EN

LOS ANGELES – CCWG on Internet Governance
Wednesday, October 15, 2014 – 08:30 to 09:45
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

GREGORY SHATAN:	Greg Shatan, Abelman Frayne & Schwab, IPC.
UNIDENTIFIED MALE:	[inaudible], ISPCP.
NIGEL HICKSON:	Nigel Hickson, ICANN.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	[inaudible] of China.
LYNN ST AMOUR:	Lynn St. Amour, Internet Matters.
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:	[inaudible] Lee from .KL.
JENNIFER TAYLOR:	Jen Taylor Hodges, BT.
SARAH FALVEY:	Sarah Falvey, Google.

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.

DAVID FARRIS: David Farris, 21st Century Fox.

LINDA KINNEY: Linda Kinney, Motion Picture Association of America.

MILTON MUELLER: We have an interesting group. I was actually planning on eating breakfast, but since Olivier is not here. There is an agenda. I don't know if everybody saw it. It was posted to Confluence. The items were to review of the various Internet governance hot spots NETmundial Initiative Plenipot WSIS 10.

Strategic plan for its implications for IG activities and role for ICANN; Interface engagement with the wider community and ICANN leadership, including the IG session later today; ICANN expenditures – I'm not sure why we're talking that here, but okay. And then charter discussion.

Personally, I would start with the charter point, but are there any other things we should add to this off the top of your head?

Just by way of [inaudible], for those who are coming into this process a little bit later – I was totally not prepared to talk. For those are coming into this process a little bit later, this initiative started in Buenos Aires.

Those who were there will recall that with NETmundial half a year on the horizon, Fadi called us all together at 7:00 AM – there were about 1000 people in the room – to talk about how Internet governance, the broader agenda of Internet governance issues beyond the ICANN world, were increasingly becoming important to ICANN and raising concerns and why this was [inaudible] leading then to the NETmundial initiative

and suggested that the community might want to create a space where people could address these sort of broader issues that are not specific to ICANN's internal operations and the management of the domain name industry, etc.

So a group was formed by various Internet governance mavens who live both in the UN environment and ICANN. Unfortunately, for some months, we sort of drifted a bit. We did manage to write a response for the NETmundial – an input document for the NETmundial initiative – about what our views were at the top level in terms of principles and the roadmap and items like that. Marilyn, hi!

But one thing we did not manage to do yet was to adopt a charter and actually boot up activity based on that. I understand that there is a motion before the GNSO Council for later today introduced by Avri Doria for the GNSO to adopt the charter – our GNSO members to adopt the charter. Hopefully, various stakeholder group representatives would be speaking on behalf of their stakeholder groups.

So the question I guess is I don't know if people are familiar with the charter or read it. There was a lot of work that went into it. It's fairly consistent with the kind of emerged standard of how these things are done, although that's of course highly variable still. To some extent, when I say "standard" that's in quotes. And there is in fact a cross-community working group about how to do cross-community working groups. Oh, here's the chair.

Just to say by way of background, that's where we are. We have not adopted a charter yet to shape our work program going forward, but there is a motion for the Council today and that is obviously – if we

want to be serious about doing this as a cross-community working group in the way other cross-community working groups are done, we should charter the thing, specify a set of objectives, scope it out and move forward.

So, with that impromptu background, we now have the co-convener of the process. Just for those who don't recall, this started out I think it was in Buenos Aires. I think it was Buenos Aires. At-Large and the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group sort of tried to boot up a discussion about how to do this, because many of the members on both sides were very concerned about this and wanted to make sure something actually happened.

And Olivier as chair at that point of the ALAC and Rafik Dammak as the chair of the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group became the co-facilitators for the initial stage.

But, of course, again, that's all pre-charter and it was just initial bootstrapping exercise and now we have to decide from here how we want to proceed.

So, Olivier, I was just giving – we did a [inaudible], although a lot of people have entered since then. I just gave a little brief background of how this initiative got started from Buenos Aires and what the current state of play was with regard to the charter issue and I outlined the agenda and that's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Milton. And apologies for my late arrival, just having finished chairing another meeting and it ran a little late. Did with

just do the GNSO status so far with regards to the charter? Have we gone through the ccNSO and the other [inaudible]?

MILTON MUELLER: We did not. I only mentioned that there was a GNSO motion for today.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this. Perhaps we can find out from the other SOs and ACs then what the status is with regard to charter adoption so as to know where we stand on this. I can let you know that the ALAC has voted and has passed the charter, so the ALAC is fully behind this.

Anyone in from the ccNSO? I understand that it was passed, but just a few words if there is anybody here. Martin Boyle?

MARTIN BOYLE: I've got no idea whatsoever.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this very valuable piece of information, Martin. I think it was passed. I recall the note from Byron letting us know that was passed. Any other SOs and ACs? I believe the SSAC has also passed the charter. I'm not sure about the – well, we haven't heard from the ASO nor from the GAC on this. I don't even know if it figures in the GAC agenda at any point.

Okay. Next I guess we have to look at – what is the next part?

BILL DRAKE: So the first item on the agenda that was circulated some time ago was to overview the range of current global Internet governance activities that might be especially relevant, the NETmundial initiative, the Plenipotentiary of the ITU, WSIS+10.

I do wonder whether there isn't an [inaudible] conversation about whether everybody's on the same page and wants how we want to do this. But it's up to you. We can dive into the substantive points of view.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Bill. Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: Marilyn Cade, one of the Business participants. I'd like to add under AOB a discussion on if we have someone who wants to retire from the group, because now there are two other cross-community working groups that are also taking interest. We may have some interest of rotating in participants and rotating out participants. But we can come to that, please, under housekeeping.

