DESIREE CABRERA:	Okay, there we go.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thanks, Desiree. Welcome, everyone. Let's start the call with a roll call today.

DESIREE CABRERA:	Okay. In the room we have Alan Greenberg, Angela, Erich Schweighofer, Judith Hellerstein, Matthew Shears, Tatiana Tropina, and for the chair we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond. For staff, we have Adam Peake, Nigel Hickson, Veni Markovski and Vera Major, and myself, Desiree Cabrera. And we also have someone, it looks like, dialing in. The number is ending in 4501. I'm not sure who you review team, but please announce yourself and let us know who you are. And it looks like Greg Shatan has joined in as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thanks very much for this. Desiree, do we have an identity for the phone number ending 4501? None for the time being. Okay, well, we'll see when they speak. Welcome, everyone, to this call of the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance. Today, we're the 9th of August, 2018. The time is 16:03 UTC, and we've got quite a number of things to discuss today.

Nigel and I have had a discussion earlier last week and felt it was important first to get the ball moving and moving in time for us to |

provide responses to the ccNSO council and also to look at our – well, looking at our draft charter is not something we can do right now since we haven't got [actually any] responses for any amendments and so on, but to get the process moving on this.

And then to start preparing for ICANN 63. That's traditionally being the annual general meeting, it's traditionally the Internet governance public meeting that we have on one side, and also a face-to-face meeting on the other. And if we are to submit requests for two meetings, then we need to decide what we wish to cover for the Internet governance public meeting.

So that's the gist of the discussion today. Are there any other additional topics or any amendments that we need to make to the agenda? And it seems that at the moment, there is a problem on Adobe Connect. Is that correct, Desiree?

DESIREE CABRERA: It looks like some people are using a dial out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And [Tatiana here is grey,] but Becky is now able to hear us. I believe she's dialed out as well.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay, so dial outs are working. Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Dial out works for Becky, yes.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes –

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Yes, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Well, I say with hesitation because my relationship with Adobe is not particularly good, I don't think, but when we have used it for internal calls on the last couple of days, the only thing that works – so one hesitates to know why we use it at all, but the only thing that seems to work is the dial out or the dial in. So it doesn't work if you try and connect your computer to it. It just doesn't seem to work. So you have to request a dial – you know, you click to dial out, or you can use one of the numbers given in the link to dial in. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. I'm typing this as we speak on the chat, so for those people that are currently only on the Adobe Connect, hopefully, they should be reading the chat and will ask for a dial out. So for those people who have just joined us, welcome again, and as I was saying, we've got two quick things today.

First, we've got to look at the responses to the ccNSO council. As you remember, in our last meeting, we were going to respond to the ccNSO

council, and that was going to set the ball rolling for the further discussions afterwards with the other SOs and ACs in order to get some kind of a cross-community engagement group going.

The second thing is for us to choose what we wish to have for ICANN 63. Traditionally, we've had both a public meeting on one side and a face-to-face meeting on the other. The problem being that if we want a public meeting, we need to choose a topic. And it's better to choose it earlier rather than later. So my question that I've asked so far is, are there any amendment or additions to the agenda for today's call?

I'm not seeing any hands up. And welcome for those – I can see now nearly everyone is asking for a dial out. So that works. And yes, unfortunately, it looks as though the direct connection via Adobe doesn't appear to work, and that's what Nigel has confirmed in a previous call that he has held using the Adobe Connect system. So Desiree, maybe you can file something after this call to find out why this thing is not working.

In the meantime, I'm not seeing anybody put their hand up, so the agenda is adopted as is, and we can swiftly – well, we're not going to have any action items, review of action items this time, because the action items were included in the report that Nigel has kindly sent over to the mailing list, and these were basically that there were three main lines that we were to pursue. One is the work of a charter with the aim to finish and have the whole new charter proposed and agreed by Barcelona so the SOs and ACs can then decide whether they wish to partake or not in the CCEG.

And then the other thing was of course the preparation for the next three months. And as you know, we don't have an ITU meeting yet, but this is all happening immediately after Barcelona, so there are quite a number of things that we need to [track] until then and in preparation for the ITU plenipot on one side, the IGF on the other side, etc. So those were the main action items.

Let's move to the responses to the ccNSO council, and I invite you to open that Google doc which we have already shared in Panama when we met face-to-face. We didn't spend that much time on it. I did ask for feedback from anybody on this, and now that I'm – and I would like to thank those people who have contributed to this document.

Quite a few people have added notes now, it's quite a clean document now, and I guess this really serves as a last call for any amendments if anybody notes anything in there that's wildly out of line or that might raise an eyebrow and might kill any chance of the working group satisfying the ccNSO's needs and interests, or if there's anything which you believe needs to be added to what we have written so far.

These are quite extensive responses, and I'm hoping that this can be the basis for maybe a further dialog if the ccNSO has any further questions and so on that we can just have a quick interaction back and forth. Are there any comments on this? Is this thing ready to go, effectively? I know that I'm kind of putting you on the deep end right now, I can see several people are looking at the document, quite a few people looking at the document at the time. And the questions are in blue, these were the questions received by the ccNSO, and the answers are in black print.

