
BUENOS AIRES – CCWG-Internet Governance F2F Meeting

Wednesday, June 24, 2015 – 17:30 to 18:45

ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So we have an online room, in case anybody wants to log in. We'll have the agenda in there. Okay. Let's start the recording, please. All right. Good afternoon, everybody. Welcome to this CCWG on Internet Governance Face-to-Face Working Group Session. We're here in Buenos Aires with maybe a quick follow-up from the discussions we had earlier this week I think it was on Monday. It feels like such a long time ago.

Our agenda today is quite straightforward. First, we're going to be looking at the membership changes that we have asked the SOs and ACs, and find out if we've had positive replies with a no-objection reply from the SOs and ACs on widening the group's participation to fall in line with the participation in other cross-community working groups in ICANN.

And then we'll look at the calendar of forthcoming activities, and the plan here is to actually plan for the next session of topics so as to be a bit proactive on these. I think that we'll also, probably, be discussing following up on the meeting we had on Monday, which is whether this group is looking forward to actually contribute to these topics by actually drafting statements, etc.

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.

It was a discussion we started a little bit on the conference calls, but having everyone face-to-face will probably make the dialogue much easier. Rafik, do you want to add anything?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

So about just introduction. Basically, I think about the item number two and so on. I think in term of operational issues, we are done. And, I guess, for us, we have to focus now in more of the substantive part and I hope that, from this meeting, we will have this to create the momentum for us as a working group to give input. This is what we agreed on. So this is my main point of view here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much, Rafik. A couple of housekeeping notes, of course. Say your name when you start speaking so that we can have all of this transcribed with the correct names. Secondly, also, at the moment, we don't have any remote participants. So I'll be checking on the hands in the Adobe Connect room in case there are remote participants that wish to speak.

And thirdly, Young Eum Lee, the third co-chair of this working group, is not able to make it because she's still at a ccNSO meeting at this present moment, so she sends her apologies.

Let's go, then, I guess, quickly to the CCWG on IG membership and hope that we don't spend too much time on this so that we can actually dig into the substantive issues. Just before running on that,

does anybody wish to suggest any additions to the agenda that we have on the screen at the moment?

Okay. I don't see anyone putting their hand up. So let's move on to that. Can we have a – because I see here, there's a link to the charter. So for any of you that are in the room.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I cannot [inaudible]...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, you can. It works.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, I cannot share [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, maybe. Yes. Who has this...? Oh, there you go. So we'll be sharing this document in a moment. So this is not the redline document as such. I was hoping that Bart Boswinkel was going to be in the room because he's been shepherding this process. Effectively, what we were asking the SOs and ACs was to widen the membership of the working group originally, and that's in number five. If you can scroll down to number five, please.

There is no one here.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] co-chair is here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, co-chair is here. Welcome, Young Eum Lee. Sorry. I had sent your apologies but well done for making it here quickly.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: We finished early.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: You can move it over here, you can [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You've made me a presenter, and it doesn't show anywhere at the moment because I need to share my screen. This is the screen over there. So if we can move down to number five please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I've opened it already, but it doesn't open everywhere else.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: And Lynn says she's at the CCWG session. She can't make it, either.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Lynn St. Amour. We have apologies from her. Okay. Thank you. Okay. Members, staffing organization...

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Marilyn Cade says she's [inaudible] on the way, apologizes, but is going to try and dial in.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Peter, for this. And when Marilyn comes on, if staff could just let us know. There's no Adobe...

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: There's no Adigo session.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There's no Adigo. Well, hopefully she'll have Internet somehow somewhere. We'll see. Right. So as it stands at the moment, the charter says, "The working group shall be comprised of participants who may be either members, observers or experts." And we defined the members as being the people that are allocated to the working group or nominated to the working group by the respective supporting organization and advisory committee.

And when it comes down to the observers, they are people that, I guess, don't have much right to speak. They're just there to observe and listen in on the conversations and so on. It was felt, in the view of other cross-community working groups that have recently, and not so recently, been created, I guess. The one on stewardship and the one on accountability that we could broaden this to be participants. So we'd have members and participants, and the participants would have exactly the same right as the members to speak.

But if it ever came down to a vote, then only the members would be voting. That was sent to the different SOs and ACs, and the question that was asked from the SOs and ACs was whether there was any objection to this widening of the membership as such, and the response, I'm only working from memory and I will have turn over to Renate. I believe that the response, so far, has only been positive, but I haven't tracked who has responded so far.

So Renate will look it up. Rafik tells me that GNSO has responded and said it's okay. The ALAC has responded and said it's okay. I believe the SSAC has responded, as well. Young Eum, I'm turning it over to you, and sorry to put you on the spot, but are you aware whether the ccNSO has considered this expansion and whether they have sent their no-objection consent?

YOUNG-EUM LEE:

Actually, for this meeting, we weren't able to discuss the CCWG Internet Governance during the ccNSO meetings. I will circulate the document to the list and get back to you the results.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Are there any other updates, I guess? Well, maybe we shouldn't spend any more time on this topic. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. I think recall that Bart sent some response some time ago about this issue. So just trying to check the communication from him. So I think the ccNSO confirmed, but just I'm checking. Yes. So what he's saying that the letter has already shared with ccNSO Council, and it will be in the upcoming meeting again.

So which upcoming meeting that was done in the 16 April, so I guess they have already, but we didn't hear from them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We didn't hear from them. Thank you, Rafik. Maybe we could have an action item to follow up with the ccNSO, please, to find out what their decision was. Perhaps I could task Young Eum with this action item. Thank you. Actually, I don't have the right to task another chair, do I? Sorry for the choice of words. Could I kindly suggest?

Right. Let's not waste any more time on this procedural. Anybody who wishes to comment on this? Are there any comments or questions or shall we just move on to the next part? I see no one putting their hand up, so let's go down to agenda item number two. Three, sorry. And let's have a look at the calendar for economic activities.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Olivier. Sorry. Alejandro Pisanty here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, Alejandro.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: I am not a member, I have been designated. I don't know if everybody here is. Can we know that? I mean, I just have to leave.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much, Alejandro. So the way that we've operated so far, actually, was to already operate with our new proposed rules as such. As an observer, I guess, you can be given the floor if the Chair allows you to the floor, if we're still running by the old rules. So there is absolutely nothing that would ask you to leave the room in any way. So that's fine. You're absolutely welcome here.

