
DUBLIN – CCWG-IG F2F Working Session
Wednesday, October 21, 2015 – 08:30 to 09:30 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well, good morning, everybody. This is the Cross-Committee Working Group on Internet Governance Face-to-Face Working Session at ICANN 54 in Dublin. We haven't got that many people in the room at the moment. Shall we have a quick roll call, Renate, please?

RENATE DE WULF: In the Adobe Room we have Bill Drake, [Juanito], Laramie Tech, and MB.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And in the room, we have Matthew Shears, Peter Dengate Thrush, Mary Uduma, Lynn St. Amour, Nigel Hickson, Judith Hellerstein, Olivier Crepin-Leblond.

RENATE DE WULF: Renate De Wulf, staff.

ALEX DANS: Alex Dans.

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And there we are. Thank you. So, today's agenda is first about our preparation for IGF in Brazil. We're going to be discussing the preparation for our workshop that we have on the transition of IANA Stewardship. After that, we'll be discussing broader ICANN's activities as they support and relate to the IGF. Finally, planning the work group for its activities between Dublin and Marrakech quite a few months, and I think we need to forecast what we're going to do, rather than trying to do things very quickly at the very last minute – be prepared.

Should we add any other business? Any additions or amendments to the agenda?

Renate, I'm not in the room yet. I will be in a second. Is there anybody online wishing to make any amendments?

RENATE DE WULF: No.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So, let's start then with the IGF in Brazil. As you know, we are preparing, in collaboration with ICANN, a workshop on the process by which the transition of the IANA Stewardship has taken place – or should I say will or should take

place. Of course, the forecast at the time when we proposed the workshop was that all of that would have been done, packaged, posted, and NTIA been very pleased with the result. We're not quite at that level yet. We're getting there. As you know, part of the proposal of the IANA Stewardship Transition is directly linked with work that is taking place in the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability, and that work is still going on.

So, a couple of things we need to do is to first look at the people that we have confirmed as being able to speak in the workshop, and to then decide on how we wish to conduct this, because I'm sure we will be asked to perhaps provide some insight as to what's happening in the Accountability Working Group, as well.

Our previous dry run, as one could say, that took place at the ITU, was very much focused on the IANA Stewardship itself, and said the accountability, which is this additional box that came in, that we might be asked questions on this.

Furthermore, I know there is another workshop on IANA Stewardship Transition that is coordinated, I think – is it Milton? Milton Mueller is coordinating it. I think they are focusing a lot more on the actual transition itself, and discussion of the transition itself. The question being should we then refer anybody who wants to discuss that to the other workshop, and that could be a good idea. And, should we also ask the other

workshop organizers to send anybody who is interested in the process itself over to our workshop.

Anyway, I've said a few introductory remarks. I open the floor for discussion. Nigel, I'm going to call upon you to let us know who the people are. What is the line-up now that we have as confirmed? I don't know whether you have those details ready, but I open the floor, generally, to everyone.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thank you very much. Nigel Hickson, ICANN staff. I suppose first of all, to confirm the workshop is on Day 3 from 11:00 to 12:30. Day 3 is the 12th of November. It's a bit confusing because there is a Day 0 as well. Day 0 is the Monday. So this is Day 3.

We've had confirmations from I think nearly everyone on the list that we originally formed. Marilyn Cade; Chris Disspain; Olivier Crepin-Leblond; Mark Carvell; Patrik Faltstrom; Lynn St. Amour; Rafik Dammak; Bill Drake, moderating; Alan Greenberg. We're still getting a few more confirmations. But we'll have a final list, and we'll circulate that to the working group hopefully in the next week or so. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Nigel, for this. Now, a question on this. The workshop format was one of a case question because

we had been told that the IGF was insisting on roundtable format, but we weren't quite sure as to what we were going to get at the end. Has there been any clarification of this? And what is meant by roundtable format? Is it a table like the one that we're having here, or is it something that's a bit different? Because obviously, the major component of our workshop is to get the interactivity with all of the participants.

