

**20150209\_ccwg\_IG\_singapor**

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Well, good afternoon, everyone. My name is Olivier Crepin-Leblond, and I'm one of the Co-Chairs of the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance. Next to me is Rafik Dammak, another Co-Chair. And the third Co-Chair, Jordan Carter, is not able to join us today, due to the other commitments, at this very moment, but we are going to be running the session.

This is a planning session for the working group. It's open to everyone to attend, but we are going to be discussing, primarily, well first the Charter, a small modification to the Charter to sort of open it up to having observers, who, having (ph) been nominated by their supporting organization, advisory committee or stakeholder group. Then we'll address the relationship between the community and ICANN staff on the Internet Governance Ecosystem, that's actually one of the main topics for today.

I suggest adding something between agenda items three and four, which just a short summary of what has been planned for the public session that we'll be holding on, I think it's -- is it Thursday? Thursday public session, and then we will be looking afterwards at the end of this, hopefully, within the 75 minutes that we have allocated; the calendar of forthcoming activities, and to plan for the topics for the whole of 2015. I probably will be unable to go through all of that, because 2015 we'll have a lot of meetings, as far as Internet Governance is concerned, but at least we'll have a rough idea of what the significant components will be for this year.

Rafik, do you wish to -- is there anything else that needs to be added?

Rafik Dammak: No. I think all was said. I mean, first, we should welcome all those -- I think we -- I think many new faces that I currently recognize, so we should really welcome them.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. Thank you, Rafik. So welcome, everybody. And the first agenda item is going to be on the Charter of this Cross Community Working Group. A little bit of history. This started as an Ad-hoc Cross Community Working Group between -- I believe it was the ALAC and the NCSG, was a very quick setup because of that NETMundial that was announced last year, with just three months until NETMundial happened, and it was felt that the community needed to send in some comments, in the run up to NETMundial. So it was basically topic-oriented to start with, and then past NETMundial the question was; do we go on? Do we not go on? And it was felt that there was, indeed, a need in ICANN to have community-wide input into issues of Internet Governance, especially today, since many of the supposed "threats" in quotes, come from outside the ICANN sphere.

So we then built a Charter that basically tightened up the membership of the Working Group, and perhaps went a little bit further than initially thought. There were at the time, no actual guidelines on how to build a Cross Community Working Group, and so we based it on past cross community working groups, and the issue that we are going to look at today, which is not such a huge issue. The issue is that of the actual membership of the Working Group.

At the moment the Charter says that the membership needs to be appointed by supporting organization -- organizations, and advisory committees, and the observers also need to be nominated by supporting organizations, and advisory committees, and stakeholder groups. And we've felt that in the light of the other cross community working groups that have recently been created, the one on IANA Stewardship transition, the one on accountability, there was a need, perhaps, to loosen the membership criteria, and certainly the observer criteria to go in line with this more open way of having cross community working groups.

Bart, I'm -- I know I didn't speak to you earlier about this, but is that how the whole thing is planned? Do you wish to add a few things; Bart Boswinkel?

Bart Boswinkel: Yeah. Olivier, I think, say, if you look at the way the CWG and CCWG charters evolved, there was a discussion around the word -- the use of the word "observer" that was one element. And so that became participant, so it's members and participants in these working groups. And the participants, it's to reflect that those who are not appointed by the SOs and ACs do have almost the same rights as all the same -- they participate at an equal footing as the members, with one exception, or two exceptions, effectively.

One is if it advocates that we vote within these cross community working groups, it's only for the SO and AC appointed members. But secondly, as a counterbalance, the SO and AC members are expected to engage with their respective communities to inform them, and to engage them in the different processes, so it's a bit of a two-sided sword on that -- from that end. And the participants, it's open, you don't need to belong to an SO or AC, it's just those who are a part, or who want to contribute to the process, yeah, can subscribe. That's more or less the statutes of both cross community working groups.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Bart. Olivier speaking. You mentioned participants, but you also mentioned observers. In the wider -- the current cross community working groups on IANA Stewardship, on accountability, is there an equivalency between observers and participants? Or have observers been changed to participants?

Bart Boswinkel: It's, in the CWG, on the Stewardship, in the Charter you see, still, the term observers. If you would look at the Wiki, the term has changed into participants. In the CCWG Accountability it's a bit more complex. You have members and participants who participate on equal footing, but you also have observers, and observers mean you just are subscribed to the email list, but no posting rights, et cetera, so you just see what's going on, and that's it. You can attend the meetings, because they are open anyway, but a lot of the email traffic, you cannot contribute to the discussions themselves. So that's even more complicated, if you would make a distinction between participants and observers. So, these are the non-SO and AC appointed people on the -- in the working group.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: All right. Thank you very much, Bart. And so the proposal here that has been discussed among the Chairs, and has been shared with the -- I think it's been shared with the mailing list, is to loosen up the rule of participants and observers -- of members and observers, and in effect, have this category of participants in the same way as the other CWGs, so as to allow for everyone to take part in this dialogue and discussion that we are having in the Working Group.

Are there any questions or comments from anyone in the room? Marilyn Cade?