My comment was going to be that I would like us to do a bit of a tour of the ecosystem events at a very high level to see if we all have a common – or common enough – awareness of some of the events that are going on that are of great implication.

I'll just mention, on the one hand, the WSIS review has three elements to it. For many people, understanding the complexity of that, it's not really apparent, but they all have opportunities for consultation and participation. So, covering that.

Then I'm just going to say I really – by doing that, we will make sure we do not become only NETmundial focused, but we are taking into account the broader range. Even the NETmundial documents call for taking the principles from NETmundial into a wide variety of other activities.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. And then the gentleman on the right. I'm sorry; I don't know your name.

VIKA MPISANE: No problem. I'm Vika Mpisane from the ccNSO Council. Just to sort of take you back, [inaudible], yes, the charter was adopted on the 25th of September by the ccNSO Council. And as far as I'm aware, the call for representatives from the ccNSO to this Board and it closed yesterday.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this information. Filiz?

FILIZ YILMAZ: Thank you. Filiz Yilmaz, ASO. We've been dealing with a lot of other stuff during the course of the past few months. We all do. So can you remind us the process of the charter approval? Should it be going through us to our constituencies or as the SO-AC chairs, one of them? Did you raise it with the chairs and you are expecting our chairs to respond to you?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much, Filiz. We have sent the charter to all of the SO and AC chairs. I don't know where the internal procedures are with regards to ASO, but you obviously have procedures to go through this.

FILIZ YILMAZ: Okay. Just to round it up, I'll get back to you about ASO AC part after getting advice from my chair, and I'll inform the group. Okay?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's perfect, thank you. So maybe we can now go into the list of topics then that this working group would be interested in addressing. Obviously we started with a cross-community working group that worked specifically on the NETmundial process.

As we know, the NETmundial process has somehow left the building and gone for its own life. I guess the first question is should we continue tracking the NETmundial? Should this working group pursue work on this? And then what other topics might this working group be interested in tracking, and pursuing and addressing?

Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: I'm not exactly sure tracking is the word I would have used. That's why I want to make a clarifying point from my perspective. I always looked at this working group as being the way that the community was providing bottom-up, widely-supported – I'm not using the word consensus here – but widely-supported guidance to the CEO, staff, and the Board on our views on ICANN's activities and roles in Internet governance and also

ICANN
LOS ANGELES

sharing information about what we ourselves were doing when we wore another hat in Internet governance activities, which are much more broad.

But that we were not trying to in any way replace the IGF, but we were trying to guide and inform the work of ICANN resources within ICANN and ICANN externally into other fora.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Bill Drake?

BILL DRAKE: I'm pleased to say that I agree with Marilyn, which is wonderful, because we're sitting next to each other. However, I would add one element. I think providing guidance about ICANN's engagement with the wider ecosystem, sharing information about what's happening in the ecosystem, but thirdly, there may be instances where something is going on and it would be useful, as we did with the NETmundial meeting itself, for the community to express – aggregate views and express them vis-à-vis these things.

The way you formulate it, it sounded slightly passive from the external site. Okay. So you're [down with] the third point, too. Because the fact that we did put an input into the NETmundial initiative I think was useful for people to see what this community shared views were on those top-line things.

And it may well be that on some other points such as the NETmundial initiative or other things there would be an instance where it would be,

in my view, advisable for us to be able to express a collective sentiment. David might have a different view, but let's hear.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Bill. David Farris next.

DAVID FARRIS: I was just going to say I think maybe what we need to do, too – we need to look at each discreet initiative that's underway and perhaps provide guidance where it's relevant, if ICANN should or should not be involved, however that works.

But maybe we need to have an overarching statement about when ICANN should engage in the broader Internet governance debate. It should be focused on the DNS issues – the names and numbering issues. We've seen ICANN actually initiate a lot of different things in the Internet governance space over the last year and things that I would think some of the community at least are not comfortable with and has been done without any guidance from the community. And therefore, I think we should have some overarching principles about when and how ICANN should engage in these types of activities on their own initiative. So it gives some general guidance. And then we have to look at the specific initiatives that are underway and provide guidance on those.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, David. When you mentioned "when should ICANN engage on its own initiatives," you mean "when should ICANN staff engaged or ICANN as the organization as a whole?"

DAVID FARRIS: I think it's more about staff. ICANN as a whole – what do you mean?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: How does that [inaudible] image?

DAVID FARRIS: ICANN as a whole. We are ICANN, and so we will choose to determine how we engage in these different activities. I'm talking about ICANN as an entity, so it would be staff and Board perhaps on behalf of the entire community.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Also, just to support that, it also impacts the budget and accountability, because you're talking about funding that's being appropriated to these initiatives without community input, so things like the WEF and other issues come to mind.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. We have Marilia Maciel in the queue.

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you, Olivier. Just a suggestion. I totally agree what has been advanced by [Marilyn] and Bill before me, but I think that another important task that we have is to map the meetings and events that are coming up – we will have a full agenda this year and next year until the WSIS+10 review of events that will deal with Internet governance. Some

of them are not very related to ICANN but they do have aspects that touch upon what ICANN is doing here.

It's just, for instance, in the Plenipotentiary Conference in Busan, we have one of the resolutions related to the role of member states and the management of internationalized multilingual domain names.