The setup that was in place at the ITU was one which was more of a classroom style. I felt it worked well because the moderation was very good. So you did have much interactivity between the participants and the people who were on stage. But then again, if it's a large round-table, maybe that helps. Maybe if it's too large, it might not help. And we probably don't have a choice into what format we wish to have. Has there been any information on this, Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you. No, not to my knowledge. We were told, I understand, from what I recall, that the rooms are all very similar. So, that doesn't necessarily help, but what I can do, if you want, we can take an action on behalf of the group to talk to the IGF Secretariat about what the group would want. There might be some flexibility. As I recall, normally, they're classroom style.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Now, with regards to the setups, moderation, etc., I wish Bill was here because he could speak – Bill Drake actually has his hand up, so let's see if we can hear from him. Bill, you have the floor.

Okay, Bill, I've just been told that there is no audio for remote participants, so I'm afraid you're going to have to write your intervention in the chat, and we'll read it to the record. Or pop over here, say what you need to say, and then go back to your other meeting. I hope you're not too far in the conference center. That's helpful. Okay. In the meantime, whilst you jog down, or jot down your intervention, I open the floor for anyone else who wishes to intervene.

Okay, unfortunately, it takes a while. "It's a roundtable. This is an unknown thing," says Bill. "I'll be running another, as well. It's just a question of having an agreed set of questions." It's not an unknown thing. Okay.

All right. So, set of questions. The questions we had at the ITU, if I recall correctly, were pretty straightforward in basically asking what the process was in each one of the operational communities, and how they integrated this with their community, and talked about it and so on, and where the process was going for them. I'm not sure we really need to do so

much work on this. I don't think there's really very – in my view, if we ran the workshop in a similar way, I don't think it would do too badly. I think it's informative.

Perhaps we do have to now try and see, now that we're further down the line, how we explain the delays, and the fact that there are so many different components up in the air, and so many question marks as to where we're going. And, I guess with the UN meeting just a few weeks later, we obviously have to show all the positives that we have. We might need to also add a bit more on the accountability thread, bearing in mind that there is such a lot of discussion at various levels, including in the GAC.

I'm not sure whether there was much discussion in the GAC on the transition. I haven't followed that. Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR:

Thank you, Olivier. I think we need to be careful about not slipping into talking about the transition itself because this forum in particular was supposed to highlight the communities and the processes, and actually use this as an opportunity to show how a multi-stakeholder process on a global level can work. And, it was just such a great kind of work example.

One of the things we're doing in the ICG is adding a little bit more text up front to talk about the basic premise behind how

we arrived at the process we're working towards, which is the three communities. There are some people who clearly thought that we fabricated three communities to make this process work, as opposed to three communities having been in place for policy and operations for a very, very long time, and that they were the natural homes for this work.

So, maybe we can make sure that we've actually got – and that's probably Bill's responsibility up front, in the moderation, to just lay some of that out clearly. But by then, we will have an update from the ICG out of this meeting. So, there should be some good material there. I just want to make clear that I thought we were to talk about the various processes that were used within the community, and how we came to this rather unique process. And it was not the process that was initially suggested either. I just think we need to make sure we don't slip into talking about the transition, and explaining deadlines and timelines.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Lynn. Indeed, I have been asked to whenever explaining the process to someone, I think one of the first questions was, "Well, but who decided these groups, and who created these groups? Is it ICANN that created all of these groups?" And that's a matter of confusion for a lot of people. Peter Dengate Thrush?

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thanks. I want to say the same sort of thing as Lynn, I think, and expand on it a little bit. This should be presented in the light that it is, which is a multi-stakeholder success story. And so, we've had a trial run that worked quite well, although I think we can improve on that, and we should be looking at how to polish that performance. There will be a wide range of understandings in the audience, so we need to make sure that we take the audience right through from complete ignorance about any of this stuff, to those more sophisticated members who've been following the nuances.

So that probably leads to the question, "Will there be a paper?" as I think there was quite a good paper prepared for the ITU session. We had a handout, I think. And, if there isn't, we can probably – I'm looking at staff, of course, again, with more work, but I'm sure it's pretty much a cut and paste of other things, Nigel, to sort of just explain. So that in that, as well as in the oral presentations, there can be answers to some of the obvious questions – who are these groups? Where do they come from? And various other ones.