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. Marilyn Cade, speaking. Let me just ask a clarifying question. I want to say that I believe that this will be a very helpful adjustment to our Charter, and I think that the practice followed now, by the CCWG on accountability, demonstrates that you can have a fairly large group that can work together productively, while adhering to certain structures and rules about process, but also have a much larger community of observers.

My question is, specifically, we will need -- if we modify the Charter, we will then need to go back to the chartering organizations. And I think that's probably important to note, and see if we can try to do that fairly soon. We have a number of participants who are from -- we have a number or parties, regardless of their standing, who are from the various SOs and ACs, et cetera. So, I'm wondering if we possibly want to set a kind of a rough deadline of trying to get this done in a month, or something of that nature.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Marilyn. Bart Boswinkel?

Bart Boswinkel: Bart Boswinkel, for the records. If you would look at -- say, in principle -- and so -- I agree with the principle, but there are the practicalities of life as well. If you would look at the CWG Stewardship, it still contains the term observers in the Charter, and what was done is that they went back to the chartering organizations, in fact, looking no objection, which is a very light process, whether they could interpret the term "observers", meaning participants. And probably you could use the same kind of method, again, to those SOs and ACs who have chartered this Working Group, asking if there is any objection to interpret the term "observers" in the way the CWG uses -- or the CCWG uses participants, or the CWG uses participants?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. Thank you, Bart. Indeed the interpretation of this term is probably the lighter option to be able to proceed swiftly, rather than having to send a Charter back to the chartering organizations, and have a new ratification process. I think that's -- Are there any comments or thoughts about this? Does silence mean consent? Okay. So it looks like -- Oh, Bart?

Bart Boswinkel: Just one additional remarks, because say then, the silence as consent, I think that was finished. It's probably something to consider as well, as a lot of people already subscribe to this working group, or its predecessor, when it was not chartered, and it may be a consideration to consider those people who want to be -- still want to be part of this group, to offer them the status as participants, so that would mean a change in the denomination on the Wiki page, et cetera, and make them participants without having to go through another process; again, to avoid a lot of bureaucracy.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Bart. So, I think that the action to move forward on this is for the current Co-Chairs to (inaudible/audio skip) -- Anne-Rachel, did you want to add something? You've just bought a \$1 million car, so -- Sorry. You don't wave like that at auctions. So, effectively, I think the way forward -- Tarek?

Tarek Kamel: Thank you, Olivier. And thank you for inviting me to this session. I mean, it's clear in the objective, but I just wanted to repeat it, so that it's clear to everybody, who maybe had not read the Charter to the end. That any NTIA Transition, the IANA Stewardship Transition issues, and related accountability with Track 1 now, or Track 2, are outside the scope of this Working Group, because it has -- it's already established mechanisms by the Board and by structures, and so we just wanted to mention that upfront, because there is a lot of work that is already going on, that's related to these issues.

In 2015, and maybe in accountability Track 2, beyond, we never know what will be post-IANA, so I just wanted to mention this so that it is clear to everybody; although it's clearly written, but just for the record. Thank you,

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. Thank you very much, Tarek. Yeah. We already have enough headaches outside with these other ones, we don't want more headaches. So, yeah, the way forward I guess then, is for the Co-Chairs to write to the respective supportive organizations, and advisory committees that have chartered this group, and ask them for -- whether they have no objections to this widening of, or interpretation of observers into participants.

I don't know who takes the action items. Renate, are you --?

Renate De Wulf: Yeah. Yeah. (Inaudible), Olivier.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Oh. Excellent! So more than one persons and actually; thank you. So I think that that's a good way forward. Just as a reminder. So, Jordan Carter is the Co-Chair from the ccNSO, appointed by the ccNSO; Rafik Dammak from the GNSO, and from the ALAC. We are still looking at other supporting organizations and advisory committees to appoint someone as a Co-Chair.

I have had a discussion with the GAC, unfortunately the bandwidth in the GAC is rather limited with all of the things that are going on, so they might just have a seat that will remain available, in case they wish to partake and so on, but that's -- they are not a Co-Chair of the working group itself. Or at least they don't want to appoint someone as a Co-Chair. As far as the ASO is concerned, I'm still waiting for Louis Lee (ph) to come back. And with the others, there is varied interest. Of course the amount of work that is currently place is stretching people quite a lot.

Tarek Kamel?

Tarek Kamel: Yeah. Thank you, again. I think it's important to have some of the presentation from the GAC, and will talk to Thomas (ph) again, so that we can claim that it's really the (inaudible/audio skip) community and it's inclusive, because the government is a part of the IG debate and the process, and it's one within the constituency of ICANN. So if we want to state to the other side -- to the outside world, that this is more or less inclusive, then I think it has been -- not necessarily as a Co-Chair, but it has to be well represented.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Tarek. Please get back to us with the feedback on this. Thank you. Marilyn, did you want to add something.

Marilyn Cade: Actually, yes, I do. Marilyn Cade, speaking. I think that in approaching Thomas, if we are clear that we are encouraging the participation, and particularly if it's possible to have participation from more than one GAC member, having --

Tarek Kamel: More than one region?