It's not a clear proposal. It's a vague one. But I think that it's important for us to map where discussions are taking place and to percolate these discussions inside a community so the community stays informed. So I see it as one of the roles of the working group is to collect this information to map events that they're coming up and to make sure that that information circulates among the community.

And I do see that we have a role in tracking – or whatever word you prefer to use – the NETmundial initiative, because I see this as moving forward even with two tracks, but I feel that there is a movement of working with the Brazilian government and [CGI] towards the IGF next year. So I think this is something that we should not exclude from our radar. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilia. Next is Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: As many of you know, I published the scary timeline of meetings or my travel schedule – it's hard to figure out which. Sort of a joke. But what I would say is when we think about what ICANN and Co. should do – staff, Board, budget supported activities – versus activities that the

community engages in, which may also take budget support, I look at this as there is what ICANN does and the risk and threats to how ICANN will be able to continue to do what it does with integrity.

So, to me, an external risk or threat are those proposals that are coming up in the Plenipot from some governments who want a change who provide some of the functions that ICANN coordinates or manages today.

It might also include other proposals that are being put forward into the UNGA to create an Internet oversight mechanism to approve and coordinate all ICANN and Internet related policy.

I look at this – and I'm looking at David now, but it's like there is the core DNS activities and issues, but there's also in the ecosystem – the Internet governance ecosystem – there's a significant amount of risk and threat that would limit or restrict or change how ICANN functions, which may be because of lack of awareness or lack of agreement.

I do think we have to figure out how to advise, how ICANN participates in such activities and how we inform the ICANN community about being an informed participant in some of those activities as well within the business community. I didn't say constituency; I said community.

We look at business, civil society, the technical community as being much better ambassadors to governments than the ICANN staff. I'm not being critical of the ICANN staff, but there's a respect when a business person or civil society or an NGO from your country comes to you and lays out a supporting message as opposed to when you get visited from someone who's just coming in.

EN

And David, I both agree with you and maybe wanted to expand a little bit on how we also advise on addressing the risk and threats and using the strength of the community to do that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Next is Bill Drake.

BILL DRAKE: I'm once again in agreement with Marilyn. It's a question of how broadly you ought to define the question of what's ICANN's remit and what needs to be done in the external ecosystem in order to preserve and protect it.

I think, like Marilyn, I would look at some of these other activities and say there are proposals that could over some timeframe begin to impact ICANN's operations in some negative way, which might not be very specific sounding to the management of the DNS, and somehow, and yet, nevertheless, affected institutionally.

The only thing I wonder about is – the point I think where there's been a lot of controversy is not just the risks and threats, but the opportunities. I think Fadi and ICANN staff in supporting the NETmundial initiative saw themselves as proactively helping to launch some activities that would further broaden support for the multi-stakeholder approach, and provide more tools for the ecosystem and the global community to be able to engage effectively, and over time, perhaps help to address some of the concerns expressed by various governments, etc., so when you have initiatives, things going on [in the] NETmundial initiative about, for example, how to replicate national and regional multi-stakeholderism,

this is something that is intended to try to provide positive supporting input into the ecosystem.

And I guess the question is a lot of people are not comfortable with that side. I think that we probably have more consensus on responding to threats than we do towards seizing opportunities as this has been defined. And I guess that's one of the questions.

At this point, ICANN is already engaged with cgi.br and WEF in launching the NETmundial initiative. Are we going to tell them that they should withdraw from that activity? It strikes me as a little bit difficult.

So the question is, proactively, what's useful to do as well and how do we want to express our views on those kinds of initiatives?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Bill. We have [Kivuva Mwendwa]. Go ahead.

[MWENDWA KIVUVA]:   [inaudible]. I think it's both ways it would seem to me from the views I've heard from the last two speakers. Some instances the ICANN staff can easily lead and show up and sell out the ICANN model, if we think an event is suitable for that.

Then there are some where actually the constituencies of ICANN would be better placed to do that. And some of it as well probably will need to be [changed] over time. If you take NETmundial, which was a success, in several [inaudible] as well, because ICANN participated in the organization of it and all the [staff], but it is [inaudible] there seems to be a bit [inaudible] of some sort where the whole event was sort of

[inaudible] to be, "Well, it was yet another ICANN event disguised of another name." So I think it will have to be a [inaudible] process where this group assesses the best way for ICANN to participate in a process.

I would also like to add the fact that I think, from what I hear, the best way of some sort of [inaudible] metrics of some sort could be developed where we could rank this event and say what event, why is it important, what's the magnitude of the importance and how to engage with the event. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I think you touched on this and I was actually looking at seeing if we could have a table and a wiki which would have a list with the different events listed, whether they are within ICANN's mission or remit or the touch on ICANN's mission and remit, what the external risk is – external as in external risk to ICANN – and then also tracking the ICANN staff status on this, whether staff has already started going on this.

David Farris, you're next.

DAVID FARRIS: Just in response to Bill, ICANN's engagement with the World Economic Forum on the NETmundial initiative, I want to say, at the outset, I in no way doubt the good intentions of ICANN's engagement and attempt to launch this initiative. However, I think there was united stakeholder frustration about it.

And if we had some overarching guidance about how ICANN should undertake these types of activities, we might have avoided some of that. So that's why I'm thinking it's so important that we need some general guidance to ICANN on this, because now they're having to play catch-up on NETmundial initiative and do damage control based on the frustration from the stakeholders after it was announced from the top down.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I see a lot of people agreeing with this. Marilia Maciel.