The first question was really regarding the sort of need to discuss Internet governance issues amongst supporting organizations and advisory committees, and the question really was whether this is properly reflected in the proposed charter. We gave several examples and several points as to how it was structured and why charter is an important thing and being involved as a chartering organization is important.

Next one is, will the CCWG be able to initiate a statement that could imply position of the ccNSO on ccTLD-related matters without properly consulting the ccNSO? I think that's also a feedback we've received from the GNSO. A bit of a concern. And that's – the CCG will definitely not be able to initiate a statement that would imply position of any part of ICANN.

The only way that it would be able to issue some kind of a statement is if it was mandated by the or asked by the SOs and ACs that are its chartering organizations to perhaps facilitate discussions with the other SOs and ACs, should they be asked to put together a statement. But in the years that we've seen so far, the only statement that was put out by the CCWG was the NETmundial statement, and that was a very innocuous message of support in the early days.

And the next question was to do with, does the new charter provide a mechanism to ensure that [the] CCWG update the chartering organizations adequately and regularly? And this was [foreseen] in the original charter but never been [effective.] How will such a situation be avoided in the future? And there I gather that we explain why we are – we think the CCG will do better.

Certainly, the deliverables and reporting deliverables now are a little more detailed than they used to be, and also seem to be more easily achievable, bearing in mind that our staff support is basically Nigel and Desiree. So we are not dealing here with a huge team of people that are able to help in our communication. I gather that we also probably need to get our own members to be more vocal in the different chartering organizations when the question comes about the CCWG activities.

And the next one is, does the ccNSO need to invite more ccTLDs to participate as members, observers or otherwise, assuming the charter is adopted by the ccNSO? And really, the answer here is that it's up to each – up to the ccNSO to evaluate how many people it wants to send in there. Since this is an engagement group, I'm not imagining that we will have a strict set with members and observers, etc., because that's more of a discussion group that we have now. In fact, the way the CCWG has been run is very much open to everyone. So we've never really – well, in fact we've never enforced at all any point regarding who is a member and who is an observer and so on. We just had lots of participants in the group.

I'm still not seeing any hands up, so then there were additional questions after that. The first was, what is the envisioned role of a chartering organization of the proposed charter, and what is the added value for the group to be chartered by two or more supporting organizations? So there I gave – I think we have – I gave you those questions. So these, we have, let's see, one, two, three, four points regarding the envisioned role of a chartering organization, both to contribute through its members to the input and also to receive through its members the input that the CCG receives about the processes that it

follows, which of course is all to do with Internet governance and what's happening out there.

And then perhaps make some recommendations and discussions as to what might be required and what mechanism is best suited for action, and then providing leadership through appointing a co-chair is something that is envisioned from a chartering organization. And of course, the value of this is that we are facilitating communication across all of ICANN [inaudible] communication channel.

Is there a clear picture, an overview of all Internet governance-related activities within ICANN? And this of course is the question that came from the somehow confusing messages that were received when one looks at the board governance – sorry, the board working group on Internet governance on one side, the CCWG on the other, and also the work that the strategic initiatives group does, and the Global Stakeholder Engagement and the Government Engagement. So I think we've tried to explain a little bit how the whole thing fits together in a puzzle and how this group could be a nice one stop shop for those different groups to also exchange information in a more efficient way.

I still don't see any hands up, so I'll continue. Why would this group advertise ICANN at various fora, and who is represented? Again, shouldn't that be done in a more efficient and coordinated way? And there we have responded that the CCWG has indeed organized workshops and sessions at various Internet governance events, but it's never acted as the voice to advertise ICANN or held itself out as the voice of ICANN or of the ICANN community.

In fact, I think that most of the events, if not all of the events, have effectively been given as, you know, conveners of topic-related discussions with panelists chosen among the ICANN community and even people outside the ICANN community [if I recall] the IANA stewardship transition part. So it's just a channel to help out. So there's quite an answer on this one. I see that several people are working on this at the moment. Okay. Some stuff disappeared. Good.

Thanks for this, Greg, and thanks for this, Tatiana. We also have mentioned the importance of participating in these IG, Internet governance fora. And this is where there are several pointers to resolution of IP addresses and DNS-related resolutions, including a final ITU plenipot. And we've got the links to those, several resolutions, etc. which I think [put] some framing of the issues. Thank you for those people who have suggested this.

These are all the questions, all the answers to those questions. I see several people are working on the document right now, but Nigel Hickson has put his hand up. So you have the floor, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. Good afternoon. Yes, I think this is excellent the way [inaudible] doing this. I can perhaps offer a few up to date entries on the ITU thing, but I'll just do that later. But otherwise, I think this is really good. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Nigel. Thanks for your support. I gather that –

LORI SCHULMAN   I have a question. I'm sorry, it's Lori, I forgot to raise my hand because we're all on the bridge.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Lori. Welcome.