I thought that we wouldn't need to spend a lot of time on this because we basically did the trial run at the ITU meeting. We've

got the same kind of speakers, the same kind of content. Should be a no-brainer.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Peter. I think we're pretty much aligned on this. Maybe just a couple of things we might wish to discuss briefly. One of the questions that has been asked is the overall openness of the process, and the transparency, and the inclusiveness of the process. I have heard some say that the process is not inclusive enough. What kind of response does one provide for this sort of accusation?

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Can I answer that? That was exactly the first point that was raised from the floor last time by a gentleman who might be named from the ITU, who wanted to make that point. I think there was a very, very good answer from several people on the panel, and from the floor. So, if there's any need, just look at the transcript. But, I think most of us could answer that pretty well on the fly. But, that's the kind of thing we need to anticipate, I think, and have included in the paper.

The other point I forgot to mention, of course, was that the co-facilitators will be there as part of that audience that I mentioned, and that's why I think we take the opportunity to

explain and develop that this is a success story. This is how multi-stakeholders work on really important issues to the community.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. I just saw Nigel shake his head. I'm not quite sure what he was meaning.

NIGEL HICKSON: Unfortunately, I think, Peter, the co-facilitators are just going to be there for Day 0 and Day 1. You're right. They are coming to the IGF, and it's very important that they are, because on Day 1, there's the WSIS+10 open session in the morning, and there certainly—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, I got the timing mixed up. You're right.

NIGEL HICKSON: Not at all. They're making an intervention during that meeting. So, I think when we have our workshop, we'll be able to perhaps reflect on that session, as well.

But I do agree just on the point of the inclusiveness. I think it's important to note – and we certainly can prepare a paper – that ICANN were asked to facilitate the process. It's been the

community that's taken the lead in terms of ensuring there's a spread of people. But indeed, it ought to be looked at because there might be some lessons to be learned for future similar exercises.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Nigel. Mary Uduma?

MARY UDUMA: Thank you. Whenever we have this multi-stakeholder Internet Governance IANA Stewardship Transition at national level, or at regional level, in my own environment the question has always been, "What is the role of government in all this gamut of things? Why is government not playing any role?" So probably those that are coming from government, and from my environment, will be asking just that question.

We had tried to include government within the ICANN process as a multi-stakeholder, that the GAC is government. That's where government [laid] rules. I don't know if that is totally correct, and without some fleshing out to be done in that response we normally give.

At African IGF, that was the over-arching question that we received during the IGF in [inaudible]. At the West African level, that was the over-arching question that we received. So,

probably would think about that people will ask that question.
Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mary. What was the response that was provided at that time, and was it suitable or did it fulfill the question that was asked?

MARY UDUMA: We tried to point out that government is in the ICANN process, and that the numbering, and the protocol, they are all business, and government is allowed to come, but the business people make their decision. But, when it comes to ICANN, because there's a multi-stakeholder platform, that the government is given its piece in the GAC.

But the second question was do they take part in the process of policy making? We said that they advised us. And the advices are taken into account by the board of ICANN. I know that people from my environment will raise those questions if they are in the hall.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this, Mary. Bill Drake, in the chat, emits concerns about the make-up of the group itself as being very

Western Europe, which is a little bit... Well, it will receive some criticism in the IGF. I'm not quite sure how to resolve this at this point in time. I do know that in the ITU, we did have a bit of a mix, but I guess it's just a process the way that it is. And of the people that have taken part, it has been very WEOG, as one could say, influenced. Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Can you list who's on the panel again? I actually don't think it's been all that WEOG-influenced, although I think that the panel probably isn't properly balanced. Could you just list them, quickly, again?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: It'll take me a minute to get it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. A second note from Bill was that there should be a short summary of explaining things for people who are not aware of the ICANN processes. Again, I'm a little concerned about having this workshop being very ICANN-focused, and ICANN-heavy,

although we do know that the majority of the drama has taken place within our walls. Lynn?