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you, Olivier. I like it very much the point about assessing the processes and finding ways to be engaged, and I think that we should also assess all the tracks that they're discussing Internet governance against the set of principles that we have that came out of NETmundial to be very important to us as to which extent this process is being consistent with the document that we have now, which is the final outcome, the statement. It should be the baseline for the work that will carry out here.

And I think that it is a way to say that, actually, we do not have separate tracks of NETmundial. All the tracks that derive from the NETmundial meeting, they should be based on those principles and that is how we should assess anything that ICANN partners with WEF or with CGI or whatever. It should [depart] from the principles that we have.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilia. Next is Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: I may be asking for clarification. I participated in NETmundial. I was one of the five business reps on [One Star] and participated with the business community in organizing. I think we had some experiences that were very, very valuable in the process of organizing, but we also had a finite amount of time, and an agreement that we were not going to have negotiated documents. So we have a set of principles that came out.

I don't think our job here is to only focus on the NETmundial principles, nor do I think that all of the NETmundial principles are about ICANN. There are sections which are about ICANN.

So, again, when we go through this process of assessing the events, I'm probably particularly focused on helping to create awareness within this broader ICANN community on the implications of the CSTD review on WSIS and overall WSIS review, because both of those I think will have really big implications as well for ICANN's role in the ecosystem.

There are principles related to that that are in the NETmundial document, but there may be other things that we will also want to incorporate into our analysis.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. I think we have reached the end of this discussion on this agenda item, which is the tracking of all the different initiatives. I can see certainly two tables – I'll come to you in a second, Nigel – one

on the events and one on the tracks. They must be somehow linked together, but it might be better to have them first tracked separately and see where we go from there.

It looks to me, though, that with the current growth and multiplication of fora, if we don't start right way with having this on paper, we'll not get anywhere. Maybe we can start with Marilyn's list to [inaudible] the table and then get staff to publish it and we can fill it in.

Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you, Olivier. Just a note on what Marilyn said on the CSTD. It's the ten-year review of the WSIS outcomes. It's a critical discussion that's taking place at the CSTD. They'll be an intercessional at the end of November where [I can] attend as an observer. Obviously other community members attend as well intercessional at the end of the November, and then the main CSTD in May next year which will adopt a recommendation on the WSIS outcome, which will then be adopted to ECOSOC and will form a fundamental input into the UNGA discussions in December 2015. So that is an important element of work and ICANN has made a contribution into the CSTD on that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. We've got our action item for number two. Let's move to number three, strategic plan for its implication for IG activities and role for ICANN.

I didn't originate that agenda item, so I'm not sure if anybody can expand on this. Bill?

BILL DRAKE: I didn't, but I wonder – this is an hour-and-a-half meeting, right? Do we not want to talk about some of those items in number two a little bit more? The Plenipotentiary, the WSIS+10. I think they [inaudible]. Probably not everybody is completely up to speed with what's happening in each of those spaces. I would think that this is—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, I was assuming that everyone was up to speed, but that's an excellent idea. Sorry, apologies for this. So we've done NETmundial. Plenipot?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I don't know that we have done NETmundial.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Then [inaudible] talk about the NETmundial initiative?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Let's do a maximum of five minutes on NETmundial and NETmundial initiative. I think plenty of us have already heard some of it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You can say NETmundial initiative as NETmundial [2] I think. Are you talking about World Economic Forum effort?

[BILL DRAKE]:   Do people want to know what's going on with the World Economic Forum?

[MARILYN CADE]:   Yes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: That's what we're talking about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, please. Go ahead.

BILL DRAKE: I'm involved in this a bit, so I can talk about it briefly. Leaving aside the whole process by which this got established about which we all have expressed views and so on, the question is, going forward, what's going on and how does the ICANN community want to interface with that?

Bottom line is what is happening in the WEF is there's two tracks. One track is what they're currently calling strategic dialogue on global Internet governance and cooperation, which will mean that at Davos there will be a bunch of panels and discussions with senior-level people, primarily from outside the community.

And I think that while this is something that grated on a lot of people that this initiative seemed to be so focused on outside the community and the community members were not more involved, there is I think

arguably something to be said for bringing into the conversation CEOs from the financial world and heads of state and others who might have some interest in knowing what's going on with Internet governance, and particularly if they provide some support whether it is simply a matter of expressing support for the model, for a certain type of approach or whether they seek to get together and try and resource some further activity.

I want to make the argument that – in any event, you can't prevent people from having conversations. We don't own global Internet governance, and if they want to talk about these things, they will do that.

I think what's important to note, though, is that it is not a norm-setting activity. I know that many of my friend in civil society got very agitated at the front end about the whole NETmundial initiative, because they thought that basically the sort of soft norm-setting process that we had in Sao Paulo with [inaudible] principles and a roadmap and so on was somehow being privatized and taken off stage into a place that wasn't accessible.

But WEF put out a FAQ before the August 28 launch meeting that I thought clarified these points, but not many people seem to have read it very carefully. I don't think the WEF aspires to be the place where norms are being negotiated or established in any way, shape or form. They're trying to facilitate a conversation, and whether you agree with that conversation, that's another point.

Then the second track is the NETmundial initiative/platform – the final name to be determined. And the concept here is to actually do some

sort of programmatic activity that, as I said, further [inaudible] report and so on would provide some enriching inputs into the ecosystem's ability to function effectively, etc.

There are four projects that were announced at the launch meeting on August 28. I don't know if people are familiar with them, but they are moving forward. And these are just the initial projects. There's one which is being catalyzed by the GovLab at New York University which is about so-called issue-to-solution mapping which is trying to map out the range of issues that are out there and put it into a technologically-driven database that can be accessed so that people could easily track issues.