LORI SCHULMAN   Yes, thank you. I have a question about the language. I have to go back to the – I was looking at the document [inaudible] at the same time. There was just – at the bottom of the section about picking representatives of the group and we pick people who [inaudible] that is both clear and positive about ICANN. I might consider taking out "and positive." I mean there may be some people who have criticisms, and that criticism is welcome in the multi-stakeholder community. So what I wouldn't want is any language that sort of conveys the fact that it, for lack of a better word, is propaganda versus, you know, a clear and reasoned. So maybe convey a message that is both clear and reasoned about ICANN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. So if we take "and positive" out, it's – you're looking at page number – which page is that? That is page number three, I think.

EN

LORI SCHULMAN	Yes, and I was going to say that if you want two adjectives there, you can either say "conveys a clear message about ICANN" or "conveys a message that is clear and balanced about ICANN," "clear and reasoned." I would stay away from "positive." I don't want us to be seen as, you know, public relations. I mean it is, there's a public relations [section] here, I get it, but we need to be balanced.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thanks for this, Lori. "Clear and balanced," I've put the suggestion on the document itself.
LORI SCHULMAN	Thank you.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Instead of "positive." So "clear and balanced." I'm absolutely happy with that. You're quite correct, it does sound as though we then end up like a marketing agency for ICANN. So maybe not. Nigel Hickson, your hand is up.
NIGEL HICKSON:	I'm sorry, I hadn't taken it down. I'm not very good at this. Sorry. [inaudible]
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Alright. Thanks for this, Nigel. And thanks for this, Lori, that's helpful. I note several people are currently typing on the document. So we're not

going to do an online, you know, half an hour of drafting and things. The plan is to get this finished ASAP. So if we were to keep this document open until – well, let's say another 24 hours and then freeze it, accept all the changes and then send this out to Katrina Sataki and the ccNSO council with our apologies for taking so much time. Or I'll send my apologies for taking so much time to respond. And with Young-Eum in copy, Young Eum Lee, the co-chair for the ccNSO. Then we can proceed forward with getting the ball rolling.

If you recall, the idea was that once we get the ball rolling with the ccNSO, the GNSO will start the ball rolling as well, and we'll – the ccNSO and the GNSO are apparently having a discussion together before coming back to us. I've been told by Rafik Dammak, the vice chair of the GNSO, that the council is expected to make a move at or make a decision at the Barcelona meeting. So we need to prepare ourselves for this, and whatever move that is, whether the GNSO decides to engage in this group or not. I really think this has gone on for way too long, and I'm also a little concerned that the amount of time we spend on process is time that we don't spend on policy. So the sooner we can get this thing behind us, the better for all of us.

Excellent. And Tatiana, you mentioned you can copy GNSO if you want, regarding the answers that we're sending to the – so who should we copy if we were to send answers to Katrina Sataki? Do you wish to be copied? Are you the link now, the liaison? I mean there's no liaison as such because the GNSO is not a chartering organization anymore, but, okay, Heather, Rafik and you. Fantastic, thanks.

Alright, I think we spent enough time on the charter, so thanks to all of you. as I said, we'll freeze the document tomorrow, Friday at 16:00 UTC. Then I have time to clean it up and then send it out by the end of business day. Now, the next part of our agenda is ICANN 63. We've got, as I mentioned earlier, the possibility to have two meetings. I'm working with Nigel and also At-Large staff and Meetings staff, because I have the privilege of being part of the Meeting Arrangement Team, to try and get ourselves two slots.

But of course, what we need to work on is perhaps not the slots as we know we'll try and get the best ones that we can get, and this is why we're starting early. But what's more important is the topic, the topic of the public meeting. In the past, we've had all sorts of topics that were both related and perhaps less related to the direct work of the working group.

We've had proposals for a town hall, for a big discussion group, and getting feedback, getting people involved. Some of those formats have worked better than others. Most of the time, it's been related to the time at which we managed to get that public meeting. When it was at a good time, we had a lot of people. When it was at a less good time – or a worse time as one would call it – we had only a handful of people in the room.

So I'm opening the floor now for ideas and ideas for topics for an IG public meeting. I gather – I guess the first question I should ask is, you know, are we interested in having an Internet governance public meeting in Barcelona? If I understand correctly – and Nigel, you'll

probably correct me, but is there a GAC high level meeting that will take place in Barcelona as well?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thanks very much, Olivier. Yes. I mean Barcelona is a busy meeting, as we know, it's the AGM meeting, and the high-level session of the GAC meeting will take place on the Monday, so the Monday, the 22nd of October is the high-level meeting which will consist of a number of sessions on issues such as GDPR and Internet issues looking forward.

The [ITU is actually] generally speaking at the launch of that session.

But I don't think this, if you like, interferes with what we might wish to do as an IG public session. I think there are a number of items which we would be keen as Government Engagement to engage the community on. I mean by that date in October, we will have a fairly good idea of the proposals that are going to be introduced the following week in the ITU plenipotentiary.