Marilyn Cade: Yes. I think more than one region; I think that would also be very, very helpful.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Marilyn. So let's move on to agenda item 3, addressing the relationship between the community and ICANN staff on the Internet Governance Ecosystem. I'm not sure who wishes to lead on this. I do know that the blog post was sent out. Nigel, Tarek, do you wish to summarize on the blog post, or?

Tarek Kamel: Nigel, yeah -- I mean, we have drafted together, it was Nigel and Rachel, and Mandy (ph) and Veni, and as you requested, to give an overview for the main, yeah, I mean, happening since Los Angeles until now, sometimes it's very difficult to give details, and it has been posted as far as I -- as far as I understand. So, Nigel, please go ahead and give a quick overview, and if there are questions, we are all available for comments, we are all available to answer to any questions occurring. So, Nigel, maybe you go over it quickly, so that we don't take a lot of time?

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Nigel Hickson, the Government Engagement. Yes, we've written the report on the various Internet Governance activities since Los Angeles, up to -- up to this meeting. It will be attached to the agenda for the IGs public session on Thursday. So this is the session on Thursday at 11:15 to 12:30, and one of the agenda items on Thursday is NETMundial and associated Internet Governance issues. And so some of the issues that are on the report, obviously, can be taken up during that session, as appropriate. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Nigel. Olivier speaking. It did -- just trying to find out with Renate here, did you -- I mean is this blog post that is published somewhere. Do you have the link -- do you have a link to it. Because I know it was sent to the mailing list, and of course to the Co-Chairs, but I mean, it would be good to perhaps put it in the chat.

Nigel Hickson: Yeah. We'll make sure, I mean it will be -- as I say, because it's related to the agenda item for Thursday, it will be attached to the agenda item, but we -- I mean, it's public -- it's public material.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Nigel. So, Marilyn Cade?

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. Marilyn Cade, speaking. Nigel, thank you; and thank you, Tarek, for the report. I want to refer everyone to the Charter and the purpose of while we are here, because seeing this report, which is helpful and informative and I welcome, does not actually fulfill our responsibility, at the CCWG-IG to do our part of the work, which is to provide input to the ICANN staff, the SOs and the ACs on issues pertaining to Internet Governance discussion and processes. And also to provide suggestions, I think, and feedback to ICANN staff about the participation in these Internet Governance activities. And I'm interested in how we are going to address the content that is an activity, better described in this paper. I probably know more about what ICANN is doing in some of these areas, perhaps, than others. I see others around the room who are at all these meetings with me as well.

There's a lot of substance in this paper, and I think it would be helpful for us to have a little bit of a discussion, rather than just to say, okay now, we've read what ICANN is doing, but we may also have the views, and I certainly have a view on some of the activities that I'd like to engage in a discussion on, but I think the Chairs, Co-Chairs, that we should think about how we are going to discuss this. If we aren't going to discuss it today, then we need to figure out how we, as a part of our regular work, of the CCWG-IG, are engaging in that discussion.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you for these comments, Marilyn. Tarek Kamel?

Tarek Kamel: Well, just to propose we have a similar approach that we are taking with the GAC in our work forward, so we have regular calls with the GAC Chair, and the GAC Leadership, not all GAC members, yeah. But -- and we provide a report that speaks about the order -- or the reports about the achievements, about this -- for a certain period, and the planned -- and the planned activities, and it's being discussed then, during the calls, that happen on a regular basis. If there are specific questions concerning achievements or deliverables, or if there are proposals for inputs concerning future activities, within the certain timeframe, that is being reported about, and it's also being -- being considered.

Whenever there is, for example, an input like the one that was the mapping of the CSTD, I know that that has been input from Marilyn and Olivier as well, through the process that has been provided to Nigel, and Nigel has submitted that. So, we can do both. I mean speak about what has happened, in case there are questions about more details. What is being on the plan, how would we structure from the working group, so that it's being forwarded and has; whatever statements, or inputs, or whatever. The form of position for the fora that is next.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Tarek. Are there any comments or questions? I had a question actually. How many people in the room have read the blog post and report? Okay. Because I was going to say, let's discuss it, but then of course, we are not going to discuss it if nobody has read it yet. It's the first time, yeah. I think we probably need to publicize this a little bit more, and maybe take it further than this. It's a bit of a pity, but it is a very long report, it does have many activities, and I see here, ITU Plenipot, CSTD, WSIS, IGF mandate, the U.N. and MAG; ITU Council Working Group, OECD, EP Committee.

I wish they didn't have so many acronyms; NETMundial Initiative, Geneva Internet Platform, West Davos Meeting, New York and Geneva briefings. Of course some of these don't really have a follow up. I'd imagine the Plenipot is just a one-off, and the follow up will be a bit different. But others are going to have a follow up, and I guess it really is for this group to then find a way, and this is maybe the right time to discuss it, find a way on how to work with you to proceed forward.

Marilyn Cade?