LYNN ST. AMOUR:

Given this is actually focused on the IANA Stewardship Transition work, there are some good slides. I actually don't think it's as ICANN-focused as that. If you really focus on the process in the communities and how the work's been done, and the ICG and the make-up of the ICG, I think it's much less WEOG, and certainly I don't think of it as an ICANN process. I think it really is a global multi-stakeholder process which allowed each one of the communities to drive their processes according to their own set of norms and values and processes, and it came together in this other process.

So I think we can work with both of Bill's concerns to address them. And I can help him, if he wants, in terms of trying to identify some of the slides, various pieces of the ICG reports have done to give the initial context. Obviously, his choice what he uses or not, but I can highlight the slides.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Lynn. That would be helpful. We obviously need a slide deck. It would be completely incomprehensible to anyone without slides and diagrams. Maybe we'll do it as an action item

if you don't mind looking at this. I have a few slides – well, we have the originals from the last slide deck, and something can be made up out of them.

I guess, Renate, we'll probably have the help of whoever it was – I cannot remember her name – who redesigned the slides for us. There was one staff member that did the slides because they're using a different system. It's not just a simple PowerPoint thing, in case we need to make some amendments, or put them together.

Mary, you hadn't finished, so I'm coming back to you.

MARY UDUMA:

I think I had finished that slide, the question raised in that chart. When I saw the list, I will say I thought of raising the issue of reaching out to Mohamed, whether he would be available to be part of the panel. Mohamed—

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Mohamed El Bashir.

MARY UDUMA:

El Bashir, yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That’s a good point. He just arrived. Okay. Let’s then have it as an action item, and reach out to Mohamed. Okay. Let’s move on because time is ticking. I think we’re pretty much clear now on this. As Peter said, “It’s pretty much a no-brainer.”

So let’s move on then. The activities of ICANN as they relate to the IGF. Last year there was a wiki page that was set up with the listings of all the workshops that were somehow related to ICANN, either workshops organized by ICANN, or also workshops that were organized by community members that were part of ICANN, and that related somehow to ICANN topics.

I think that we have a page now – Renate, do we have the page of workshops and – the wiki page? That was actually built pretty quickly. This was on the agenda because I thought maybe we needed to have a discussion on this, or coordinate on this. But looking at all the workshops being listed, I’m not really sure we even need a discussion on this. I open the floor.

So there’s just one point, though, which I have made with every IGF, actually, and it’s to do with the number of board members that will travel to the meeting in Joao Pessoa, and whether they would be given a sheet as to which workshops, and so on, to attend. Perhaps that would be a good thing to share that document with them. And I guess that’s really up to them, and I’m not quite sure who decides on the board, and spread them

into these workshops. It's important if there is any support to be had from the board for these sessions. It does make a difference when you see an ICANN board member that is present in the session.

That's an action item, again, to share it. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thank you. Yes, there's a number of board members going. I think the total at the moment is six or seven going. The idea is similar to what we've done at previous IGFs, that the board members would indeed have discussion beforehand, and discussion on-site, perhaps, at regular breakfast sessions. If you recall, we did that in... Somewhere. And the board members would indeed support the different sessions. Of course, there's the actual ICANN sessions themselves. There's the ICANN open session, and the Day 0 session on the IANA Stewardship Transition.

And of course, we also have Chris Disspain as one of our panel members. Indeed, he'll bring his expertise and knowledge of the process to our workshop. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel, for this. And, Bill, you have put in the chat, you do think that compiling and sharing workshop lists would be

useful. And that has been done. I remember seeing it. Peter Dengate Thrush?