We will also have a better idea on some initial questions in the minds of the high-level – sorry, of the U.N. Digital Cooperation panel, and I can say a bit about that later. They have offered to potentially have panelists come to our Internet governance public session and explain their thinking so far if we wish that. And of course, the IGF is also coming up in two weeks after our public meeting, so there's – sorry, of our Barcelona meeting, so there's quite a lot potentially taking place to touch on, but it's obviously up to this group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Nigel. I have a question for you with regards to the IGF. In fact, I'm sorry, I apologize for not having asked you before this call, but the group did apply for a workshop, if I recall correctly, didn't we? And if that's the case, was that agreed or not agreed, or did you check on this? Because I understand that the selected workshops have been published.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you. I thought we had clarified on the list, but perhaps not. So what happened, if you recall, we had these discussions and we did put in [a workshop but] we were late in our application, as you know. The IGF secretariat took it on board, and it was thought that this would make an ideal topic for a day zero session. But in the way that the IGF has panned out – and many on the call will be able to give greater detail of the IGF [perhaps], but the way that the IGF has panned out, there is no day zero as such, there's no sort of session where we can propose a number of workshops on day zero as we did before.

So yes, so we haven't got a workshop as such. Well, we haven't got a workshop for the CCWG-IG, and we didn't get our workshops that we proposed for the ICANN organization or the specific – well, we might have one, but we didn't get three. But yes, but anyway, there are going to be other occasions at the IGF where we can possibly input. But yes.

MARILYN CADE: Olivier, can I take the floor? Hello?

DESIREE CABRERA:	[I believe] Olivier's audio dropped, but he did say that Marilyn could speak next in the chat.

MARILYN CADE:	Thanks. So two comments that are about process, and then I'll go on to substance. First of all, we do not have either restricted or anonymous participants. So whoever they are, they really need to identify who they are. It's really a violation of our commitment to transparency for us to even assume that people log in with such registrations. So I'm going to ask whoever is managing the call to contact them and ask them, tell them they need to identify who they are.

Let me go on to substance. I do think it would be very helpful for – and thank you, Nigel, for your comment. I think it would be very helpful for us to have a public event, but I don't think it should be only about the ITU. I was actually quite surprised when you said that the secretary general is going to address the high-level group, which means he's going to lead the ITU plenipot and transport himself into [Paris] briefly. Quite amazing.

And I'm assuming that that is in a closed session, so let me just post that as a question to you to come back to. For our high-level session though, I think it would be important for us to be very welcoming to the new working group on digital cooperation, because we want to continue to be open and inclusive but also interesting to the ICANN community. And adding that as a segment in our public session, I think, would be – I think that would be extremely interesting to help us encourage broad attendance.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Marilyn?

MARILYN CADE: Yes?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, you're finished?

MARILYN CADE: Yes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That was rather abrupt. Okay. Thanks for this, Marilyn. So sorry, I dropped out at the beginning of what you were saying. But I heard there was some concern with regards to some of the people that were listed in the call. We've got a bit of a problem today in that for most people, they needed to ask for a dial out or to dial in directly. But Desiree Cabrera is tracking who is coming in and who is coming out. And so we will have a full listing of who is here. [No concern on that.]

MARILYN CADE: And – sorry, but people should announce themselves now as opposed to just post it later. So you could have announcements. I will announce I'm on the phone as 1196. But I think it's really important that we never lift the requirement that we are inclusive but also transparent. So

perhaps you could ask those who are – whoever "Anonymous" is, whoever "Restricted" is, and also 4510 to announce who they are.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks, Marilyn. I tried earlier getting 4510 to speak out, but it might be somebody who's dialed in and doesn't know what their actual number is. On the anonymous and restricted numbers, I think it sometimes comes from people dialing in using Skype or calling from abroad, and it doesn't actually give the full number. I don't know if anybody is on these calls. It's going to be a bit difficult to get Anonymous to speak when the person who's Anonymous doesn't know they are.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Olivier, it's Matthew.

MARILYN CADE: And, sorry, let me just wrap up here. I had asked for clarification, so can we go back to that before you go to Matthew? I can't imagine that the secretary general is leaving the plenipot. So I just want to verify, please, that report from Nigel that you're expecting the secretary general of the ITU to address the high-level meeting. Can you confirm that? And then sorry, Matthew, if we could then just go on to you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks for this, Marilyn. Okay, so that part I missed, so I wasn't quite sure. Let's have Nigel Hickson, please, and then afterwards, we'll

have – I see Veni has put his hand up, and then we'll go over to Matthew Shears. So Nigel, you have the floor.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Sorry, perhaps I wasn't clear. So I was talking – I think the question was in relation from Olivier's question, what is taking – is there a GAC high-level meeting taking place at the Barcelona ICANN 63, and I confirmed that this high-level session is taking place – or the high-level meeting is taking place – on Monday, the 21st of October, the Monday of the ICANN meeting, and then the ITU Secretary General is speaking at [inaudible] meeting. That's a week before the plenipotentiary starts. The plenipotentiary starts on the Monday or the Sunday, Monday the 29th. So he doesn't have to [pop back] or anything like that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. Next is Veni Markovski.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Yes, I was just going to add to what Nigel said, because I think this confusion comes that the plenipotentiary starts after the end of the ICANN meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks for this, Veni. The plenipot does start after the end of the ICANN meeting. And in fact, it starts – so you've got ICANN Barcelona, and then the plenipot starts on the 29th, if I understand correctly.