Now, in the agenda, you have a link to the global Internet activities for the rest of this year. I think that our plan was really to start looking at each one of the topics that we have, each one of the meetings that are coming up and to plan our own activities as to how we want to prepare for this and whether we wish to set ourselves some deadlines on this.

I know, Nigel, you wanted to say a few words, perhaps, first. Or should we just open our floor for our first set of feedback on this? It's unfortunate that Marilyn Cade isn't here, since she's very much intent with all of the different forthcoming meetings that are taking place outside of the ICANN walls. But I open the floor, quite openly at the

moment, to see if there are any suggestions as to how we should proceed to go through each one of these and say whether we should go forward.

Peter Dengate Thrush?

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thank you, Chair. Can I start, perhaps, at a higher level, a matter of topic? I have very much appreciated the fact that Nigel and staff have circulated prior to ICANN staff – particularly Fadi – speaking at some of these events. We’ve seen a preliminary draft or an indication of that, and people have come back and made I think what have been taken as sort of helpful suggestions. So I recommend a continuation of that practice.

I was wondering if we can sort of beef that up a little to make it more useful. Can we actually have a copy of the speech as delivered, for example, posted on the website for this working group? So that when people are looking for what’s going on in IG matters, and there’s the Chief Executive speaking about Internet governance at an Internet governance event, there’s the text of the speech, for example.

We’re just looking at ways of making this information more accessible and more easy to find and more relevant. That would be helpful for all of these events [inaudible] it’s not about any particular event, just a [meta] message for as we go forward.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for the suggestion, Peter. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, good afternoon. Nigel Hickson, Government Engagement Team staff, whatever. Thank you, Peter. What we've tried to do in our ongoing relationship and, of course, this is still early days for this cross-community working group is to share in advance when we are preparing an input for a conference or we're preparing an input for a Under negotiation or whatever. Sometimes it's not possible because of the timeframe or because of other circumstances, but where we can do it, we will do it.

In terms of circulating speeches that Fadi has given or Fadi Chehadé or perhaps even other people who hve given at various events, there's not a problem with the public events. With Fadi Chehadé usually the problem is actually getting the speech. Because, as you know, he tends not to use written notes. He speaks from the heart, so to speak.

But if I'm there, I usually do try and take a note, and so that note, I think, we circulated on one or two occasions. And yes, I mean, perhaps we should make sure we do it on a regular basis. So thank you for the...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Nigel, for this. I do note that in many of these conferences, there is some kind of recording taking place, whether it's video or audio. Would that perhaps be one way, if there is no written speech, to have at least a record of what Fadi said? And perhaps to

have a repository for this specifically? Is there currently a repository on the ICANN website for this?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes. I mean, some of this is on the wiki, but probably not necessarily all in the same place. So as I understand it, we have a location for this working group, don't we? So we can make sure that that material is at that location.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Nigel. I see Renate going, "Oh, more work." It looks as though we probably do have to beef up our wiki pages and perhaps have a segment or a location where we can either point to any location for the video or audio record of those speeches. But also, if we do get the speech in advance and we can have that repository there.

I know that we don't have that many staff to do this, but it's, I guess, if we want to progress and actually have a good record of things and good access to these resources so that we know what's been said and perhaps take action on them and build on them, we need to have a home that is at least furnished to some extent. Any comments? Bill Drake?

BILL DRAKE:

Thank you. I don't have my computer in front of me, so I don't remember, but does this group live on the main ICANN page at all? I

mean, there's lots of stuff on the main ICANN site about the CWG and the CCWG. Is there any kind of organized spot for cross-community initiatives or other things? One thing that I just wonder about, because a lot of people actually don't really peruse confluence that thoroughly and some people find it a little bit oddly organized and sort of just you have to dive into it.

If we decide that we want to have a little bit more ambition to the activities of this group, or at least a little bit more visibility for the activities of this group, it might be sensible to have at least some small outpost on the main page, as well, just to establish some collective consciousness that we exist.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Bill. Before responding, the answer I think is, no, there isn't any space on there. But then the only groups that are there that are listed are the SOs and ACs. So I don't see, apart from the CWG and CCWG, I don't see any other CWGs or CCWGs that are listed. And there are other CWGs and CCWGs, but usually they're housed in the home of the respective organizations that are chartering them. That's where the [link] goes to. I've got Veni, and then Judith. So Veni Markovski?

VENI MARKOVSKI: Very quick. It's on the front page lower right corner. There is a link to all the groups.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Of all the CCs?

VENI MARKOVSKI: Of all the groups. You open and you have every group connected there, and it says, it's particularly there is a beautiful picture, and it says ICANN Groups.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: But Veni, these are the SOs and ACs. These are the ALAC, the Board, the Address Supporting Organization, the ccNSO, etc.

BILL DRAKE: Yeah. I think my point is more generalizable, too. Because more and more work is being done on a cross-community basis, I would think, also. We might even suggest to Chris that there be some aggregated space for these things to exist. And then if the pointers go off into confluence for details, that's fine, but at least they have it visible there. It might not be a bad thing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much, Bill. Let's have Judith Hellerstein.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. I've had discussions, recently, with Laura Bengford, who is redoing the ICANN website, and she was actually talking about this very issue today of how she could easily put out little pointers to different groups, and also put direct links into the confluence wiki for

different events and everything like that to make it a lot easier to search in the ICANN homepage and for having direct links. So I would say just that we meet with her and discuss what is possible, because she was saying it's very easy to be done.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Judith. And just for the record, I think Laura's working on the new website. I have a feeling this is a long-term thing. So it might be going on for a few years until we see anything coming up.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Right, but she was saying that something could be done. She wanted to show me what could be done, and she had something [excellent] to show you to link. And so maybe that could be, I've done for this working group, as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, understood. Let's move on, I think, from the website now. A few more words?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yeah, quick I guess if you want to ask to put that on the spot we can ask [inaudible] responsible for the IT service and so on, and he worked on the website. That way, I think it will be [a quick way].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Rafik. Can we have that as an action item and can you record the action item with...? Okay. So website, past speeches, past interventions. That's a first step. Where do we go from there? Where do we go more generally?

I mean, we've got the forthcoming activities. I don't have them all in my head and I can't read them because they're very, very small on my screen, but there are a number of events that are coming up. There are a number of things. Where do we go from here? How do we go about engaging with them and preparing for them? I see Peter has his hand up.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thank you. Again, at a high level, we've got a whole series of events and we had a timeline at the session the other night starting I think with the [United Nations] on the 1st of July, and then the 2nd July or 3rd of July and 4th July. These are just a matter of weeks away.