If, for example, a Minister or Vice Minister wants to know what's going on with network security, they would be able to go into this tool and find the range of different activities that are happening in different places in order to have a better visualization. This kind of ties into the notion of a Clearinghouse, which I've been pushing for some time as well.

That's a programmatic activity and NYU is already working on designing the software and the framework for doing this and they hope to have something to demo in a few months.

Secondly, there is an initiative about best practices for so-called distributed governance networks or distributed governance groups, there's a little analytical confusion here in my mind – but that's beside the point. We had a meeting in Turin in October 1 and 2. This is being coordinated by the Berkman Center at Harvard University.

There's a series of case studied being done about multi-stakeholder practices that are being pursued in various contexts, particularly at the national level, but there will also be some case studies that will look at some of the transnational things like the [RIRs].

We had a discussion about those case studies in Turin. There will be a document that tries to summarize and integrate the insights from those case studies in order to identify good practices to be taken forward in organizing these things. The confusion I think is that the case studies are really more about multi-stakeholder cooperation than they are about distributed governance groups, per se. Distributed government groups being essentially like transnational policy networks which are not necessarily just multi-stakeholder.

Thirdly, there's an initiative being organized by CGI.br about national and regional multi-stakeholderism – how to replicate that around the world, identifying good practices, etc.

And then lastly there's one that probably would – for those of you who have concerns about ICANN's staff or initiatives – there's a toolkit for Internet cooperation and governance which I guess ICANN is coordinating. It's not very clearly explained. Maybe Nigel knows more about it.

But it's supposed to establish a basic framework that can then be used to replicate patterns of multi-stakeholder cooperation in different environments. I found the description of this to be a little bit vague, personally. I'm not quite sure what is envisioned and there hasn't been anything more said about it.

The last point I want to make and then I'll stop – again, these are just initial projects and the concepts is that CGI, WEF and with ICANN buy-in, I guess, would create a platform where other initiatives of this kind could be launched where people who wanted to come together and pool resources and do something that might be of some use would be able to do it.

And what I've been pushing them a lot on is making sure that you build a platform that allows distributed global participation in the processes by having inputs so that everybody can provide guidance and so on.

There will be a strategic coordination group. There will probably be a group below that that will be operational to actually oversee the project's details. And then there will be hopefully a mechanism by which everybody will be able to participate globally.

The problem there is that WEF doesn't know how to do that because they never have. They're used to just putting videos on the web of their discussions rather than actually aggregating inputs from people around the world. So, they're seeking help in how one would do that. So that's what that initiative is about.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Bill. I was going to ask which ones of these initiatives are relevant to this community but I don't want to launch into another ten-minute description. But we've got a good list now that's on record. We'll build the table from that and then perhaps we'll be able to fill in which ones are absolutely significant and we should get involved with and which ones are beyond our reach.

Next, the Plenipot. Is anyone ready to provide us brief details on what's going on with regards to that? Which I believe starts next week.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: So, there's [Ton-], me…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We've got [Ton-], you, we've got – Sarah Falvey?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Do it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Sarah.

SARAH FALVEY: So the Plenipotentiary begins on Monday. It's for three weeks long. The first week supposed to be elections of the various chairs and secretary general and then the second two weeks are supposed to focus on a discussion of the [conuntry] and regional contributions.

It does sound like it's going to be a pretty long three weeks. I think in general there are some contributions from countries that are looking at the role of ICANN and the space, the role of Internet governance, and the organization that are a part of that. I do think it's going to be a topic of discussion along with obviously the normal discussion points at the Plenipot. There's quite a few of us who are going, actually. The people who look miserable over there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sarah. Is there some coordination between all the people that are going? Even informal through a Skype chat or something?

SARAH FALVEY: Yeah. Usually we have a Skype chat but it's pretty informal. Apart from that there hasn't been much coordination.

Marilyn's just dying to speak so I'll let her go.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: So, this is only my fourth Plenipot. There's always informal coordination between the technical attendees and the business attendees but we're all on government delegation unless we go as a sector member and there are rules about what you're allowed to share.

Although we do informal conversations and coordination, we are all bound by adhering to the positions of the government on whose delegation we go. Unless we go as a sector member. The risk of going as a sector member is that you have to pay 11,300 Swiss Francs on top of your sector member dues. So, very few sector members do chose to go. Although some do go both on a delegation and also under their own hat.

There are three tranches of work that have implications for ICANN. One of them is very much in the Internet policy arena, where there's a

number of proposals. There's also an issue about whether the council working groups related to WSIS and to Internet public policy will be opened up beyond just for member states to also include at least sector members. So that openness issue is a separate item and an item of much debate. My prediction would be that the outcome will be opening them to sector members but not to the [great unwashed] like the rest of us.

The third item of work – which is actually probably hidden to most people, is the issue of the ITU being allowed to accept off budget financing. And the reason that matters is at least on the budget when the items are on the budget the council of the ITU tries to enforce a balanced budget. When the ITU accepts off-budget financing it is able to expand its role in coordinating on behalf of the UN Agencies in the WSIS review, in the WSIS forum, in the WSIS+10 high level event, etc.

That money is typically coming from a particular funding source from a government that is not particularly supportive of openness and transparency. While that doesn't look like a risk item, it actually is a big risk item because its allowing the ITU to increase its role in speaking for and convening all of the UN agencies in how they participate in the WSIS review, how they participate in WSIS follow-up.