Marilyn Cade:

Well, I certainly don't want to dominate this, but I'm going to give an example, I think it's unfortunately that people haven't had a chance to read it, and to be able to ask questions about it. I'll give an example about the ITU Plenipot; I think there's significant follow up to the ITU Plenipot. I was just in Geneva for four days, Nigel was there for two of those days, and Veni Markovski was there on the Bulgarian Delegation for the time as well. Those two council working groups are one on WSIS, the ITU Council Working Group on WSIS, and the other is the ITU Council Working Group on International Internet Public Policy, both have reflective implications for ICANN, and one of them, the WSIS Working Group has reflective implications for the overall Internet ecosystem.

The Internet Public Policy Council Working Group has a specific list of work items, which reflect into the work that ICANN is responsible for. During that meeting, one government proposed that the ITU should take up their own consultation on the IANA Transition. Fortunately, there were a number of other parties there, who are engaged in the GAC, and were able to assure the room; in that particular working group stakeholders do not speak. They were able to assure the room that there is no need, and in fact they would be welcome to come and join the process. But both of those working groups will meet again in October, and in May the Council, the ITU Council itself will meet, and I would expect there to be continued efforts by certain states that are not fully engaged in ICANN, to be pushing forward for the ITU.

My observations is, again, this is a member -- that is a member-driven U.N. organization, and so one observation I had is that, I don't see the ITU staff actively attending the GAC as they used to, and so one of the things that I took the opportunity to do is to speak to the Secretary General, and urge them to resume attending the meetings.

But I think this kind -- we need to find a way that we are all prepared so that we can exchange views and talk about this, these kinds of activities that ICANN is engaged, and then also to provide reflection on how we, as a community, may be able to, ourselves, contribute to ICANN's success. Not because we are trying to dictate what the ICANN staff does, but we are trying to inform what the ICANN Community can do, when we are engaging in these events and activities.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Marilyn. And of course as a reminder ICANN has dedicated staff to work on these issues, but as a certain class of participants, and of course as far as ITU is concerned, we do have members that are either advisory parties to some of the member countries, or even on the delegation of member countries, and that's an asset that can be used. Tarek, if I can put you on the spot, what kind of a relationship would you be happy with as far as -- the way that we could contribute into the work that you have with your staff?

Tarek Kamel: Talking about the -- the ITU Plenipot pull up, or in general?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Pretty much in general, on all the issues. I mean, there's a lot going on.

Tarek Kamel: (Inaudible) will definitely welcome any input on any consultation and guidance that we've got -- we get the membership of the -- the Working Group has a lot of experts that really can add and reflect back the input also from the community that they represent and deal with. At the end we are five, six people. In our group we are cooperating with the Regional Vice President, (Inaudible) or Sally, but still even that number is still limited, and we are dealing with only a specific number of people that we can interface with. So (a), I think that on a regular basis, if we get input to the liaisons, and to ourselves from the members of the working group, about any issues that are hot in IGF (ph), in general, that we might not be paying attention to, or even if we are paying attention to, this adds then to the overall picture that we are working on. So that's one part; which is more or less the generic part.

The other part is very specifically, when it comes to a specific forum, like preparation for the IGF, this has a certain format, that we need to adhere to while we are moving forward. When it comes to the ITU it has its own regulation, it's via member states, we are not even -- it's not only a member state, but we don't have a status there, we are being represented either by Veni, as it has been mentioned as in the Bulgarian delegation, and sometimes Nigel has his own relations to go into some of -- occasionally of the events.

So having that on a regular basis, feedback about the -- what's happening in the -- whether in the Council working groups, whether in the Council working group, international Internet-related issues; whether in the WSIS review, a working group that that is happening. I want to also say at this occasion, that our relation to the ITU has changed. Okay. More or less to the positive side, as such, in the last two years; I'm not claiming that there is agreement on everything, but there is a bridge, there is a link, there is dialogue between Fadi and the leadership of the ITU, and between ourselves and the ITU, which enhances the overall reflection of the environment that it's not the enemy anymore, and I hope that we all also take this approach.

Now, we have areas of disagreement, but we have also areas of agreement together, and we can be working together, specifically towards the WSIS. So that's the second issue, input that we can take from having the members of the Cross Community Working Group who have the privilege to attend events that we might not be able to attend.

The third thing, is when it comes to input that needs to be getting out of ICANN, for example, to the CSTD and the mapping issues that they were asking for the other couple of weeks, that would make a lot of sense, that we get expertise and inputs as it happens from the working groups, so that this reflects the input of ICANN, and reflects maybe, also, the input of the community into that direction. When it comes to the IGF, you can do panels together, for example, or organize some panels, panels together that would reflect the interest of ICANN, because at the end, I mean, this is an ICANN Internet Governance Working Group. This is not a generic IG Working Group that talks overall, the ecosystem about other issues that are outside the scope of ICANN.

We have a special remit from the Board, as ICANN, so we are very keen that we stick to it while we are moving forward, which is the naming and numbering. And there is a lot of work, even outside IANA, related to that, that can be addressed within the IGF. The WSIS, and its renewal of the IGF, it's something that we all need to be working on, and I think the whole group can help us a lot in doing that in -- whether in New York and whether the decision is going to be taken in an intergovernmental basis, or in other places.