What we've talked about is preparing an actual ICANN position on the WSIS extension, which I think would probably only run to a page. Most of that would be describing, in the usual way who ICANN is, who this working group is, and the actual declaration of principles part would be probably four or five paragraphs.

But there isn't actually any bottom-up community-derived ICANN position that I know of on the WSIS or the extension of the IGF, although all of us I think have a common view, and we've got staff and the CEO and people participating on the basis of that assumption.

So it seemed to be it'd be helpful if we could have – and I'm not talking something complex or contentious. This group could actually develop that, and it could have the input and the support, and we could send it back through the co-chairs to the ccNSO and the other SOs and [inaudible]. And that would be, then, a community-derived position, which our warriors can arm themselves when they go in to do battle in these various fora.

Because, at the moment, all they've got is a very long history of supporting and here's now the official, if you like, the community bottom-up position. So that could be something we could aim at sort of having finished, if possible, by Dublin. [inaudible] any contentiousness about this, it's going to be writing down what the actual position is and proving that everybody agrees with it.

If they don't agree with it, of course, if there is any contention, well then we really should find out about it. I'm pretty confident there isn't. I think most people at ICANN have got a reasonably supportive view of the IGF and the WSIS process, and want to see it carried on. If so, why not say so? Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Peter. Young Eum?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Thanks Olivier. I actually, basically, agree with Peter in saying that it would be good for us to come up with a position. But I think it was Marilyn who voiced the concern that we do not have the mandate

from the SOs. Of course, we can come up with one and then go back to the SOS and try to do that, but if I remember what we did in NETmundial, we came up with a position, we had this public session, and we had the feeling for the session.

I don't know if we are chartered to come up with an official ICANN position. I would just like to go for a community sort of feeling kind of position. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Young Eum. David Fares?

DAVID FARES: Thank you. I'm not really sure why we don't have a mandate. I understand our mandate being giving advice to ICANN about how it engages in Internet governance activities, and therefore, whatever statement we produce would be a statement that we could present to ICANN and say, "This is the position that the community has established." It doesn't have to be to the WSIS directly, but it will be made public. We can make it public if it's directed to Fadi or whomever within ICANN staff. So you can achieve the same goal within our mandate, I believe.

And I would just argue that I think, perhaps, we need to have a general set of guiding principles for ICANN around Internet governance issues outside of ICANN activities. It's something I think I mentioned several times through the working group in the CCWG, so that I think the staff and the leadership of ICANN have a clear statement from the

community as to what we think ICANN should and should not be doing in the IG space.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, David. Bill Drake?

BILL DRAKE: So if we all recall to the beginning of this process. Last time we were in Buenos Aires, we were looking forward to the NETmundial. And Fadi had that 7:00 AM meeting with 1,000 people in the room where he sort of said there's these threats to the ecosystem and we must do this and that, etc. And we decided sort of on the fly we'll create this working group. And actually, at the time, I remember him whispering to me on the stage, "How many working group should we have?" I said, "One." He was thinking of multiple, which I thought, "Wow."

We set, as our first objective, to provide an [inaudible] to NETmundial, which we did, I thought, quite nicely. But then after that, I think, really, it's not been clear whether everybody had a shared vision that we would be doing any further independent speaking for the community separate from ICANN, the organization.

And I think that that's just been sort of the unresolved thing that's been in the air. And when Marilyn has, at times, and I think people from IPC also have, at times, suggested that we don't have a mandate to be making statements in an external environment. I think that speaks to a collective sense of is that really what we're here for?

And my question is, well, are there things where, indeed, we feel that, at a high enough level of generality, we do have enough consensus? And I think the NETmundial statement indicates we do. And then secondly, is it helpful for the community to be speaking in parallel with whatever the staff's doing?

Now, in the case of the WSIS, we know that ICANN is working with ISOC and other ISTARs on collective positions and so on. So one can make the argument, well, ICANN's already in that process. Is it helpful to have the community speaking alongside that? You can make the argument that we want to emphasize to people, and we did this at the WSIS forum workshop we did as well, that ICANN is indeed not just like a secretariat. It's the community. Right?

And I think there's something to be said for trying to establish that and bring that home to people in operating environments where that's not really something that they integrally take onboard. They may not have a sense in that, particularly kind of diplomats who represent governments in the general assembly, for example, where they don't interact with that kind of mobilized community.

So from my own standpoint, to make a long story short. From my own standpoint, I think that it is potentially useful for us to do this. If, however, people feel that this is too contentious or too demonstratively difficult, I also don't want to have internal warfare about it. In which case, then, the more mellow approach that David's suggesting, thus simply providing input to the ICANN staff and leadership, saying here's kind of where the community is. That's

something we can do a lot more easily, I would think, than external representations.

If we don't want to do either of those things, then I would say maybe we're not really a working group, and we should be a working party. And a place for people to care about Internet governance in ICANN to come together and take stock of what's going on, and plan the public session, and not so much more.

It doesn't make sense to be a working group if you don't have an agenda of work and outputs, in my own view. So I think that these are fundamental questions that we have to decide whether there's significant enough interest in the community to try to engage externally, or provide input internally, or simply be a place where we're gathering together and sharing information about upcoming things, etc. And I'm happy with whatever everybody is happy with.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Bill. We have Peter Dengate Thrush next. No? Okay. Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much. Nigel Hickson, staff. I thought it just might be useful to set out what we're doing on the WSIS in terms of the process. Of course, as we were reminded earlier in this agenda item, there are other issues apart from WSIS, which we could perhaps outline the input we proposed to make and discuss those in the context of what's been said, as well.

But on WSIS, the iSTAR organizations, as you know, the iSTAR leaders meet from time to time. So that's the regional Internet registries and the IETF and ISOC and W3C. And they decided that for the input into the WSIS process, we would have a coordinated position, and we formed a small group led by ISOC to determine that sort of coordinated position.

This isn't sort of like hard negotiating. This is sort of coordination of a position with the understanding that, generally, the input from the technical community is more effective if it's aligned in some way.

So having said that, the sort of messages that we will be putting across in various fora, whether it's in Geneva or New York or wherever, will be as a result of that strategic sort of development process.