ICANN Barcelona ends on the 26th. Does that answer your question or your comments, Marilyn?

MARILYN CADE: It does. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alright. Thank you. Next is Matthew Shears. And sorry for making you wait, Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Just trying to clarify – thanks, Olivier – that I'm either Restricted or Anonymous. I've never quite been called that before, but that's because I'm dialing in through a local number in the UK. Thanks. And I cannot tell which I am.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Matthew. And you are – now you've been qualified, I've noticed you are Anonymous. And Restricted is Bartlett Morgan who is dialing in using Skype. So I think we've identified everyone. And 4510 is Angela. Excellent. Okay. Let's go back to our public meeting and face-to-face meeting. Any topic, any specific topic? Now, Nigel, you've mentioned one topic that we might have for the public meeting. Let's see if we have others. Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Sorry, I think it's up to others to – I just mentioned the potential to look forward to various events or various issues on the table at the plenipotentiary, but also the wider agenda, taking into consideration the U.N. panel and perhaps other [inaudible] developments taking place at the U.N. and elsewhere. I know we don't want to be event-driven, but I think there are some important dynamics taking place in the overall Internet governance space that we could focus on. But, I mean, this is just an idea.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thanks for this, Nigel. Well, look, if we're going to have 90 minutes for the public session – and you mentioned the willingness of those members, of some members of the U.N. Digital Cooperation panel to come and speak to us and make use of this opportunity to speak to us, I personally – it's just my view – am not sure that they should speak for the full 90 minutes but perhaps a section of the discussion, maybe a good 15-20 minutes of something could be used as a quick explanation from them as to what they're planning on doing, and then question and answer from the audience if that's – you know, so that's one avenue forward, but we obviously have other things to discuss as well. So what other topics could be discussed here? I see Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Thanks. So if we're going to do what I'm going to call – and I think would be good if we did this – kind of the roadmap ahead or the road ahead – maybe we call it the road ahead just temporarily here. I think it'd be extremely – I've already said this, I don't know if you were back –

effective to have the high-level panel, but giving them ten minutes to explain their purpose and t hen a more open dialog, it might depend on how many attendees we're going to have. I've been in touch with Chengetai and also with [inaudible] for different reasons around the fact that the IGF secretariat – probably [inaudible] now and Anja, will be attending.

I'm not suggesting they speak, I'm just referencing this. But I think it would be good to have a – so let's say we have a robust briefing about the high-level panel on digital cooperation and how it affects ICANN. That's one topic. We ought to have at least an update on the IGF and on the Paris Peace Forum, because I think those are relevant activities [yet] this year. It would, in my view, be helpful to at least have some kind of high-level view of what is being discussed at the U.N. that is of particular impact and influence to ICANN, particularly in the cybersecurity area. That's the one that comes, I think, most relevant, perhaps there are others.

And then I think we need to decide, are we talking to the end of the year, or do we want to reach into the first quarter of 2019 for the topic, the events that we [are int4erested in?] But I just want to, again, endorse the idea that we take advantage of the high-level panel on digital cooperation and use that as a way to really elevate the visibility of the CCWG-IG.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Marilyn. Do we know if the change – how do I say this? I gather you are aware that Chengetai is leaving the IGF.

MARILYN CADE: No, Chengetai is [inaudible] from the IGF to the Secretariat. That's why I mentioned that [inaudible] and Anja would be the people who speak about the IGF.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Because there's a job opening which was shown in New York for just nine days or something.

MARILYN CADE: I understand that's a yearlong – he's there, he's [inaudible]. I don't think we need to go into this. He would undoubtedly be one of the people who attends, but I thought we were talking about having panel members, not just the secretariat.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Not just the secretariat. That's a good point. And it's good to know that not just [inaudible], but others will be present in Barcelona. I gather that there will be quite a good turnout of people since it's not that far from Geneva. I note now Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Olivier, and others. Hello. I'm a bit lost here. Why are we talking about these high-level panels on [inaudible]? To me, it sounds like a big closed initiative. It never mentions multi-stakeholder,

but it doesn't look to me like it represents any threat with regard to what we are doing multi-stakeholder in the domain name system.