The continuity of the WSIS process, we don't want to lose this process. It is something that we have been all benefiting where, as a community, including ICANN, for the last 10 years, so let's not lose it. There is a risk that we lose it, and that the world says, well, let's wipe off this off the world's agenda. These people got have enough attention, ICG (inaudible), and let's look at something else more interesting in the environment, or whatever.

Also, it might touch on ICANN's limits, so we need your help that this does not happen, to avoid the worst, and we need the recognition also within the process. So, I think it's a long journey; while we are moving forward, and although we said that the IANA scope is outside of here, we'll not be able to neglect the repercussions of the output of IANA, whatever it is, in which direction on what we are doing. So, we should not lose that out of sight.

So I hope that the ongoing coordination and corporation with the Working Group will enrich our knowledge in that we will also reflect what we here and what we do in our engagements, and when it comes to representation, I hope that there is then, close coordination, I think as it happened in the Plenipotentiary. So, does this answer your question?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. Thank you very much, Tarek. I see the two-track process here; the internal track process in shaping the policy within ICANN, and then the external one being -- having the influence of being

able to be part of some -- of the -- different fora out there, that you might not have a direct access to. Any comments, thoughts -- I know, Marilyn, this is right up your alley. I'm sure you have a thousand things to tell us. But I just wondered on this side. Okay, so I will start with Bill Drake, and then Marilia Maciel. So, Bill, you have the floor.

Bill Drake: Thank you. Going back some time, when ICANN first started to have to really engage the geopolitical environment a lot more, many of the people in community who operated in both the sort of U.N. type settings, and ICANN as well, we are interested to follow, what ICANN was doing in terms of representing the organization and the community in these various context, and I know that we had NCSG, the Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group, a number of times, discussions with the Board, where we asked, you know, you had -- they had at the time a Board, group. I can't remember what it was called -- Global Stakeholder Engagement, or something like that, that was taking the lead and in those kinds of relationships, and we had asked them a number of times, you know, how do we work with you, how do we engage with you, and it was always difficult to get answers, and they didn't have a way of doing that. Now --

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Bill Drake: You're right. Now things have evolved, you know, we've staffed up, we have your shop (ph), and so on, and now the question remains though, again, the same, -- in a way though, Tarek, when you say there's a lot of people with a lot of interest, and you welcoming the input, et cetera. How can we more actively coordinate is the question? We have this mail list that sees very little traffic, despite the fact that, you know, you look around this room, and it's quite full, there's a lot of people very interested in these issues.

You have a lot of people who do have strong interest in and stakes in some of the kinds of activities that your team is leading ICANN's representation in. So I wonder if there isn't some way for us to have a fuller coordination, without tying your hands too much. I don't want to create tons of new work for you guys in terms, you know, that you should have, you know, before every meeting you should be checking with the community and so on, but if we can find some way to, like, establishing a more going communication about the things that are coming up, and what you see as the challenges in those different settings to be, and how the community might weigh in, and so on. It might help to give this activity more structure, more purpose and so on, because otherwise, we are sort of in a kind of funny place.

We are not like a lot of other cross community working groups, that they have a very bounded, defined deliverable, right, I mean we -- During the NETMundial Initiative process, we were taxed, but we do have all these people together now, and there are ways in which we can actually contribute in a positive way, and I think it strengthens, ICANN's hand very much, if when you go into these meetings, you are able to say, you know, it's not just ICANN the staff talking, we have this big community behind us, that is supporting the positions that we are articulating here, as reflected in (inaudible).

If you were going into a negotiation, and it would be useful for the community to adopt a statement, for example, that you would pass along, and say, reflecting civil society, different business groupings, et cetera, et cetera, ICANN community is expressing the following view on this matter, or whatever. This is what I'm asking, how can we concretize the general desire to have input and coordination by turning in something real in terms of an activity.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Bill. Tarek?

Tarek Kamel: If I may. Yeah. Definitely the input is needed and especially from experts around the table, that can really help us, and there are many, but I also want to explain the way we are working and that the Board and Fadi asked us to work. There are two types of engagements on IG that we are getting involved in. Things that are very specific to ICANN, which are related to ICANN's Accountability, the gTLD Program, the IANA transition, for example, and these things that are

very clearly related to ICANN and ICANN's mission, the numbering and stuff like that. And when it comes to these issues, we are becoming vocal, whether in the ITU Plenipotentiary, as Veni is there, and others, or in other fora. As say the IGF or -- or because that's our bread and butter at the end.

So, that's one of the ways, if you can help us while we are taking positions and speaking, if we know definitely in advance that this is going to be one of the subjects that's -- are going to be raised, because it is by far more strong, if we have the community behind, and with us, and speaking with us, and attending different -- different sessions that are related to ICANN's limit, numbering and protocol parameters, and I expect after the IANA transition, that this issue will be more and more needed, because we will find further pressure on these issues from the outside -- from the outside world, as such. But let's wait and see.