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: I assume it's going to be there again, but they have very good software at the IGF – meeting planning software. And I'm sure if we look at that, you'll be able to load up [inaudible] all the ICANN meetings that are occurring today or this week, and link that to all your contacts, put it in your own diary. So it's actually a very good software, and we can have a look at that. I don't know whether it's going to be available before the meeting starts, but once it does start, that's another tool that you can use to do just what that list will do.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Peter. I wasn't aware of that software. It runs on mobiles or is that...? It's a mobile app.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Yes. It's a very good mobile app of what's happening, including a whole lot of social media stuff, who's going to be there, who of your friends is going to be there, which ones you should be at that they're at, and who's not there, and all the things that social media can now do for us.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think I've tried it vaguely at some point in the past 365 days. Okay. That's fine. Anything else on this? Lynn St. Amour?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Thank you, Olivier. I thought we had also talked about whether or not there were any messages members of this particular working group wanted to be carrying forward on ICANN's behalf, as we actually participated in sessions and hallway sessions. I don't know if there had been any work done on that, or if there are things which, again, from an ICANN perspective, and what ICANN does, that we'd want to... When I was with ISOC, we would actually say, "Here are three or four of the key points we actually want to take the opportunity to advance," and that was forming all of our interactions in hallways and more formal sessions and things. And I think as this working group, if we could come up with a couple of those that might be helpful, as well. At the moment, it's still too early, and I can't think of any.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Lynn. That could be useful. Sometimes it's called a song sheet. So, should we have a song sheet? I think that it's quite likely the majority of questions asked of anybody who is known to be active in ICANN circles will probably be asked about

IANA Stewardship Transition and ICANN accountability. What song sheet can we have on that? Treacherous.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Well, I think for the IANA transition, I think we can do that because coming out of this meeting – and Mary’s on the ICG as well – coming out of this meeting, we expect to put a status update up, and then the current draft of the transition. It obviously isn’t complete. It won’t be complete until the CWG Stewardship Group says they’re happy with the work of the accountability team, which obviously [isn’t done]. But I think we’ll actually have a small number of talking points that can speak quite factually to where we are.

The accountability is a different question, but maybe we should take an action item to try and pull together a set of talking points that we might all use to talk about the status of the accountability work almost as a separate item, because it does have an impact on the ICG work, but it actually runs in parallel.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Mary?

MARY UDUMA: I support what Lynn has said. Even my colleagues from fTLD that I hear in this process, some are still confused about what actually we're trying to do. And more especially, when it comes to PTI and ICANN, it's still a soft point that is not very clear. So probably, when you're doing something, you will be able to clearly state it so that anybody that will be part of it. That being said, I also want to ask whether it is only the board members that will be looking at being there? Are there some other people that ICANN will sponsor to go there, or go in on their own, and reaching out to them to also participate in so many of the workshop groups?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Mary. We've been made aware of the number of board members that are going there. I'm aware of a few other people that are going there as part of the special SO and AC budget requests, where they have been funded to have a workshop at IGF. I don't have off the top of my head how many of them there are, but I guess we'll see the usual group that is active in ICANN and in IGF, and with many workshops from civil society being included.

Now, making a list of these, I guess we can see the workshops that we have listed that have been identified, and you'll see the number of people there. As far as a song sheet is concerned, as

far as they are concerned, I'm not sure, because they might have different points of view, and so on. I do think we need to remain rather neutral and focus basically on I would say just the positives, on what's going on. And, in fact, we can very much be very proud of this process. It's done pretty well.

On the song sheet preparation, or the main message out there, we might have different points of view as well on some of the other process of what's going on at ICANN. But I do believe that 99% of the time we'll probably be asked about this. So I don't know yet. I'm not quite sure how to proceed forward with building one of these, and I'm not even sure whether it's the mandate of this working group to do a song sheet.

Maybe we could ask the CWG IANA and the CCWG Accountability to provide us a one-pager as to where they think we are, which would be helpful for anyone – not just for us, but to put it out there as a summary. And I believe there will probably be a statement of the CCWG Accountability at the end of this week to summarize on where they are, and so on. So it might be a bit redundant on what we're trying to do.

Okay. Let's move on then, and let's go to the planning for our activities between Dublin and Marrakech. As we know, the WSIS is ongoing, and there has been some very good work by ICANN staff, in consultation with the working group, in being able to

tap into our input, and then do things with it. I'm not quite sure where we are on WSIS. I haven't followed the process at all. And of course, it's going on as we speak. What do we expect after that based on what there has been so far? Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thank you very much. I'm not sure who's on the remote, whether – is Marilyn on the remote? She would be able to give – it's rather early in New York, to say the least, although she was on a call earlier.

