.

COLLIN KURRE: Hi. Hi, Marilyn. Can you guys hear me?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, very well. Go ahead.

COLLIN KURRE: Okay, great. What I meant to say was if ICANN is putting forth this workshop proposal – and I was just making the comment. Maybe I was a bit too pithy. That taking stock X years after WSIS or X years after event Y is something that's not necessarily unique. And I'm not thinking that we need to reinvent the wheel by any account. But, if we do want to put forth a compelling workshop proposal, then it might be good to kind of shake it up a bit or look at something.

I liked what you said in your next comment. What have we achieved since 2006? Maybe it was the taking stock or the phrasing of the idea that triggered something that was "seen it before".

I think if the CCWG is putting it forward, is putting forth the proposal, then I would expect to see something that was perhaps maybe coming from that unique and specific perspective, coming from an ICANN perspective either as an example of a multi-stakeholder Internet governance body or as the perspective of a technical operator.

Something like that, because the workshop proposal is otherwise quite generic.

The way that we could maybe strengthen a proposal that would otherwise be generic would be by partnering perhaps with other organizations or other bodies to co-submit a proposal that is taking stock. That way, it could be informed by multiple perspectives. I hope that clarifies my comment.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Colin. Israel Rosas has his hand up again. Israel, you have the floor.

ISRAEL ROSAS: Yes, thank you. Just to clarify also my position. I think that, of course, we are not ICANN. We are not ICANN staff. But, the cross-community working group on Internet governance [inaudible] understanding of how ICANN has a relationship with several Internet governance issues. Perhaps there could be some topics that could not be in [inaudible] relationship with ICANN. Perhaps we could try to talk about in another session or another way and try to take advantage of this specific [inaudible] that we are proposing as a unique way to engage with that community, with the growth community, the Internet governance community. But, about the work [inaudible] in ICANN.

I do think that we should try to be more ICANN-related session, but taking into account the broader community. But yes, building on the

idea that the cross-community working group [inaudible] in ICANN.
Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Israel. So, we have somehow a base for a workshop town hall. I'll share the points I have. I'm slightly concerned with something that is too generic and too open and just saying, well, taking stock ten years down the line. But because I'm also mindful of the criticism that this working group gets from ICANN communities in that it's actually not being [inaudible] by the activities that ICANN or activities that relate to ICANN.

Of course, so far we've always played the game correctly in that we have always followed a very ICANN-centric agenda. But certainly a mix with the ... What Marilyn is proposing and what Collin and Israel are responding and saying we can certainly try and do something that has an ICANN flavor to it might be able to fly when it comes down to our own internal politics.

Are there any thoughts on this? The concern of course being that it is very late in the game. Now, thinking about co-organizing it with other organizations is an interesting idea, but again we're very, very late [inaudible]. We have only two days left.

MARILYN CADE: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: Yeah. I'm not going to support organizing it with other groups because of the timeframe. I don't even know who those other groups are. Does that mean the ITU, WIPO, OECD, or is the proposal more of the same such as RIR or ccTLDs? I don't know.

The fact is anyone who wants to participate ... Our big issue is can we actually draft a workshop proposal that fits in the present call for issues of [themes] and do it in the next few days and get it signed off on? So, if someone could post the very short list of [themes] that the MAG has approved, I think that's important.

Secondly, let's not compete with ICANN. ICANN has an open forum. Last year they also did a [inaudible] event. That's not who we are. We're the CCWG IG. That is how ICANN should participate in the Internet governance ecosystem. If we're confused about that, then we should go back and revisit our mission. We're not telling ICANN what its job is. We're trying to help advise ICANN on how to be effective in the Internet governance ecosystem. That's different from the core mission of ICANN. It's trying to help ICANN survive in the larger Internet governance ecosystem.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Marilyn. Any other thoughts? Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thanks very much, Olivier. Just to confirm, yes, ICANN will submit for an open forum this year. We've got a couple of ideas on workshops which we're trying to pursue, but we're in the same boat as everyone else of course because the timeframes and because of the other various issues that we're having to confront at the moment, and of course because of resources as was mentioned, but we would hopefully do a workshop on something about GDPR. We might also do a workshop on looking at the DNS itself. We did a workshop at [Day Zero] last year that was quite popular and we might build on that and look at other related issues to the domain name system. And we might do a workshop on legislation this new initiative that ICANN is taking part in.

But, I agree. This doesn't [inaudible] I think has some merit, has to be framed in a certain way. But, it's [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this, Nigel. I'm heartened to know that there's other topics that are going to be addressed and certainly GDPR is one of them that is very important. Probably with a lot more history by the time the Internet Governance Forum takes place.

I note that we are somehow running out of time. What I would suggest then, taking it from here, I haven't seen any total pushback on this, but obviously we're just a small number of people on this call. What I would suggest is that we ... Marilyn, if you could drop a note of what you've said in your proposal onto the e-mail, I'll then create a Wiki page as we have done in the past with a link to a Google doc and we'll try and see if

within the next 24-48 hours can build something that holds the road with everyone involved and then submit it.