The other type of category, were the Board and the CEO were very clear. When it comes to IG issues, that are not only related to ICANN, we need to coordinate with ISOC, we need to coordinate with RIRs, we need to coordinate with the rest of the community when it comes to the - - to the global positions, as such. And here we have also our channels that we are working with, with ISOC and others, as such, and we are inviting you also to participate. There are the mailing lists, for example, that ISOC is leading, and to a great extent, ISOC sometimes takes leadership, and the instructions from the Board, at the time being is, if ISOC leadership in those issues that are not explicitly ICANN-related, as such -- as the examples that I have mentioned, the gTLD, and IANA, and ICANN accountability and jurisdiction, and this list.

So, when it comes, again, to ICANN's limit, we are there, we hope to be together, we'll make sure that we coordinate on panels, on statement papers, on inputs, on whatever engagements that we are doing. When it comes to the broader things we have to work within the ecosystem, as such, and you mentioned that as well within the calls, or whatever, which avenues are we taking with ISOC and others?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Tarek. And there is actually a precedent for paper to be sent by ICANN, or contribution by ICANN, which was bounced into the working group to start with. And that was the CSTD mapping the Internet feedback. Nigel, could you say a couple of words, and then I propose that, perhaps, we could have a formalized way of you being able to share some of those contributions with the community, given him enough time of course, to be able to respond, and then being able to amend the contributions accordingly.

Nigel Hickson?

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. Nigel Hickson. I'll be very brief, and it's so pleasant to have so many people here, and I do hope that you'll come along on Thursday, because the agenda item on Thursday is specifically addressing the NETMundial Initiative, and associated issues. We have a panel -- well we don't have a panel, we have a number of discussants moderated by Bill Drake, and we are able to address such issues as the WSIS, as the IGF, and the ITU activities, et cetera.

But specifically on your question, under the review of WSIS, this is the review of the WSIS outcomes as called for in paragraph 111 of Geneva's (ph) agenda, there are a number of activities being carried out before the U.N. General Assembly looks at this issue in -- this December. One of them is that the CSTD Committee, which is the Committee on Science and Technology for Development, which comes under the Economic and Social Committee at the U.N., is developing a paper that will be going into the UNGA (ph) as an input.

And we have an opportunity, ICANN as an observer at CSTD to input to that, and there's two papers. There's a paper on the WSIS outcomes, and these a mapping exercise, which is an exercise at looking at the various Internet Governance activities, and the reason the Internet Governance activities, including cyber security, and privacy, et cetera, and seeing how they are being affected, who was working on them at the moment, and those are the sort of papers, which we are asked to

give an input to, those are the sort of papers which, as Tarek and others have said, of course, that we can circulate to your group as you -- to this group as you see appropriate, and seek input, of course. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Nigel. There is actually a question on the chat, and I've not forgotten the queue Marilia, so you'll be speaking soon. Tarek?

Tarek Kamel: To Bill's question, and about the coordination. We can also not only have meetings during the ICANN meetings, to also three times a year, but whenever there is a good number of people coming at a location in Geneva, for example, for an event, an ITU, or CSG meeting, or whatever, or the IGF overall. Then we can also come to an (inaudible), well not do an extra travel, not to add extra burden on the community, on the community members for a face-to-face meeting, but whenever there is a chance. So, at least to meet four, five, six times a year, this will help definitely the communication to be improved, besides the regular calls.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Tarek. And I note that this is the model by the Internet Society has actually made use of. They meet at ICANN, they meet in other fora as well. Bill, you wanted just a quick response, and I don't want to take so much time, I know that time is ticking so fast.

Bill Drake: A couple of bounded things. The WSIS Forum is coming up. Is ICANN planning on organizing a session at the WSIS Forum?

Tarek Kamel: Do you mean, in May?

Bill Drake: Yeah.

Tarek Kamel: Yeah.

Bill Drake: Because the deadline for submission of workshop (ph) is coming up, and I would say, one thing we could do to start, Tarek, was to be -- to do something that involves the community working with the staff, in putting something together for that.

Tarek Kamel: Sure.

Bill Drake: But more generally, I wasn't to come back, I've raised this point before. I'm a little concerned about the WSIS, and raised this in particular, in the public Internet Governance session we did last time in L.A. I'm concerned about the WSIS+10 Review, and the modalities for stakeholder input, and whether people are going to actually get their acts to provide real effective inputs into that process. It's all, at this point, looking a little bit obscure, exactly how people will participate and, you know, you've got an intergovernmental discussion where a lot of things could go wrong, depending on what happens with IANA, and a million variables. Right? The IGF renewal could become a political bargaining chip that gets thrown around. All kinds of stuff could be happening. I wonder as a real concrete deliverable, would it be useful for this community to think about trying to make some sort of formal input into that process?

Okay, Marilyn, you are looking at -- you are looking at me funny. So you can explain to me why it's not a good idea, but I'm just thinking -- I'm really wondering whether this intergovernmental process is going to see much in the way of effective stakeholder inputs. Tell me what you are thinking, because I know you are thinking because I know you are engaged with that?

Marilyn Cade: Actually, I'm going to defer and share my thoughts after the other people in the queue get to speak. I did want to discuss the WSIS question -- the review process, but I'd rather do it after we hear what the other folks have to say, and then talk about whether it is useful or effective, or harmful, because sometimes approaches can actually -- certain ecosystems respond better to some approaches than to others. So, I'd like come back to that.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Marilyn. But I do note that specific discussions on the WSIS+10 can probably take the rest of the afternoon, and we do have a session, the public session will be addressing -- we'll talking about this, so maybe that would be a good time at that moment, with probably more people, also, around the room. On the process itself though, that seems to be a good example.