I personally do not consider it as an initiative that we want to legitimize by discussing it in our group. I am ready to be convinced otherwise, but I'm wondering how much time we can actually devote to discussing this initiative. I'm still ready to be convinced as to how it is relevant to what we are doing in this working group or engagement group. I'm not trying to [rebut] here. I'm just really … Well, let's say, puzzled a bit. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Tatiana. Do you not think that it's an opportunity for communication with those processes or with the people that are in those processes? [inaudible] being one of these processes that has arisen recently. So, communication is key. You mentioned that it doesn't mention multi-stakeholder anywhere, but maybe that's part of the discussion and part of the interaction that needs to take place with the members of this high-level panel. Is there an opportunity to discuss it with these people?

TATIANA TROPINA: Olivier, I'm ready to answer. So, I do believe that, okay, this is a new initiative. Maybe it is a [inaudible] initiative, like many of the UN initiatives. I don't know what the product of this initiative would be, but let me point something out. First of all, it is very closed. It is invite-only. What kind of added value is it going to bring?

And if I look at different initiatives like, for example, these global cyberspace security corporation initiative looks, for example, much more relevant to me with their [musings] around these public call of Internet.

But, instead of discussing this one … And I'm not saying that we have to discuss it, but if I compare different [inaudible] initiatives around, some of them look more relevant to me than these digital corporations because for now I don't see how it's going to really foster the dialogue or provide any channels of [cooperation] or engagement with the wider community or at least just a test project of someone in the UN, which will exist just to put the names of some people on the list and will never produce anything. Honestly, we don't know, and honestly I'm not convinced. And of course it can be one of the topics for discussion, but I don't think that any substantive discussion can revolve around this for now because I'm not convinced of the value of this initiative for this particular group in the ICANN context.

Then again, I'm not trying to say that I'm right here. I'm ready to be convinced otherwise. But, I really would like to see more substance here. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Tatiana. So, we've got different views on this panel currently on the call. Nigel and Marilyn, you still have your hands up. I'm not sure whether you wish to have the floor. Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much. I forgot to take it down. The reason I raised it is simply because they had indicated to us that it might be a possibility that some of them would be in Barcelona. I mean, no one has asked let's be in the IG public session. It's just that some of them have indicated they might be in Barcelona to try and understand what is considered to be a fairly mature multi-stakeholder process, just because that's part of their remit apparently.

I'm not trying to say this is good or bad or anything else. I'm just saying that some of them might be at the ICANN meeting to try and understand how the multi-stakeholder process works in terms of policy development, so there would be an opportunity for them to come along and just update us for ten minutes, plus five minutes for questions or whatever on what they're doing. And I think we could do it in a fairly neutral way, but it's obviously up to the group.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Nigel. Marilyn Cade, your hand is still up.

MARILYN CADE: It is. Thanks for giving me the floor and I think maybe then Veni is going to speak. I really appreciate the opportunity to comment on this. I spent the last six years of my life in UN working groups at the CSTD, the Commission of Science and Technology. Thank goodness I had Nigel there for most of those events, and some others who are on this call as well.

The issue of enhanced cooperation is a very, very sensitive issue that never achieved the kind of fulsome acknowledgement across the government that we needed from ICANN's perspective. Very few governments managed to block the [acceptance] that we are already engaged in cooperation in the digital space.

This UN working group – and I'm not going to agree it's closed because all UN groups have limited appointments. The CSTD working groups that I was on had [inaudible] huge work, on my part – and I will just say that I was the architect of this. We had 20 governments and then we had five plus five plus five. Five members from the business community, five from the technical community, five from civil society. It was never enough, but it balanced out.

I think this group is going to examine digital cooperation and ask are we doing enough? I spent a lot of time looking at their terms of reference. Are we doing enough and how can we get the government to do more in engaging with stakeholders?

So, just want to be clear that, although the term multi-stakeholder is not used, there is a huge recognition of engagement with strengthening cooperation between government, the private sector, civil society, international organization, the technical and academic communities. That translates into multi-stakeholder. Perhaps not the same word, but the same intent. I just wanted to really reinforce the importance of that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Marilyn. You reminded me that I have unfortunately forgotten to give the floor to Veni Markovski who had put his had up

earlier. Veni, with my apologies, you have the floor. I'm not sure whether you are able to speak now. I note that your phone has some funny-looking logo on it.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Actually, I already spoke.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You did? Okay. It was very short, then. Sorry. Alright, so the queue is clear. I'm getting some growing feeling that there is some interest in this group to have part of the public meeting being on the UN digital cooperation panel. Not giving them too much time. Tatiana proposes five minutes, no more. Others propose a bit more.

Looking at the overall thing, if we have the UN digital cooperation panel, the ITU plenipot update and discussion which is probably likely to be the hottest thing at the time, since we will by then have many, if not all, of the proposals and the IETF update and discussion, bearing in mind that I understand this is going to be back-to-back with – is it a peace conference or something? Details are slowly coming up.

Then, we could, if we take 90 minutes in total, have maybe 15 to 20 minutes let's say on the digital cooperation panel, just over 30 minutes, 35 minutes on the UN plenipot update and another 20 minutes on the IGF update and discussion. I'm hearing Marilyn Cade just about to fall off her chair. Marilyn?