So, with regards to having it agreed on by everyone in the working group, I think we'll probably just have to issue some kind of a consensus call. And then with regards to [inaudible] the actual workshop submission, suggested panelists and so on, we've done that in the past and it seems to be quite a regular occurrence that everyone – and I've certainly seen that with many different workshops, so everyone is working frantically on the last day to just put it together and struggle with the system as it shows its bugs [under load]. If we're all okay with that ... I'm not seeing anybody saying no to this.

Our next agenda item is the preparation of the face-to-face meeting in Panama. I would suggest that we move this to the mailing list. It's pretty straightforward. I think it's likely to take place unfortunately again during a lunchtime. Is it either Tuesday or Wednesday lunchtime? I'm not sure yet as to what the choice will be. But, the topic itself will revolve around the interaction that we usually have with the Board Working Group on Internet governance.

I would say to ask Nigel on this actually whether the Board Working Group on Internet Governance was going to have a session and on what topic was that session going to be about?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you, Olivier. It's unlikely that the Board Working Group [inaudible] separate session in Panama, although it's possible. I mean, it

depends on the agenda because of the various issues that the board is confronting with GDPR and other issues.

But, the Board Working Group on Internet Governance did want to join our session, so Matthew Shears has reached out and we are looking at a lunchtime session as we discussed, Olivier. It's the usual problem with the way the meetings are, the agenda is settled. We find it almost impossible to be able to secure any slots. So, we're looking at whether it could be Tuesday or Wednesday lunchtime. Hopefully, we'll get confirmation on that. We were told we couldn't use the ALAC room, for example. Anyway, this is all detail which we can come back to. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. So, we move onto any other business. Marilyn Cade mentioned earlier or asked earlier when it comes down to the budget what kind of an impact is this likely to have with regards to Internet governance and ICANN or ICANN's involvement in Internet governance.

I have [inaudible] the budget and not seen that much [inaudible] government engagement, but Nigel Hickson, perhaps you might be able to give us some insight into this.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you, Olivier. I'm not exactly sure what I can say. The ICANN budget has been published, I think, as many of you will know. There's no drastic implications for government engagement. All the various ICANN

operating units will have a slightly reduced budget to comply to for things like travel and sponsorship and other support mechanisms. But, there's no indication at all that we wouldn't support this cross-community engagement [inaudible] one of my key objectives is to support this group along with Desiree and part of Desiree's time and part of Dierdre's time. We're committed to it and we'll continue to be committed to it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Nigel. I think the question goes further than this and more like is this likely to translate into ICANN participating less outside of ICANN walls and less in Internet governance circles? Is this likely to pull back on the government engagement department relations?

NIGEL HICKSON: It's true we'll have to look at priorities very carefully and if we have a reduced travel budget, which we will have, we'll have to look at this more carefully, but in general it won't. We'll continue to monitor the activities which Veni has talked about. We'll continue to be involved in the ITU discussions and the OECD and the WIPO discussions. We're committed to fulfilling our objective.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Nigel. It might be that ... I certainly see when it comes down to community regional outreach program travel which sometimes includes going into some of these Internet governance or

wider Internet governance circles that might be affecting those programs and might be affecting the community.

Marilyn, was that to answer what you were asking or looking for or are you suggesting ...

MARILYN CADE:

Actually, thanks Nigel, but I'm seeing since I review the budget for the BC I'm seeing some continued shifts that concern me about implications by the community and Internet governance activities. Certain things have been dramatically, Draconianly curtailed while other programs we are told, for instance – and I'm not asking you to respond. I'm just going to say this. But, we are told that our special projects that involve our ability as the community to engage in Internet governance activities are dramatically curtailed. I'll use the word Draconianly here. Yet, all of a sudden, there's a Next Gen funding. Nobody knows who these people are. They don't have an agenda. They can't find their way ICANN with paper bag. I mean, really. But, they're still being funded, but we don't even know how they affect ICANN generally let alone our Internet governance activities.

Other cuts are reflected so that people from the community will not have funding to attend or participate in the Internet Governance Forum or in the NRIs to reflect concerns about and support for ICANN.

I'm just putting that on the record. I think what you answered is what you and [Terry] and his team are going to do. My question was a much deeper question. I'm not expecting you to respond, but I'll bring it up

with the board and with the community during the upcoming ICANN meeting.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Marilyn, and thanks to everyone on the call. Nigel, your hand is still up. Did you wish to add anything or is that a hand that you wish to take down?

NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry, I'll take it down. I do apologize.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this. Thank you for attending this call. I'm afraid we're seven minutes beyond the official end of this and I'm late for my next call. You probably are, too, as well. Thanks to everybody. We'll follow-up on the mailing list and I'll try and follow-up in the next couple of hours with regards to the preparation for IGF workshop and the face-to-face meeting in Panama.

With this, this call is now ended. Thank you and have a very good day, evening, or morning, everyone. Bye-bye.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Bye. Thanks, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]