So essentially, this week in New York, on Monday, there was the second open preparatory meeting or open consultation session, where stakeholders were given the opportunity to give their views on the zero draft, and how that should be amended or adjusted going forward. Then yesterday, today, and tomorrow, there are inter-governmental sessions where stakeholders can also observe, but not take part, to discuss the zero draft yesterday morning, in New York, there was a session, essentially, where member states just gave their initial views on the zero draft, and as I understand, today, they'll drill down into particular topics in the zero draft paper.

As a result of the discussions this week, there will be a further draft prepared for further discussions. That draft will hopefully come out in November, and so might well be available for discussion at the IGF. Certainly, the stakeholders are asking the

UN Secretariat that stakeholders are given an opportunity to comment on that draft. So there's sort of second draft before the final paper is prepared for the 15th and 16th December meeting.

So I think things are on track, so to speak. Some stakeholders were disappointed that the agenda for this week's discussion was somewhat amended at the last minute so they had less opportunity to interact with governments. But at least stakeholders are in the room. Hopefully, we'll be able to give updates on calls that you schedule, Mr. Chairman, as we move forward. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. Now, looking at December onwards, so 2016, what is the likely process beyond that, or are we finishing with a full stop at the UNGA?

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you. Not at all, he says. Somewhat. No. So 2016, well, we know some meetings on the schedule already. Clearly, some of these meetings are subject to what happens at the UN, but for instance, the CSTD – this is the Commission on Science and Technology for Development. They have their annual meeting in May that's always in Geneva. They have an intersessional meeting, which is going to take place in Budapest in, I think, the

second week of January, and that will discuss the outcome from the New York session, and plan what happens in the CSTD plenary. As many of you know, the CSTD is responsible for crafting the ICT for Development Resolution that's adopted each year, ECOSOC.

So, that's one component. Another component will be the WSIS Forum, which the IT have already planned. Again, that's possibly subject to what happens at the UN. But WSIS Forum is planned for May. And then in June, next year, just before the ICANN meeting in Panama – thank you, Mary – there's an OECD Ministerial on the Digital Economy, which the technical community, and civil society and business have an input too, and ICANN is part of the technical community. The new CEO, whoever the new CEO is, will be invited to that meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. You might need to cut down on the coffee that early in the morning. Okay. Well, that's great. So, the calendar of events, actually, is being built. We haven't had the chance to have it ready by this meeting, but thanks for this input, and I guess we can work with – I believe Marilyn Cade, as well, will work on this and add to this. And now we have on the record the forthcoming activities.

The question to the group is are we happy in the way that we're working at the moment with staff in order to be able to follow these processes? I know that in our last meeting, Peter had advanced the idea of actually being more proactive, and perhaps writing papers in advance, and so on. We couldn't find consensus at the time. There were other positions and other points of view there.

So first, are we happy with the process by which we interact? And I would also ask Nigel as to whether what the community is providing, how much or how little it is doing, is that helpful to staff in being able to formulate an ICANN position? But then also, the other way around, as far as the community is concerned, do you feel happy in the way that we're interacting as we are at the moment? And, I open the floor. It's a very open question.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'll jump into the breach because Nigel's been so good about doing it on all of the other items. I think one of the things we had thought about was certainly writing papers and positions, but I think it was actually having a longer trajectory to our work, so that we could actually keep things kind of in process, and then build upon them.

So maybe what we should do is look at some of the key meetings that are coming up in 2016, determine which ones we think might have an impact or we'd be interested in having a statement prepared for, and then start to put maybe just a draft outline of some of the things we might address, or talking points or something. But for me, I think it was a little bit more about a horizon, and just looking at that, and making that determination of where we're going to participate and what we might want to say, I think, will give the work a little more direction.