And the final point I would make about that is the ITU acted as the convener, for example, of the WSIS+10 review of the action lines. Although that was participated in by the other UN agencies and it was an open multi-stakeholder platform. It was heavily dominated by the ITU and there are proposals that they would continue that role in the overall WSIS review budgets and issue there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Marilyn. Any response or reaction to the list that Marilyn has provided us with? Any further questions or comments on the ITU and on Plenipot?

Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. Marilyn knows it all. Just to add to the list I would've thought one issue of interest to this community sitting at an ICANN meeting would be the proposal that the ITU secretariat puts forward work to become a Regional Internet Registry. Not necessarily a Regional Internet Registry but to become an Internet registry with the ability to issue IPV6 addresses to the developing world. This is a Russian proposal. There's a history to it. But I think it will generate a discussion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. Go ahead, Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: Nigel has listed one of the proposals that are in that tranche I mentioned of a number in the Internet track. There are others that call for the ITU to build [IXPs] in developing countries. There's a number in that, and I guess I should be really fair here. The role of the development sector is very important to the developing countries. Very, very important to the developing countries.

It's really of concern to me that the important work of the development sector is being transported into the [T sector] and taking on some of the oversight mechanisms. Nigel just gave you one example – my example of the building [IXPs] is another one.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next is – we have a queue here – Matthew Shears and then Young Eum Lee. So, Matthew first.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Olivier. Matthew Shears, CDT. I think I can share that civil society is organizing in preparation for Plenipot a number of civil society representatives are on delegations. We have an active informal work that's going on in the background, analyzing the resolutions and the proposed resolutions and new activities. A number of those people are in the room who are involved in that.

I think on the issue of coordination we're assured we [have] talked to ISOC about coordination. I think it's fair to say that we will be delighted to coordinate with other groups as well on locations. So I just wanted to give you that update. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Matthew. I'll close the list now, realizing it is 26 past and we only have until a quarter to ten. This is going really fast. We still have Young Eum Lee, Janis Karklins, and then anyone else who has something to add to this, could you just send it over to the mailing list.

Young Eum Lee?

YOUNG EUM LEE: Young Eum Lee, .KR. I just would like to mention the fact that there was talk of a constitutional change or the possibility of the discussion of constitutional change within ITU but the absence of proposals of the change in constitution I think should also be noted and would like to know if anybody else has more details on that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Young Eum. Next is Janis Karklins.

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you. Just a very, very short piece of information. We hear that the Turkish host of IGF 2014 will send the letter to the President of the Plenipotentiary Conference attaching [chairs] report and will ask to disseminate it as a conference room paper to inform any debate in Plenipotentiary Conference on Internet governance related issues. Whether that will be done or not, it is hard to say. It will be a decision of the President of the conference. But at least we'll hear the Turkish host a ruling to make that contribution.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's a very good initiative. Thank you, Janis. Maybe I have to get the mic closer to me. Is that better? Sorry about this.

So we still haven't touched on WSIS+10 review. Can we just spend five minutes on this with someone who could just provide us a helicopter view of WSIS+10? Marilyn?

MARILYN CADE: I'm going to do – very quickly – there are three parts to the WSIS review process. We just completed one called the WSIS+10 Action Line Review, which culminated in a report at a high level meeting with negotiated text and the publication of a set of documents that are now called "The Green Book" that are being treated as though they have the same status – they don't -- but as though they have a significant status just as the WSIS documents do. I can point you all to where to find them.

The important thing that happened there was heavily negotiated. It reviewed the action lines, rejected adding new action lines, rejected adding targets, and there is a proposal at the ITU Plenipot to go back and reopen the outcome of that meeting, which was a high level meeting. That's going to be thought about.

The miracle that happened, literally, was that recognition of gender, the importance of access to [inaudible] for ICTs, for women in youth, was being rejected by a number of countries. In the end, with significant negotiation help from the [inaudible] of UNESCO, the three countries that were not willing to sign on – Cuba, Saudi Arabia, and finally Iran – [did] accept the documents. So, they are consensus documents. Really important because they are going to go into the rest of the WSIS review.

The next phase of the WSIS review is being conducted by the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology for Development. That review has been – the outreach has been concluded.

EN

There's a continued what we would call a desk or literature review of reports, etc. that is being done. The draft report will be presented at the CSTD Intercessional in the 26th through the 28th of November in Geneva.

I will be there. I am one of the five business representatives on the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. There are five technical representatives. Five civil society. There will be an effort made by [the friends] of the Internet participants in the CSTD to call for the mapping exercise that we did and to be included in that review and to have a one-time reopening of the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation to contribute to the report which will go into the CSTD in May.

That review – the CSTD review – will be a matter of record. It will be accompanied by a resolution. Should the resolution not receive unanimous support, the chair of the CSTD had the authority to forward the CSTD review of the WSIS directly to the UNGA. The chair is Minister Johnson of Nigeria. She's very, very strongly engaged and positively engaged in this issue.

The final step of the WSIS review will launch in June and conclude in December. In December of last year the resolution that came from the CSTD into the UNGA did not enjoy full support on how to conduct the modalities of the WSIS review. Two co-facilitators were appointed, Finland and Tunisia.

After extensive consultations a proposal was put forward, finally agreed there will be two new co-facilitators appointed. The review will launch in June. It is up to the countries to determine what kind of outreach they do with other stakeholders. There will be an effort to accept inputs

from stakeholders and there will be a two-day event at the UNGA in New York with invited representatives from stakeholders to speak alongside governments. Then there will be a resolution or a decision taken.