Tarek?

Tarek Kamel: Thank you. I mean, I want to comment on what Bill has said. The process is fuzzy as you know, of -- as a preparation for WSIS, unfortunately we don't know exactly when the two ambassadors or conveners will be selected. Who will they be? What is really the input going will be? Are they going to take the ITU input and the UNESCO input, and the input from ECOSOC or not? I mean many, many questions, and we give it enough attention at ICANN. The Board also is very concerned about what will happen as well as ICANN's leadership, and management, Fadi.

So, it is going to be a hot topic on the agenda, where there will be coordination very close with ISOC. The meeting with ISOC is on Wednesday, Nigel? Wednesday, yeah; Wednesday, so this will be a good opportunity that Nigel, maybe, can talk about it on -- in the public session on Thursday, as such. We have presence in now in New York (ph); Veni Markovski is in New York since one year. So we started to be aware that we cannot leave New York without presence from the ICANN, and will empower that presence, probably, but also whoever from the community can help us while we engage with the community there, which is a different community, even than the Geneva community.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Tarek. So I think maybe we can -- there was a question on the chat, actually, on who was the dedicated contact person from your team, for the working group. I believe it is, Nigel.

Unidentified Participant: Anne-Rachel.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Nigel and Anne-Rachel. Yeah. Okay. So that's the thing. So, I think, perhaps, if we can commit to having some kind of process, whereas, when you have inputs that are in the sort of a more formal way, rather than being the fuzziest of the fuzziest, that could actually be shared with the working group in advance. I don't where the timelines would be, or the time scales would be, whether you do the night before you fly, or whether it's months before, I don't know. I don't want to --

Unidentified Participant: (Inaudible)

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Next we'll go to Marilia Maciel, and I'll look at the questions on the chat. Marilia, you have the floor.

Marilia Maciel: Thank you very much, Olivier. This is Marilia, for the record. Actually Bill has spoken much of what I wanted to say. And first of all, maybe there was some confusion in your question regarding who read the blog post, because I understood that you were talking Tarek's blog post; that he's supposed to orient our public session. Not this report here, and the report I think that, most of the people have read, because it had circulated on the list.

Just specifically about the report, I think it is very useful to keep the community informed about where ICANN is participating, what are the forums that you understand are key for different reasons. But what I missed in the report, and I miss in our discussions, it's really an opportunity for political assessment, a clear, honest discussion, about how do you see -- what are the main issues? What are the forums that are discussing these issues? We try to map this in our side, but I think that it lacks the input from you side, because I think that you have your own evaluation internally, with the Board, with the CEO, regarding what are -- and the main fora that ICANN should participate, and what are the positions that should be taken there.

And I think that we should discuss together; what are these positions? And not receive maybe a report or a proposal about the position that ICANN will adopt in this forum. But maybe take this

space here as an opportunity to really frame from the beginning what are the main issues, which kind of position ICANN should adopt in this forum, and take a step in really writing down, and putting this on paper, and writing a document. I think that this is a very privilege space, I agree that it's very important to reach out to different communities such as, ISOC, but maybe the most important would be to attract this community to participate in the discussions, here, in this Cross Community Working Group, because if you target specifically, ISOC or other groups, you are missing a lot of knowledge that is present here in this working group that does not attach to any of these structures.

So, I think that the other way around, bringing these actors here, and using this space really to strategize. And I think that your presence here, Tarek, and I see members of the Board, too, it's really important for us to have this kind of high-level political discussion, because I don't know how far ICANN stuff as well, can make a political assessment about what are the threats and the opportunities that ICANN, as an organization see. And I think that to have a mature discussion, with people here that could contribute.

And Bill said, perfectly, it would even enhance and strengthen ICANN's positions elsewhere. And it would be very important that the meetings of the working group, at least the ones that take place in (inaudible) meetings are attended by you; or by senior members too. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Marilia. Tarek?

Tarek Kamel: Yeah. When I mentioned ISOC, I was clear. There are clear instructions from the Board and the leadership coordinate with ISOC and other part of the iStar ecosystem, when it comes to generic, common, IG issues. Not necessarily ICANN-specific. So this is the area where we have the mandate, and we have the instructions to coordinate closely with them, and this is an agreement between the Board -- at the Board level. This does not mean that we cannot take input from ICANN's community, but we can also not overlook coordinating with them, because of many reasons that I don't want to get into.

But when it comes to the -- ICANN's very specific issues; the gTLD, also the IANA here, internal, within the world group, as such, and the restriction and other issues that might touch on ICANN's - - on ICANN's remit. Indeed we are open to any discussion, assessments and exchange of ideas. But I also want to say, it is not very often that we provide a position paper within the conference. We go there, and we speak and we try to influence the decision-making process that is there together with others. So that's very often the modality or the output. And sometimes there is something written that is being delivered, but that's not always the case. Maybe this is, in some cases, but not all cases. But we welcome any discussion, and we are ready for any high-level political exchange, either within closed meetings, or in whatever forms. This enriches definitely the assessment and the discussions.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Tarek. Maybe -- Marilyn Cade, for a quick response, because time is going.