So from a process point of view, I mean, I'm obviously not here to address what the working group wants to decide upon. But from a process point of view, having an input from the community, if you like, at the input into that process is, I think, were suggesting is extremely valuable. So if one is going around the corridors and someone says, "We think that the WSIS process should have an output of X," or whatever, that forms part of your collective thinking.

So when you're in a group discussion with other people, you reflect on those issues. So having some sort of an input would, of course, be appropriate. I think where the problem comes from a process point of view – and, again, I'm not trying to predetermine any results – is where you have your positions.

So if the CCWG came out with the quote “ICANN community” position, which was then slightly different from that Fadi or Veni or whoever made it a WSIS meeting, myself, or whatever. Then that would cause some confusion. Because, as we know, the outside world is confused by ICANN and the ICANN community. I mean, understandably, and ICANN is ICANN. So I think that process question is interesting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Nigel. After, I think it was in Los Angeles when the working group started its work – and I think it’s not Los Angeles this time, but it was about a year ago – there were concerns from Tarek on exactly what you mentioned here, what happens when there is a dissenting view and when the working group has a different point of view than staff.

There had been questions about the working group instructing staff on what to say and, obviously, pushback on that. Have we, in your view, found some just balance in the work that we’ve done with you in the past few months, I guess, because there has been some input from the working group towards the ICANN stance in various issues and so on. Maybe not to the extent that we would wish it would go.

Has there been any feedback on your side as to what the current relationship is?

NIGEL HICKSON: I'll be very brief because of others. So I should have said at the beginning that I wanted to give Tarek Kamel's apologies for not being here. He really did want to be here at this meeting, but unfortunately, he's had to return to Europe. His view is that the relationship with this group has been very positive.

As you can see, from this paper, although I did a lot of drafting, if you like, some of the additions were made by community members that greatly enhance some of the details and the intelligibility of the paper. So that was useful.

The input to the CSTD process, ICANN's contribution to that was, if you like, enhanced through the working group process. So I think the answer is yes, where it's appropriate, where it's possible. It's good.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. David Fares?

DAVID FARES: Yes. Thank you. I guess I'm just wondering if the CCWG can't give guidance to staff about what the community's view is about what ICANN's role should be in the IG space and what the community's position is, what's the utility of having a CCWG and what about the bottom-up process?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Did I say guidance? Sorry. I think the CCWG can give guidance. It cannot instruct staff. That was the fine line between giving guidance

and instructing. Did I get this correctly, Nigel? Was that the concern that Tarek had on this? And that was in response to some of the discussions that he had heard via third parties, etc., etc. Not quite what was exactly said?

So that's something that's been so far. The question now comes on to whether this working group can also produce papers that will go directly to those various fora. And there is a precedent with NETmundial. The NETmundial principles. And, of course, that was a barebones, the sort of lowest common denominator that we had. It wasn't a paper that was particularly earth-shattering.

But, at the same time, it certainly appeared to be reflecting the basic view of the community at ICANN. We'll have Peter Dengate Thrush.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Yes, Peter here. I think we're getting off track. I think we're inventing a difficulty and then trying to solve it. The idea that we're talking about separate lines of communication. The language that we'll use, frankly, confuses me. We're not talking about developing a competitive position, a parallel position. Speaking alongside that, what we're talking about is developing – we are ICANN, okay?

The way this works is that we are ICANN. There's not someone else called ICANN that we're going to go and try and talk. We are ICANN. So we are going to develop the ICANN position. And in developing that, if there's any kind of sense of conflict, then this is where it gets resolved. And staff will be feeding into that process with the enormous expertise

that they've had. And out of all that process will come the ICANN position.

So let's not create a sense that there's going to be two positions and then we have to have a resolution mechanism for solving them. Let's just working on, as a working group, on creating a position, and that becomes the ICANN position with staff input, and staff expertise, and [CSC, NSO] expertise. All the different components of ICANN will make the ICANN position. That's what we're talking about. And in this case, it's a relatively simple one because it's the position we've been adopting and been doing for the last 15 years.

So on the specific question of would we, then, create something and send it directly to a forum, no. I think that seemed to have been a very ad hoc solution arising from an urgent response to NETmundial. And the person who's going to take the ICANN position to the WSIS is the CEO and Veni and the other staff that are going already to talk to those things. It's not a question of trying to send a different message from that one. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thank you, Peter, for this. So we've got Alejandro and then Veni. Alejandro Pisanty?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you, Chair, and the person sitting on it. I have seen weird in ICANN. I have seen weirder in ICANN. And I am really baffled because I don't know if I'm seeing the most reasonable thing or even weirder.

And the question here is it's made very clear by Peter's latest statement. I hope it's not his last statement. It would be terrible. That we are ICANN. Reminds us that when the community in ICANN has to arrive at the position, it does by established procedures. It goes bottom up from the constituencies of the SOs when they have constituencies, then the SOs themselves, they discuss them, they vote them, they have a policy development process that has 45 days for consultations and 30 days there for ratifications and stuff.

And then you have a position that is a community position that is put forward to the Board, and the Board may vote on it. In short summary, for all my recollection, this CCWG was created mostly in reactive situation to constrain Fadi around NETmundial. It's like a strange creator [inaudible] to have lived in [Prague] some years ago crafted by hand out of clay, which suddenly got a life of its own and started giving orders and doing some mischief, the [Golem].

So I'm not sure if that's happening or this is just a CCWG that will assist the community's own established processes by making it easier to community across the communities so that they will have shared drafts, and then push them forward, push them upward for the process from the bottom.

It's also quite striking to think that these positions will be about much more than ICANN itself, and it would bring out a lot of surprises. Because, I mean, some of these communities are in a level of meeting eye-to-eye within ICANN. But basically, ICANN was established because they don't see eye-to-eye.

So ICANN, for example, in the GNSO space is established so that the noncommercial entities, the commercial entities, the registries, the registrars, etc., have a way to find agreements inside ICANN instead of having to fight them out with the FTC in the US or the European Commission or whoever.

So these communities and other issue are each other's throats in Internet governance. You have intellectual property interests in total contention with some of the noncommercial proponents or some of the ALAC entities. So maybe clarifying the function that this is useful to feel the community's standard processes maybe help make them faster and clearer will be the right way to understand the group. And everything else is going to leave a mess here, a mess there, or a mess everywhere, and this Golem picture will be remember fondly as that when it was not so bad.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Alejandro. Next is Veni Markovski.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Thanks. I'm a little bit lost at the agenda because it seems like we're talking about something...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, we're on three and we're looking at the overall, the high-level picture, I guess, before digging in. I think we are actually probably

even gone further than three because it looks as though the only real deadline for us at the moment is going to be that process, the WSIS.