There's a very strong linkage – a very important linkage – between the sustainable development goals and the WSIS review. For most countries that I speak to, they're very significantly concerned about making sure that sustainable development goals and the further on work from the WSIS are much more intertwined than perhaps they've been in the past. And Janis may have other comments.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Janis, would you like to add?

JANIS KARKLINS: It's very difficult to complement Marilyn. She is giving a very good picture of what's happening. I would like to give you a heads-up on a proposal which I'm planning to make in early December this year to the MAG that maybe next year's IGF in November could be used as a platform for negotiators to engage with the community on Internet governance related issues. By then, one can argue that maybe it's too late, but by then there will already be a draft which community will be able to comment on.

If we manage to bring at least part of negotiators to Brazil and emerge them in the atmosphere of IGF, in my view it would be helpful for them to better understand and create a positive attitude towards IGF as a result. Again, all that is subject of approval by the MAG and approval by

the co-facilitators which will be appointed by the President of General Assembly.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Janis. Next is Marilia Maciel.

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you very much, Olivier. Just two observations about that. One is about the substantive outcomes of these processes, which I think that so far are very vague. The documents that have come out are of the high level events. They're not helpful to establish a view beyond 2015 and they do not tackle current problems. They do not update the documents from the original WSIS.

For instance, member countries did not manage to find a common view on the protection of bloggers which is a topic, for instance, that emerged since WSIS. So I think it's not very helpful.

And on the third track that Marilyn mentioned of the review from June to December I think at the time is too short for intergovernmental meaningful discussions and I think that we really are in a situation that maybe we will have anodyne or not very meaningful documents emerging from the WSIS review.

This is not good for any of us because we have original documents that were very good in terms of putting a people-centered development-oriented Information Society on the agenda, but then we need to move forward and set new views.

Something that emerged from the IGF was the possibility for non-governmental actors to create a platform in which they could create a parallel document from the WSIS review. Something that the other actors could feel comfortable with and that includes topics that probably inter-governmental environments won't be able to make into the document.

This would be a document of course parallel, unofficial, but that could have legitimacy and support if enough actors rally behind it. But if we believe this is a good idea, it's something that we need to start thinking about because we should create a platform for a collaboration and development of this document, taking into account that we made something a little bit similar for the NETmundial, for instance. It could serve as an example of how we can collaborate online and I think that it will be very important to have a document after the WSIS and this will be a possibility to do it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Marilia. That was a very fast delivery. The queue is closed. We just have Bertrand de la Chapelle.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thanks, Marilyn, for the excellent update. Following what Marilia was saying I do agree that the two elements that have to be followed and scrutinized totally is the format of the event itself in December and how open it will be. Whether it is just open to a few speakers that are allowed to take the floor for a limited amount of time or whatever it is a more participatory process.

The second element is indeed the fear that I fully share that Marilia has expressed that the outcome of this process might be something that is closer to a resolution of the CSTD which is relatively empty rather than something that really makes the whole process move forward. In that regard, I think Janis is pointing in a very interesting direction to use the IGF in Brazil that will take place before as a springboard to basically almost give the impetus that the event in the general assembly may not give on its own.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Bertrand. Now we have four more agenda items and we've only got ten minutes. That's going to be a little bit difficult to achieve. Of course the charter discussions and update has already been dealt with, so we really have strategic plan, interface and engagement with a wider community, and the ICANN expenditure.

With regards to the strategic plan I think it would probably take a full hour if we were to start discussing the plan and so I wondered if we could have a couple of volunteers who could be looking at the strategic plan and maybe in our next conference call have an explanation of what its implications are on the Internet governance activities, bearing in mind that there appears to have been a new way of doing things by shrinking the budget in this next cycle.

Are there any takers for this? Has anyone already looked at the strategic plan? So exciting. Of course, Marilyn would have.

MARILYN CADE: I'll make an offer. I'll find the appropriate ICANN staff and look at the appropriate sections and look at the appropriate parts of the budget, which I can tell you still don't show the $3.5 million spent on the mystical, magical, marvelous, top-down [inaudible]. But I'm sure that with Nigel's help and other ICANN staff help we can come back in with a report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That sounds very appropriate, Marilyn, thank you. So let's go to number four – oh, Matthew Shears.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Olivier. Matthew Shears, CDT. I have a question that I'd like to raise with regards to item six, which you've just said we've finished the discussion of, if I may?

This is the first time I'm attending this, so please excuse any ignorance. But in the blog post that was written in February by yourself and Rafik it talks about to achieve its objectives the CCWGIG will undertake but it's not limited to the following activities. Give guidance to ICANN staff and CEO regarding Internet governance issues.

It seems to me that's a pretty one-way dimension. Bill just raised the issue of the [IEG] toolkit or whatever that it is. It seems to me that that should be more of a discussion or interaction between staff and the working group. Perhaps that could be addressed. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Matthew. That was then. I think their charter actually was updated since then. The charter does say that and it's a full interaction it's not just a one-way street, thankfully.

So number four is the interface and engagement with a wider community [in] ICANN leadership. This afternoon there is an Internet governance session taking place. I wonder if Nigel could say a few words about this, please.

Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much, Olivier. I'll be very brief because the session is on the site. This is a session that staff often run in conjunction with a number of community members on Internet governance update. That's the genesis of it. In fact, if we had a discussion along the lines that Marilyn prompted earlier on such issues as…

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Nigel get closer to the mic, perhaps. Please.

NIGEL HICKSON: Closer, God. If we had a discussion this afternoon along the lines that Marilyn prompted on WSIS and [PP14] I think they'd be very happy. But essentially it is a chance for members of the ICANN community to engage in a discussion on Internet governance issues that are coming up.