MARILYN CADE: I am. I'm sorry. Can you just say again how many minutes you want to allocate to the ITU?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well, it's not the ITU. It's the plenipot. It's an explanation of the different points that are coming forward, etc.

MARILYN CADE: Excuse me. I have more expertise than even some of the ICANN staff on the plenipot and it is the ITU. It's Marilyn speaking. I want to be clear who I am. We can do a lot with written briefings. We shouldn't give the ITU anymore time than we give other important groups or we are giving a bad message. So, you want to give them 20 minutes, then you give 20 minutes to the other entities as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Marilyn. So, when give the ITU 20 minutes, do you mean give the ITU topic 20 minutes? I don't think I wanted the ITU to speak for 20 minutes, a representative from the ITU to speak for 20 minutes.

MARILYN CADE: Well, I'm not sure [inaudible] involved in ITU speaker. That's not what we … Why did we have an ITU speaker unless we have a UNESCO speaker, a UNDP speaker, an [inaudible] speaker? Why have an ITU speaker? I thought we would have a conversation about hot topics at the ITU plenipot that are relevant to ICANN. That wouldn't be done by the ITU.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct. What you're saying basically is we shouldn't give more than 20 minutes, let's say. If we give 20 minutes on UN digital cooperation panel, we shouldn't give more than 20 minutes on the ITU topics, hot topics.

MARILYN CADE: Or any other group. We need to think about who we are. We are an international organization and we should provide factual updates ahead of time, so we then maximize the discussion. By the way, what are we planning on doing? Asking the ICANN community to say, "Hell no, we won't go. We don't like merging the [ITRs]"? Well, we have to think about what our consultation process is, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That can be worked out closer to the time, Marilyn. I'm just trying to set out at the moment big lines of what the topics might be for a public session. Then, if we are to conduct a consultation or to try and ask people in the audience things, then obviously we're probably going to have to prime the community with maybe an update on what's cooking and then also what their views are on this. But, I'm not sure this is … I wasn't thinking in that much detail at this point in time. Anyone else to chime in on this? any thoughts?

So, 20 minutes on UN digital cooperation panel, 20 minutes on UN plenipot update and discussion on those hot topics, 20 minutes on the

IGF update and discussion and preparation [inaudible] same time. Tatiana Tropina, you have the floor.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you, Olivier. I am still against 20 minutes on digital cooperation panel. Is it really bearing the same importance of the ITU plenipotentiary? I am a bit lost here.

But then, with regard to the agenda, I do believe that just making a kind of strawman right now and then populating it with more ideas would be the best way to go forward, otherwise we're just going to get into the weeds right now instead of just seeing a bigger picture and painting a bigger picture. But, I do believe that giving the same time for digital cooperation and ITU plenipotentiary [inaudible] is a bit beyond me, although I understand that I might be in the minority here. I'm just really puzzled, perplexed here. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Tatiana. I guess we probably need more time to see what time allocation we provide on each topic. But, at least what I'm happy with is we've at least now got three topics and if anyone suggests a fourth topic … If that's not the case, we have our work cut out for this.

I was going to ask Nigel one more question. Regarding the preparation for the ITU plenipot, is your group or are you putting to, you or any other partners – and I'm looking here, for example, at the UK's multi-stakeholder advisory group on Internet governance or perhaps the Internet Society. Some of the groups that are known to be quite

proactive before a plenipot meeting. Is there anyone out there that is putting together some kind of a table that shows the different proposals and different issues that are there so we have an easy glance and we can focus on the topics that affect ICANN or is that not something currently done?

NIGEL HICKSON: I'm so glad you asked that. ISOC I suspect will do their usual matrix of proposals and where they affect the Internet community. That is always a very worthwhile document. We will be doing some sort of spreadsheet with the proposals and how they might affect ICANN in any sense. We'll be doing this because it will be useful, we believe, for the working group on Internet governance. It's something we touched on in our last discussion at the Panama meeting and also for others in the ICANN community.

So, yes, we'll be happy to circulate that before the Barcelona meeting, I hope. Actually, on the call today we have a new member of our team here in Geneva, [Vera Major], and she's working on that because my skills are very limited when it comes to that sort of thing. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's great. Thank you very much for this, Nigel, and welcome [Vera] to this happy family that we have here. Judith Hellerstein, you're next.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi. [inaudible] is going to be doing a matrix. Probably it will be ready before the Barcelona meeting. I'll have some more information for you

about that later, but I know they are going to be doing it. They just haven't gotten started on it yet.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Judith. I gather currently not all the proposals have been received so far. I guess it's still all being built as we speak.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yeah. So, the proposals are all not in. They are waiting probably for the last of the regional meetings to be happening. Next week is an African one and [inaudible] the week after. They're waiting for a bunch of these regional meetings to be finished, so that more of the [common] proposals and other ones are out there. Some people, some countries may not even meet that and they may do [inaudible] proposals later on. It's a bit up in the air right now.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Judith. We'll follow up, then, after this call. I think we've got our work a bit more cut out now. So, what I noted is for the public meeting we have three topics for the time being – the UN digital cooperation panel, the plenipot update and the discussion on the hot topics that would emanate from any of these matrices that will be built soon, and the IGF update and discussion.