VENI MARKOVSKI:

So I think the confusion came from the fact that within the WSIS review process, there are certain deadlines. For example, mid-July, there is a deadline for comments to be received by the community. And these comments, somebody has to send them. One.

And two, there is a deadline tonight to self-nominate yourselves to participate at the meeting on July 2. There was another deadline last night. So there were so many deadlines and there will be even more, and then this is one path. Another path is whether you want to discuss position on the WSIS+10. But the position on the WSIS+10 before we know what would WSIS+10 come with is a little bit difficult to make because the first draft of the document, which the co-facilitators will prepare will be published the first week of September.

So we really don't know what will be discussed next week, neither on 1st or July nor 2nd of July. We have some ideas, but that's all. And I think before we see something in writing – and by the way, my observations from the co-facilitators is that they're trying to do this as open as possible, and even as open has never been at the UN in New York. Is that they will give you enough – us, meaning like the global community of the nongovernmental players – who give us enough time to send comments on every draft that they will do.

So they're planning to have three drafts and maybe a fourth one. They're planning to have two preparatory committees and maybe a third one. For those of you who are not familiar with these terms, these preparatory committees are meetings in New York, at which the governments will have discussions on the documents. And it's called an outcome document, which will be signed in December by the ministers.

So in all these steps, there will be time for discussions. And in all these steps, there may be most probably most of those discussions will not require any opinion from ICANN, depending on which action lines are reviewed from the WSIS. Of course, if there is a discussion on IGF, we've heard that a number of times. I don't think anyone is doubtful at ICANN, be that staff, Board, community, random people showing up whether this needs to be continued.

But then again, this is one very, very small part of the whole process. So I think we really, we need to see what the co-facilitators will write in the first draft, which is called, by the way, for those of you who are not familiar, non-paper, even though it's going to be a paper. And then decide on maybe continuing the mailing list discussion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Veni. I'm going to ask the unaskable. Is there any timetable for this? Any timetable for this? Do we know when any consultations are likely to be?

VENI MARKOVSKI: Yes. It's on the UN website.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's on Marilyn's one, yeah. Because I can't see it on the one that's on the screen here. That's the problem.

VENI MARKOVSKI: It is on UN, their site, if you guys go through [inaudible] and WSIS will show up. And all the timeline is there. However, note in the file it says draft, which means that most probably next week there will be another discussion how this draft will become permanent.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Veni. Peter Dengate Thrush. And then Bill and then Peter. Bill Drake?

BILL DRAKE: Just to respond to a couple of points that have been made. Peter, when you suggest that I'm creating a bifurcation or a problem to be solved or something, I was simply building on the fact that we've been meeting weekly on phone for a year and a half. And during that time, a great number of times, people have expressed the view- some people, a minority maybe – but some people have expressed the view that this group should do in the future what it did in the past, which was to make its own statement that went out into the world. Okay?

So I didn't invent that. That's a discussion that we've been having. Now, whether that is a Golem-like mischief or something like that, I leave to other people to decide. As I said, I am perfectly happy if there's not the consensus to do that and we want to restrict ourselves to simply interacting with staff prior to meetings, providing input to them, seeing documents that they are working on, and so on.

As I said, I'm totally happy with that, too. I was not lobbying for the notion that we should independently go out and craft separate positions from the staff. I was only reflecting on the fact that people have raised that point a number of times as something that we could do.

I haven't seen it being problematic so far. What we did at NETmundial I thought was pretty anodyne. And I think in that context to at least to have had the ICANN community speaking as a community, and the things we said I think were worth saying.

So one could see the argument for doing things similarly, but if it's problematic with some people, then there's no reason to do it. But again, if we're not doing that, if we're not actually producing an outcome document of any sort, then again, I raise the question of do we need to be a working group or should we be a working party that is basically an interest group within ICANN of people who are concerned about the larger ecosystem and tracking what's going on and coordinating with staff, and so on?

In which case, perhaps, then we would be less bound by the complexities of giving every part of the ICANN community onboard

each time we wanted to do anything, etc. etc. etc. So this is the question.

By the way, though, Alejandro, it was not created to constrain Fadi, it was Fadi's idea. So just on that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for Bill. I'd like to hear from others around the table who haven't spoken so far. We'll have Peter respond to you, and then we'll get an around-the-table view.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thanks, Bill. I think that's very helpful. I wasn't [inaudible] so let's move off this. If there's ever a debate about whether we should be doing anything separate, for the record, I'm going to vote against it, if I have a vote. And as far as the staff, where I come from, normally the staff would be preparing the first draft of such a paper. So that's going to be how we coordinate this in the future.

And I have to go, so I wondered if I could leave you with another topic that I would like the community to endorse and support, if possible. And that is the two suggestions that were raised on our public session. One was that there are occasionally these United Nations meetings. I'm thinking particularly now of this WSIS process leading up to the vote in December, where members of developing countries, SMEs, etc. were unable to participate. And the suggestion was made that ICANN might be able to help by its now very sophisticated streaming and other services.

I have no idea whether it's possible to do that at a United Nations meeting, but it would be good for us to be seen, I think, to be helping with that.

And the other one was raised by Bertrand, which was at the fundamental level of whether these meetings are multi-stakeholder or not. I can remember and Alejandro can remember where we've had our senior leadership ejected or not admitted to some of these meetings in years gone by, and we know that things have got a lot better.

But again, it would be quite nice if part of the ICANN position, part of these principles and part of any concrete actions that we take are always positively on the side of openness, transparency, participation, multi-stakeholder, everyone being present.

It may be that there are voting rules at the end of the day that we have to not participate in, but in terms of the discussions. So thanks, Veni. I'm going to leave, but I'd just like to support those two things. Generally, the openness principle and, two, the technical support of streaming and recording the meetings. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for your contribution, Peter. Veni Markovski?

VENI MARKOVSKI: Thank you, and I've put in the chatroom the links to the document, too. Just want, Peter, two questions, comments. First of all, the

meetings so far has been webcast. There is webcast organized by the UN, which is actually very good. It's on the Web TV of the UN so anyone can go and see it.