So, this afternoon on the agenda is IGF, Plenipotentiary and WSIS, and then there's a separate section – so it's in two phases this afternoon. Those three items in the first phase and then the second phase to discuss the WEF initiative and there will be someone from Berkman and someone from Brazil as panelists.

Bill gave a very helpful overview of the projects and no doubt people will be able to ask questions about those projects this afternoon.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. Many of you will recall that I was the person who proposed that the cross community working group on [IG] organize the town hall that we held which led to our consulting with the broader community. [Boyd] and staff were of course in the participants and that is where we put forward our recommendation.

So I would like to propose – and thank you for that, Nigel – I'd like to propose that the CCWG Ig organize the session in Marrakesh. Nigel, I really hope you and others from the staff will work with us but I want to make it very clear my proposal is we organize and we run. ICANN very generously offered us their world class television moderator and I turned that down.

I want this proposal to be clear that I'm proposing we organize and we run an event in Marrakesh which would be a repeat of the town hall approach. I think we should then do proper preparation for it so that it

really can be engaging and can address, Marilia, some of the issues. We're a good representation but by no means broad enough. So, that's my proposal.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Of course this afternoon's session looks as though it was very well planned and put together and it's certainly probably going to bring a lot of people and be very exciting and interesting.

Indeed, there was some unease within this community about the top-down nature of such an arrangement and certainly with the community having a cross-community working group on these issues on Internet governance, it would certainly feel right for it to be planning the session in Marrakesh. If there are no words against that, then I think we can say that there's consensus in this group for proceeding forward like this.

With two minutes – sorry, one minute remaining – we have ICANN expenditure which would take us one day to discuss, at least. ICANN expenditure on Internet governance – I thought we were told it's going to be nil now, isn't it?

MARILYN CADE: I don't see how it could be. How could it be nil? I'm not sure. It can't be nil. I'm happy to ask this question at the microphone or Nigel could suggest to Fadi he find a way to answer us before.

I'm told that there are staff – I love the public forum, you guys know – I'm told that there are staff that are going to be allocated to be a part of

the joint WEF-CGI initiative. ICANN is still funding [OneNet] in some way.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Inaudible]?

MARILYN CADE: Last time we met we heard that there was support being given to Paul Wilson to continue it. So there's some kind of expenditure and I would assume that there's also expenditure – we're talking about budget items. I'm assuming there's also expenditure related to…

We should just ask for a clarifying review of the budget items because when you said expenditure, that's what you meant – what was in the budget, right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, that's correct, Marilyn. Perhaps this working group could ask for some clarity from the finance staff to provide details.

Sally's here, but it's just timing. We are one minute beyond…

MARILYN CADE: Yeah but Sally's also—

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sally, would you please join us at the table? Sorry to put you on the spot – it's by consensus that you're being brought here. Don't take it against the chair.

SALLY COSTERTON: You're kind of all right I think is probably the best way of putting it. What is correct is that this [inaudible] in terms of deciding how much resource, which is money and people, ultimately of course it's all money because if you're going to pay staff, it's still money that is used from the baseline budget – the core budget of ICANN. This is what Fadi presented at the opening ceremony.

And by the way, I wanted to correct something earlier. There is no intention to shrink the budget. So, just for the record, that's not the plan. What Fadi talked about was holding the increase in the growth of the baseline budget to a very small level, probably in line with inflation and whatever the standard accounting model is that is normally used. It's something like 3% to 5%, that kind of area.

What he also talked about which may or may not include Internet governance and it very much depends on how the community wants to contribute to this is if there are new initiatives that the community feels it wants to pursue on top of the baseline budget which the activities of which are incorporated or will be incorporated in the operating plan which will be coming out for public comment.

Everybody will be able to see what is included in the baseline budget for Internet governance in terms of personnel and programs as part of that process. And then if there are additional projects or initiatives on top of that that anybody in the community or in [inaudible] same kind of thing feels should be added, then those will be put into the process of fiscal responsibility – whatever the word is that we're going to use for community consultation and agreement on prioritization.

There will be a mechanism to increase investment Internet governance for us collectively should that deemed to be necessarily and that will be done through a bottom-up process. I hope that's helpful clarification.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, indeed. So now all we need is to go to number seven, any other business. And I think Marilyn had a point with regards to retiring from the group.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. It's Marilyn and I'm happy to write something and propose, but I just think we ought to have a procedure so that if someone wants to – if their sending group or they themselves want to withdraw that we should invite the sending group to put forward another participant name.

The group is open to observers, but for many groups they really feel that they are appointing people to the cross-community working groups.

I'll put something together and circulate it welcoming anyone else who wants to, but I think [inaudible] so a notice is sent to the chair or the co-chairs advising of the intent to replace some participant and the chair then receives the nomination from the sending group. The other person is removed from the list, removed to observer, blah, blah, bah. So, something very simple but clear so if a group runs into this they know there's a procedure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so that's another action item for the near future. We have the first action item to do with the complete list. Alexandra, you have all of this recorded?

ALEXANDRA DANS: I'm sorry, yes. So the first one is we need a table of events where you should participate and a table with the threads to WSIS+10 review, Plenipot, and NETmundial Initiative. Then we have Marilyn Cade leading the strategic plan for the next conference call. We have the transcript ready in 24 hours so I'll share with you the table.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic! Any other other business? Without anyone putting their hands up, I thank you all for this very high-octane meeting and this meeting is now adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]