I have to say, also, it's always the same relatively small number of people that participate in the work. Yet if you look at the CCWG-IG list, there's a whole list of supporting organizations and names and participants and sponsors, and actually not many of the people that are here regularly are on the list. Maybe I just need to reacquaint myself with what this working group is supposed to do. Are we meant to have support from all of those other constituencies in ICANN, and if so, do we need to reach back out to them and get them to refresh their participation? Because if we can get better participation from a broader set of the constituencies here, I think we'll have more resources, more work, more relevance. But there were a number of questions in there.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: That last point was really my starting point, in that the staff has been going to these meetings and fighting these international fights, and presenting the Internet the position for the entire life of ICANN. ut until this working group got started, there hasn't been any link between that work and what the community thinks about any of that.

So part of the process that I think should be created is a link, and this working group is that process, and it does require every now and then, for the ccNSO and At-Large , and maybe SSAC, and all the other components to have a look at some of those issues. And even if their answer is, "We're not concerned about this," you carry on to the extent that it affects you. And that's a pivotally good response.

That way, first of all, I think there will be a community-developed position, but much more importantly, staff when they're abroad or at these things, can actually point to a multistakeholder model developing a process, and developing the position that they're standing there articulating.

Now, it also does have the occasional impact that it will – the community may have a slightly different view as to how the staff should behave at one of these sessions, but I think that should be a healthy debate. It's not a question of attempting to change

or control or dominate, or any of the other things which so much of the discussions of this place tend to get imbued by.

This is about creating a platform for international and Internet governance engagement, and I think it's helpful for us to be able to point to a solidly built policy through a solidly built multi-stakeholder process. That's all. We do that with everything else. It shouldn't be too difficult to do it in this case.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Peter. I think that I've got a very similar point of view to the one that you just emitted. The worth of this working group is that it actually does fill the gap between the community and staff on these wider internet governance positions. The concern I've had as co-chair is, of course, the lack of involvement that we have seen recently. I have asked, informally, many of the participants who were originally listed, and unfortunately, it's all been down to the air being taken out of the room because of the CWG IANA and the CCWG Accountability.

So, we have to... In some way, we could say, "Well, this is a temporary phase that we're going through at the moment," but you're very right, we should re-establish those links. Perhaps we should have a summary of the activities of the working group that we could send to all of the SO and AC chairs, and let them

know what this group has been up to, and of all the processes that have been taking place. Because I know for a fact that they're also very much focused on IANA Stewardship Transition, except the few that have a wider mandate, such as the SSAC, for example, because they've just done their bit enough to where it's okay, that's dealt with. Peter Dengate Thrush?

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thanks, Chair. Just a quick comment on that, and that is, the air is always being sucked out of the room by some massive issue at ICANN, and anybody who thinks that that's not going to be the case going forward, I think, should stop and review the history of the first WSIS, being sued by VeriSign, the new gTLD program.

There is always a mess of crisis, some of them existential, on which a lot of time had ended. But that doesn't stop other groups from carrying on with their work, and then the GNSO is carrying through a whole lot of work, and looking at other issues, and some of them are even asking for a new gTLD round, and so on. So there's no – yes, it does take a lot from the volunteer effort, but the way you deal with that is to be up front, and to keep going, and to put the papers out, and to require the groups – it's the squeaky wheel sort of management system. If you're not putting stuff back to these groups, calling them at meetings, asking why they weren't there, asking for their

community’s position on something, and getting it all to their agendas, then it will slip away.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Peter. What’s your thought on having a summary of our activities then that we could push over to the SOs and ACs, and ask for their feedback on this? Question for everyone here. Or should we be more provocative? Shall we seek their input on saying, “Well, these are the different topics?”

I think that Nigel mentioned earlier the different meetings, and Lynn, you were saying we should identify what we want to do in advance of all of these meetings. Nigel did identify the calendar, and we’ll build the calendar in the next few weeks so we’ll be able to have all of the different things. I would imagine we will continue and follow up on WSIS. We’ll obviously follow up on any ITU event that will take place. I’m not aware of any Plentipot or WikIT, or any of the other wonder acronyms that they have, but there obviously would be a follow-up with the WSIS since there’s going to be a crescendo in December. And then what afterwards? Obviously, there will be work after. Lynn St. Amour?