With regards to participation, there is no need for any support for participation because this is being driven only by the missions of the respective countries to the UN, and there are 193 or so there, and they have people there who participate. So nobody from any capital is planning to go for the negotiations there because they have the diplomats there. That's all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Veni. Earlier, you did mention, actually, that there was a deadline for nominations of people to go and speak at the UN. But I believe that's for the 2nd of July is the actual day when this happens. This seems to be so short notice. It was quite surprising.

VENI MARKOVSKI: It is a short notice because, apparently, again, it's a work in progress. I'm sure that for the next preparatory committee to be announced much earlier. Deadline to do it is open as possible.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Veni. I, personally, I have received that invitation. In fact, quite a few people have received the invitation. It looks like they spammed half of the people they could find on the list. And I expect that there will be either a lot of people wanting to be

in that position, and I'm a little concerned that whoever will be going for that position will not actually be there – well, probably sort of represent themselves, but not be able to represent anyone else on this. Just the process is a little strange.

Veni?

VENI MARKOVSKI: Thank you. I've heard some of the people names who put their names. Actually, very decent people including from the community. So we'll see who will actually show up because the fact that your name is there doesn't yet mean that you will go. Like if somebody needs a visa, they won't be able to get the US State Department right now is not issuing any visas because of a hardware problem.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: A hardware problem. It's not an Internet problem, is it?

VENI MARKOVSKI: Hardware.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Marilia Maciel?

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you very much, Olivier. It's very late and I'm very tired, but let me try to articulate something that is intelligible about this. Well, first

of all, in terms of participation, there will be two opportunities to participate in face-to-face meetings, if I understood correctly. One is now and another one is further down the road in either September or October. Veni can correct me, I don't remember very much. But there will be another opportunity.

One thing that nongovernmental actors have been struggling with is the difficulty to participate in these processes because usually does not follow exactly in the scope of the things that we're doing. So maybe one thing to discuss would be maybe people in this community would like to participate in the next one. This one is to close and the deadline is closing, but maybe in the next one, which I believe will be the one that is more close to the meetings, so maybe to be more important.

Maybe we can do something organized to participate and to make our voices here. So maybe to organize for the next one. There will be importance of supporting people to go, maybe even financially speaking, because people do not usually have the resources and projects and activities they currently develop.

Another point is related to remote participation or webcasting and how ICANN could kind of give support to that. And it's true that the meetings are transmitted through the webcast, but I believe that what came through the public session, and I would like to confirm this with Peter, but he's not here.

What I captured was that ICANN could probably offer support in spaces like the IGF, for instance, that have been struggling to enhance

remote participation for many years now. And although they have the hubs and they use the system, but what ICANN has, for instance, worked with CGI to provide in NETmundial was far superior to what we have in the IGF, even in terms of bringing in the hubs in a way that it's more flow and kind of interacts and ties in with the methodology of the meeting.

So maybe this is something that ICANN can really offer support, not the UN itself, but the IGF. And I believe that would be a useful avenue to explore. I am [inaudible] that I don't have strong views in terms of contributing with a written contribution or not. Indeed, it has been something that we have been discussing. And I believe that even on a general level, like we contributed for the NETmundial talking about a vision would be something that would be relevant.

I think that it's hard to understand how a community that has been as organized as this one could not tie itself around any vision of what should be done in terms of information society for the future. I mean, it's a key moment that we have, and civil society organizations have been collaborating with the technical community on different inputs related to the opening of the process, how stakeholders could be included into the process, or even the vision that information societies should remain people-centered and development-oriented.

I think that even these documents can be short and concise and sometimes high-level, it sends a message to the world that we feel part of the ecosystem, we care about what is going on, and we are

kind of united around this vision of development that I truly believe that is something that is important.

So I think we could, is not that we need to do it, maybe there is not a time or appetite in the community to do it, but I that would be relevant and a missed opportunity. But other than that, I believe that what is important than providing something into the process is to try to understand how it can really be part of this international effort that will be done by different parts of organizations with Internet governance to really foster the topic of development and to put people at the center.

As I mentioned in the public committee, how this translates into ICANN remit? How can we incorporate this on a day-to-day basis, and how do we see ourselves interacting with other organizations to try to coordinate and really send this message across not in terms of a high-level message but really on the ground, how do we translate this into practice?

So I believe that this is a mission for the next years, and to me, more important than provide an input, which I believe would be valuable, but okay, if we don't want to do it, is to try to understand what is our role in this ecosystem to move this mission forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this input, Marilia. Just on the question that you said the community could come up with its own position. Are you, by that, then saying that they would be transmitting these positions

directly like they did for NETmundial? Are you saying that it could come up with its own positions to tell staff about the input for those outside submissions?

MARILIA MACIEL:

No, I think that it's kind of both. Because if there is room in the process for us to send our contribution, then we can send directly. I think there will be room for that. But, of course, if we come up with a contribution that comes from the community, I believe it orients staff in how they will participate and interact when they are in this meeting. So it would work for both goals, I think.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks, Marilia. Young Eum?

YOUNG-EUM LEE:

Thanks, Olivier. I think the reason why we seem to be kind of maybe not so clear about what our mandate is, is because we are trying to – I think when we first came together, we were trying to show a multi-stakeholder. I mean, the key concept was multi-stakeholder. But then, when you think about it, ICANN is made of the SOs and ACs and the stakeholders. But not just that formal stakeholder, but we wanted to show this community stakeholder approach.

I agree with Marilia in saying that we could try to come up with a position, which would not be a formal ICANN position. When we submitted our position to NETmundial, we submitted as the group of

ICANN Internet governance, right? Cross-community working group on Internet governance. So we would present ourselves as a working group on Internet governance of ICANN.

And so we could sometimes work with the staff. Sometimes, we could try to come up with our own position. And so I think this is another way of showing the multi-stakeholderism within ICANN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. We've got another ten minutes, less than ten minutes, to this discussion. I we need to respond to a few points that I've heard here. So first on Alejandro's points about the danger of creating a Golem. Interesting analogy.

And I think that ties up with what you've said, Young Eum. The fact that there would be a community position and not just a position from a specific supporting organization or advisory committee or a stakeholder group. If we do not have the ability to or the platform to be able to discuss the community position at that point, the community, ICANN community that we always refer to does not appear to be having any voice at that point.

Each one of these stakeholders groups, which will have its voice. But as we all know, each one of their stakeholder groups have their own processes by which they take part in these external processes and so on, and so the IPC will be having its own people over at whatever meeting it's at, and others will be there. And so there won't be an actual ICANN community point of view.