Let's not put times around it. I expect that there will be maybe a part of an open discussion part where we can let our community interact on any of those topics and maybe even more. I even wonder whether … And I'm sighing. You might not hear it, but sighing as if some of the

community might wish to discuss the charter in the open session, although I'm not sure I probably would go and drown myself in the Barcelona Mediterranean Sea if that happens. I'd rather discuss substance than process.

Speaking about this, I think we've got a process, a way forward, and we can move to any other business on this call. This is a one-hour call only.

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, if I may, were you going to touch on the face-to-face meeting?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Nigel. Thank you for reminding me. I always think of the face-to-face meeting as being easier to organize because part of the face-to-face meeting is interaction with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. I would certainly invite Matthew to chime in on how we're going to proceed forward with this.

The other thing, of course, with the face-to-face meeting is that there we will indeed have a discussion about the charter, but probably more about the feedback we would have received by then from any potentially chartering organizations.

So, we should leave some time aside in that face-to-face meeting for an interaction with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance and another part, maybe 20 minutes or 30 minutes, to be used as needed on the follow-up to the cross-community engagement group, if that flies of course. If it doesn't fly and no one wants something to continue, then

we could use that 20 minutes to say goodbye to each other. That was a joke. Well, maybe not, actually. Who knows?

So, we'll definitely need to get the agenda – use some time for that. Does that fly, Nigel? Is that okay with you for the time being? I see Matthew Shear has put his hand up. Matthew, you have the floor.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Olivier. I think that makes sense and I will be working to ensure that we get some time, along with Nigel and others.

Just one thought, though, on that face-to-face. Hopefully, there won't be an extended discussion of the charter. I think I agree with those who have posted in the chat that we really need to get that finalized beforehand.

I'd actually like to talk a little bit about how we're going to operationalize it, how we are going to encourage this, what we're hoping is going to be a very fruitful exchange on Internet governance issues and challenges and how we're going to actually enable this to happen and what the mechanics of that would look like so that we can actually start moving into the substance rather than the process discussions. So, if we can spend some time on that in face-to-face, I think that would be very useful. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Matthew. Do you mean just operationalize the charter or operationalize the relationship with the Board Working Group as well?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Well, I think one of the challenges that we've had in the past has been actually moving into a substantive discussions about what are the Internet governance or Internet policy or cybersecurity issues that may be coming up that we need to share with the rest of the community or the community hopefully shares with others. I think it's that element that we need to focus on. What's the mechanics of that to happen and what do we do with that information when we have it and how do we share it? That's what I'm interested in getting to, so that when things to percolate up through the community, how are they brought forward? How are they brought into the [CCG], to the attention of the board and things like that? Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Matthew. That's noted. I think that can be the main topic of our discussion with the Board Working Group. So, we'll all be able to contribute to this. Hopefully, indeed, by then the charter will just be a little sidetrack of saying, "Thank you very much everyone for having helped on this. We're moving forward."

Okay, I'm not seeing any other hands up. Nigel, you wanted to speak just before Matthew.

NIGEL HICKSON: No, I think what Matthew said is fine. I'm very happy. Thank you. Just to note, Olivier, presumably will now take this forward in some way with

the meetings team and with other players to try and get suitable slots. I know it's always a challenge, but we'll do our best.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. As I mentioned, I'm going to push this one up. We'll set up … Well, I'll send an e-mail out after this call. Maybe not immediately afterwards, but in the next 24 hours, to Gisella Gruber who is the person in At-Large who's been usually booking our rooms because an advisory committee or supporting organization needs to be booking the room, otherwise we end up with booking those after everyone else has taken those rooms and we end up with the worst possible times.

So, I'll get her, you involved, and also [Tanzanika]. I have asked [Tanzanika] privately about how we can proceed forward with putting our names through early enough so as to get better times.

I also understand that the GNSO Council has not yet finalized their schedule, either, so we're moving a little bit with a lot of goal posts around, but as long as we can get a good time, I think everyone can work around it.

I think that's it, really. I think that's what we'll do. So, as a follow-up, I'll follow-up with you and with Gisella and [Tanzanika] by e-mail, and hopefully we get a good slot or a good couple of slots. If anybody has any preference for those slots, could they please e-mail me or Nigel? Then we'll be able to make our decisions from that and make the requests from this.

EN

Thanks, everyone. Just AOB now. Any other business? I'm not seeing anyone put their hand up, so I'd like to thank everyone for joining in. It was quite a good lineup today. Our next call is not happening next week. We'll wait a couple of weeks until we think of another call. It's probably likely to be in early September. Either very late August or early September. But, we'll send a Doodle out as per usual so as to find the most suitable time for everyone.

Thanks, everybody. Have a very good morning, afternoon, evening, or night. Take care. This call has ended. Thank you. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]