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Thank you, Olivier. I think it’s a good idea to be a brief sort of [pressing] maybe on what we’ve done this year. If you think

about the calendar, you think about some of the inputs we have actually pulled together, the various presentations. I think that's interesting. I think pointing to the calendar and the events next year, and the fact, if we get a high-level timetable of the things we intend to participate in, or have a position on, I think that will catch their interest. And I think we probably need to do a little bit of a campaign drive if you really want to make the participant list that's here, that draws from all of the constituencies – basically, get them back into the room.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Peter?

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Yes, I agree. I think a good governance process means that there should be a report at the end of the year's activities, and it should also include a highlighting or a forecasting of what's coming up.

The other thing to avoid with those, giving my description of how to make these things work, you've got to avoid also crying wolf in trying to alert, and they get excited, then they find out actually it's not their issue, they can't do anything about it, or it's already been done.

So, to a certain extent, that would be the position for the meetings in New York. The positions on that have all been well established today, or whenever it was, Monday, as the day when members of the community can make submissions. And, from now on, it's going to be difficult for people to actually do anything. So, you don't want to be calling them to arms, getting them excited about an issue only to find that in fact there is nothing that they can do.

So, focusing is limited on next year's activities, and starting to frame that for people so they understand why there should be interest, and what they might possibly asked, would be very helpful. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Peter. And your allusion to crying wolf just rang a bell with regards to each one of the processes that we've seen. Before WikIT, lots of movement everywhere, "This is the end of the Internet." Before WSIS+10, the end of the Internet. It often is waved around a little bit. But, I think that's a good way forward.

I must share a bit of a disappointment that I've had on our work, but it's just been due to overwork from everyone, me included. We had those WSIS contributions that were put into a table. Renate works very well in putting these together, and I was hoping that we could collect some input from people who had

read the contributions, that could just put a few words neutrally as to what the contribution was about.

I guess this kind of work needs a lead to be able to push this forward, a driver pushing it forward that spends a significant amount of time on this, pushing it forward. ISOC has managed to do exactly that. And even they couldn't cover everything. They just focused on the government, or on specific submissions, or did they cover more than that? I saw maybe the first version, which was only looking at specific submissions, but I suppose that they have paid staff that has spent a significant amount of time to be able to do this.

I guess when we had our calls, we might have been – we, as in maybe I – mea culpa – might have been a little overenthusiastic as to thinking what we could do with the limited means that we do have. If you see any other way to do this, and to be able to have some of this – because I must admit I have read some contributions partly, and it was really sideways reading, and so not to an extent of being able to summarize anything. Lynn St. Amour?

LYNN ST. AMOUR:

Thank you, Chair. I think when we actually did the call for “was there support for that activity” I thought there was lukewarm support. And, I think probably a few people approached it as

sort of best efforts. So, we perhaps maybe need to be a little more cautious or thoughtful about things we take on. Maybe in that instance, we should have just said we're going to use one of our sister organization's set of papers, and let's drive discussions on the topics instead. So rather than spinning our wheels to try and do something probably less thorough than what a bunch of paid staff did over several months, that we could have taken that, built on it, and actually had the discussions in this room about what it meant to ICANN.

So maybe we just need to be a little more thoughtful about other work we pull in, and what we, ourselves, commit to.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Lynn. I did speak to Constance Bommelaer about this, and she was very positive about being able to collaborate and share the ISOC input. I'm not sure whether we have sent the link to the ISOC work in the CCWG's – we did? Okay, yes. So that, I guess, was very helpful indeed. So I do note that Constance was quite positive about this, and we might be able to do this in the future, maybe at an earlier stage, a bit more upstream, rather than doing it at the very last moment.

Any other suggestions on this? I do note also that we are four minutes beyond the allocated time. So we're going to probably

have to break off, and then follow up afterwards. But we have made some good progress.

Any other business, really? Or any other questions or comments before we move on? We're set for our public session. Bill Drake has been doing very good work also with the different people that are taking part, and with Nigel. So we shouldn't really have any concerns about the public session we'll have tomorrow. Hopefully we will have enough people there, and that's it. Thanks very much, Peter? Yes?

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: I was just saying thank you, Chair. Thank you, everyone.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. This meeting is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]