Now that said, obviously, sometimes our points of view will be very different from each other, and that's where we would end up with something that might be much less advanced as a position than if each stakeholder was to say something. But I am a little concerned about not trying to get that community point of view.

I saw you shake your head, Alejandro.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: I don't know. I see this as potentially micro-management by a community, which doesn't want the Board to do micro-management. But then it's actually writing down the words that have to be said on its behalf.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Micro-management of what?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Of the statements that ICANN makes in these meetings. As I said, I see with the potential. I guess we'll have to see it more in fact in the future, but you already have a process. If these are issues of such importance that whole community has to express itself as an ICANN position, then you have the PDPs.

You have the PDPs. I mean, that's what you have the PDPs for: to establish the policies of the organization. I'm really baffled, but it may be my tendency to [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Alejandro. I'm not a PDP expert, not being from the GNSO, but a PDP last several months and years and whatever. And looking at the actual preliminary roadmap for WSIS review, which Veni has pointed us to and that was actually my second answer to Marilia on this occasion.

I note that the pre-preparatory meeting is on the 1st of July. The deadline for written submissions is mid-July. So that gives two weeks for a response. The non-paper is looked at being first week of September and a deadline for written submissions about the non-paper is the third week of September. So we're looking at very, very tight deadlines for providing two weeks between opening of comments or between the paper being published and then the comments being there.

So in this way, I would certainly see having a working group ready to be able to plow into this with people that at least can focus on this rather than focusing on whatever else it is to reach a decision is probably the best way to move forward with this. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes. I guess I like that idea and I like Marilia's idea of getting prepared for the document to issue a statement and Young Eum in the name of the Council Working Group Internet Governance and not in any other. And I like that.

I'm also really – I'm not sure, do we think we can [able] with these two-week turnarounds to agree? Because we're not going to be able to go back to the chairs and get approval within that tight timeframe. And so that's the concern of that.

And my, also, other concern is if the idea then is to if we do put in a paper and we do also come to one of the preparatory meetings, then the October one is the same time as Dublin. And unless they're going to change that, that's going to be sort of problematical for us. And we're going to do all this effort and then not even present. And so that's my question to everyone.

And maybe the deadlines are changing and maybe they're going to change these. So that was it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Veni?

VENI MARKOVSKI: Just to respond to the dates for the Dublin meeting, this was raised during the preliminary meeting, which was a couple of weeks ago in New York. And the comment, as one would have expected, is that this is not ICANN-related issue at all, and therefore, they don't care when the ICANN meeting because, indeed, if you think about it, within the WSIS, ICANN is not even mentioned in the Tunis Agenda.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Let me just jump in. And a footnote to what Veni said. And that's not [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks. Nigel Hickson?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank that and try to stay away.

NIGEL HICKSON: Just a couple of things, if I may, to clarify a couple of points. First of all, in terms of support for the UN process. ICANN is open always to requests. We recently funded the transcription of all the CSTD output, so two whole days of CSTD output from that meeting were not going to be transcribed. They've been recorded, but they weren't going to be transcribed because the UN didn't have a budget so we provided the budget and did the work for them.

For the IGF, as you know, we do transcription and we provide funding to the IGF. We're involved in the MAG and if the MAG ask for other contributions, then ICANN does consider it. So there is support there.

In terms of just on the time around – and it's obviously up to this group how things are done – but I think we should reflect on what Veni said earlier. In the, obviously, we haven't seen the zero draft or the first preparatory draft or the non-paper. But we don't expect a paper of 450 paragraphs, 329 of which mention ICANN or the Domain Name System. We expect probably a paper of five or six sides to start with

where, perhaps, one or two paragraphs might talk about Internet governance in a broader sense.

We might talk about enhanced cooperation in a broader sense. So in terms of the input from this cross-community working group, we did it for the input to CSTD in two weeks. So yeah. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Nigel, and we are reaching the end of this meeting. Time has gone very quickly. I wanted to draw out a few conclusions from the discussions that we've had here so far. There are a couple of actions items that we've put down. But it looks to me as though we don't have a consensus on whether this group should draft its own statements and send them to external processes by itself independently of staff.

Perhaps one of the dangers is that ICANN staff would draft one position, the community would draft another position, and that would just confuse people very much. And it probably would confuse us, as well, and would create a whole lot of mess.

What it does look like, though, is that the community certainly, some significant number of members beneath the community is ICANN, basically, and should work with staff to draft positions and responses to these processes. And that probably brings us to the question of how far. Who is basically in the driving seat?

Does the community drive? Does staff drive? Is there a shared driving seat? If the community turns left and staff turns right, where does the

car, where does the vehicle go? And this probably is the next stage of our discussions that we'll have to hold with staff. Nigel, I hadn't given you any advanced notice, but that's my own conclusions from what we have here.

With regards to keeping this as a cross-community working group or having this group turn into a working party, Rafik and I just had a thought and said, "Well, if it goes into a working party, then really, there is no link to the supporting organizations and advisory committees as such."

We've done all the work to be a cross-community working group. That opens the avenue for any substantial issue where there would be time for a decision, and so on, for the different members of the group to go back to their SOs and ACs and perhaps even undergo formal ratification of whatever position the working group is proposing.

But it's, obviously, for the current process that we have with the WSIS review, that's I think understood is going to be quite a struggle for the working group to come up with any concerted position, and definitely not a position that they can actually have their own constituency support in any way.

So it will just have to be I guess the informal process that we've had so far with Nigel, with Veni, with other policy staff and try to provide support as much as we can to be able to have a position that not only reflects the ICANN, the organization view, but actually the ICANN community view, as well.

Nigel, any thoughts on that? Or in fact, anybody else who wishes to add to this? Alejandro?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

As I said, I am only an observer for now. I'm wondering if this status may change to an upgrade or a downgrade. I may very easily downgrade myself. The way most organizations that have large constituencies, leaderships, and different types of issues with different timescales work. Is that there are some functions, which are executive functions, and the executive functions aren't performed by the executives or the executive part of the organization. This would be top management, middle management stuff, depending on the exact issue.

And the organizations, if they care very much about the issues, then they say top different levels of constraints. The more they care, the more the constraint, the breadth of the field within which the management or the executive representation can respond.

That is by setting policy – by setting policies that are sometimes very prescriptive. On the other hand, the more prescriptive a policy is, the less flexible it tends to be, the less adaptable to changing circumstances.

So basically, you give a mandate, which is built bottom-up to your structures, mostly in this case to the Board, and the Board has a vigilance on the staff through their reports, through [designation], through the ability to designate to remove the CEO and the CEO, in

turn, has a lot of processes to make sure that the people who speak for the organization represent the views of the organization, especially if they have been built bottom-up.

If you have something that you really care about that has to be official, then you have [inaudible]. I mean, ICANN has an excess, if anything, of processes to make sure that nothing goes against the grain of the community, the policy development process and so forth.

But one thing to have an exact say on a given two-week call within UN process that otherwise is a [decade out], the [Cadel] process, it's a WSIS+10 means it's been ongoing for ten years and it's looking for another ten years. That may really be creating an artificial constraint that will not be fulfilled in a satisfactory way.

Further, the WSIS discussion goes way beyond ICANN. And as you have already said and Nigel has particularly expressed, ICANN issues don't even come up. Coming up with a discussion about issues outside the ICANN remit from the ICANN community will only attract the limelight on ICANN, and eventually cause two types of trouble, potentially.

I mean, this is not a forecast but the potential kind of trouble. One of them will be okay, so let's discuss ICANN. And second, you have just made a fresh bunch of new enemies by coming in with a statement that will irritate or irk some of the participants. Particularly, as I've said, many of these participants, many of the ICANN participants are at odds with each other. ICANN was created so that these discrepancies and controversies may be resolved and moved forward.

But outside the discrepancy, for example, between ideas of free speech and ideas of control of the media for the propagation of contents under intellectual property constraints are in a very strong opposition. Those are one of the bigger fights in WSIS.

I think it's very [inaudible] and potentially irresponsible to step in without considering all these angles. I don't say they haven't been considered. They may be. Other members, other regular members, of the group has asked to [enroll] the speeches to see if the constraints have been followed.

But I would mostly go through expressing concerns, moving them forward, taking them to the staff or to the Board, and making sure that in the long run, the very limited common will of the community is followed.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Alejandro. I think that the risk that you've described here is the one that's not going to happen since we haven't reached consensus, and I don't think we will ever reach consensus on being able to draft papers directly independently of ICANN. The ICANN staff structure as such. At least not in this room and not from what I've heard in our previous conference call. But I think you've described quite well maybe one of the ways forward.

Marilia, and we do have to close. I wanted to sort of summarize on a few points and a few action items that we can draw from this meeting. Marilia Maciel?

MARILIA MACIEL:

Thank you very much, Olivier. Just to clarify what we have discussed and proposed here. I think Bill left but I think that he shares the same opinion. It was never our intention to propose that we hold a position on cybercrimes or any of the issues that are going to be touched upon in WSIS review process that do not fall under ICANN remit.

I think that what we have proposed here, but it's not happening and it's quite okay that it's not happening, is that we write something that is related to what ICANN do. ICANN is one of the best examples of multi-stakeholder participation that we have. So if we reinforce the importance that the process remains multi-stakeholder in all the instances, etc. is something that we could contribute with like we did in NETmundial could be extremely valuable.

If we endorse a view that the information society should continue to be people-centered, develop and oriented, it is important. Several organizations are doing this. If we make a point that the WSIS review should be multi-stakeholder, open, transparent, several organizations are doing this, including ISOC.

If we discuss something that is touched upon in several reports that have come from different UN organizations such as importance of Internet exchange points and deploying IPv6 and etc. something that we touch upon and would not be controversial. It would be not hard to reach a position. So just to clarify what we have proposed here not to have it on record. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks great, Marilia. Thank you for putting that on record. But would you see a barrier to this being transmitted via the vector through the ICANN staff and the current...?

MARILIA MACIEL: Not at all, Olivier. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. That's great. Young Eum? Okay. Well, we're running out of time. We're actually late already on closing. Just additional action points. I think that there was a suggestion, which was made by Marilia, for ICANN to offer space in IGF for technical hubs. We can do a follow-up on that. I don't know. Nigel, do you want to do a follow-up on this?

NIGEL HICKSON: [Inaudible] can look at [inaudible].

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We can look at that as a follow-up. So that's one action item. Other action items. I think we've gone through all of the list that we had. That's all for me, really. Anything to add? Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Not really.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You've been suffering due to the cold. You should bring a jacket with you. Ladies and gentlemen, thanks for this. I realize it's very late. So thanks. I think it's been an okay meeting. We haven't got that many people around the table but we've moved a little bit further forward. Nigel, I was going to give you the last word since you've seen some of the discussions here, whether you had any comments to make.

NIGEL HICKSON: No, thank you very much. I think it's been very useful. I'm in certainly the behest of the chairs, the continuation of the calls, and the calls, whether it's on a weekly or two-weekly basically. We can update the group on where we are in terms of the process. The timelines, of course, could change, and we can update the group on the timelines.

And there's also, of course, the other issues in the briefing paper that we need to or we could perhaps touch on at some time, including the forthcoming OECD ministerial and work of the ITU. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Nigel. Veni Markovsk?

VENI MARKOVSKI: Thank you, Olivier. Just to say I haven't been following your discussions and mailing list. And the work in New York is extremely – it's taking a lot of time because, also, I'm the only one from the iSTAR organization based there.

But if you need, at some point, some updates, I would be more than happy to share with you upon just invitation and a time, which allows me to participate on a conference call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We'll make sure of that, and Nigel will liaise with you on these points. That's good. Renate, maybe we can just read through the action items, please, to make sure we haven't forgotten any. And then we can close.

RENATE DE WULF: Okay. Young Eum Lee will follow up with the ccNSO on whether the decision for the charter.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: And I ask you to send me a copy.

RENATE DE WULF: Of course.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Thank you.

RENATE DE WULF: Not a problem. Rafik will ask Chris Gift to make the CCWG IG page more visible on the ICANN website. Nigel will look into having technical hubs at IGF but helped by ICANN. And we are looking to

building a repository for past speeches from Fadi and past interventions on the CCWG IG page.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Renate. There's one more that was missed, and that's the link that Veni has sent us with regards to the WSIS review preliminary roadmap. If we could save that and put it somewhere on our website. You've e-mailed it to yourself. Okay. Fantastic. Super. That, I think, will put some perspective for everyone who says, "Oh, let's write a paper for WSIS but hang on. Where? What? How? And how much time?" Especially, with the summer coming up.

So thanks, everyone. And this meeting is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]