Marilyn Cade: I'm going to build on what Marilia has said. I opened my -- Marilyn Cade, speaking. I opened my comments by saying that I reference the Charter, but I'm going to reference the genesis of this group. And I'm sorry that the Chair of the Board has left, but I'm sure this will be conveyed to him, perhaps by me. The genesis of this group was because this community was disappointed; is that clearly said in that, disappointed, that significant actions had been taken, that the community was not in any way engaged and consulting on. And I think hearing from Bill, hearing from Marilia, myself, and others, I think we are not just telling -- our feedback is, I think, not just that we want to comment on what you are doing, we consider it our responsibility to contribute on planning what you do, as well as helping to make sure that it is widely supported by the community of stakeholders and ICANN.

Certainly the Board and the senior leadership have the right to decide that your priority focus is on another iStar organization in certain areas. But myself, I would interpret the feedback here, to be

that we think, we, as a community, should also be contributing before, but before major decisions are taken. That is not happening today. I'm very aware it's to happening today, and so is the staff, and I think we are asking; how can we productively contribute, and I'm just looking at Marilia, to make sure that I'm -- but how can we productively contribute, because we are the best ambassadors for ICANN.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Marilyn. Tarek, you wish to?

Tarek Kamel: No. I'm in no doubt, definitely that community members, as I said at the beginning, are participating in different fora, they are -- many of them understand ICANN's remit, and ICANN's history, and ICANN's evolution, and the threats that also exist to the organization, specifically in the coming 12 to 15 months. So it makes a lot of sense, that there is a very close coordination, which does not replace or exclude coordination with other players as well as -- as such. But I wanted also to stress that we have the mandate to coordinate with the other iStar staff. This does not mean, that there could not be ICANN community consultation and coordination, and input, and support.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Tarek. We have a question or comment from a participant in the room. Who is behind me, and if you could, please, introduce yourself.

Ashwin Sosonyta: Thank you. My name is Ashwin, from GAC, Indonesia. I'm trying to go back a bit, because our colleagues mentioned about the -- some similarities and differences between -- in any discussion between ICANN and ITU. Now many of the GAC members here at ICANN, also sit in the ITU Council. And ITU Council, we will have meetings next May, while I also sit in some (inaudible) ITU Council, and many of the GAC Members also do the same.

Now, in the ITU Council meetings, discussion on this particular Internet Governance is always interesting issues, I do not know. My English is not so nice, so I do not know a better word than that, but they -- you can sensitive issues, interesting issues, whatever, but it's always, people will talk about that. If one or two countries put governance on Internet survey, there are more countries will raise their hands and give interest, sanction, or whatever.

Now, normally, around two months before the Council, many of the countries will have to submit their contributions to the ITU Council, so my proposal today, this is the first time ITU Council will meet under the new management, under the new Secretary General, and under the new Bureau -- Director, or something like that. Now, it will be useful if our colleagues or the group, can share what are the, say, differences or similarities that have discussed between ICANN and ITU. Now, bearing in mind that during the ITU (inaudible) in Dubai (ph), discussion on ICT governance has become very hot topics, and many of the countries, if you remember, actually walk up, from the Dubai meeting in (inaudible) bracket, so -- because some of the -- well, hot discussion. So I think it will be very useful for the ITU Council members, if what happened, or what has been discussed can be shared among public view. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. Thank you very much for this contribution. I think that, Bill, the Thursday session is going to be touching on this, isn't it?

Bill Drake: On the ITU Council?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Well not only the ITU Council, but the various topics of Internet Governance, the WSIS+10, the NETMundial, et cetera, et cetera.

Bill Drake: Okay, so we are turning to that point then -- We have 10 minutes left.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. I know, so we do have to move forward. I think, looking at the calendar of forthcoming activities, is going to be, if we do it in 10 minutes as well, we are not going to achieve anything, but we do need to look at the next session that we will have which will be the public session. Just

prior to that, I think that the gentleman just mentioned here, actually, is the external process that we've looked at -- that we spoke with, with Tarek. It was the internal process of having the input from the community into ICANN's processes. But there's also this ability of the people around this table in their respective delegations, countries, et cetera, to influence the process, based on the discussions that we are having here, based on the discussions that we are having on the mailing list, and that this working group is working on.

Bill Drake: Yes.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Oh, great answer. Thank you.

Bill Drake: Did you want me to say something about Thursday?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So, I think perhaps now, we can move to Thursday, otherwise we'll never reach Thursday. So, let's get down to the agenda for Thursday, please.

Bill Drake: Okay. So, just briefly, so in the past the public Internet Governance session has been held in every ICANN Meeting, has been planned by the Staff, and this community had asked that we, going forward, work with the Staff to co-plan these things, so that there will be a more participatory activity, that led then to various discussions on the conference calls that we've had as a group, about exactly how to organize the agenda. And unfortunately there's been some back and forth there. There was an agreement that we would talk about the NETMundial Initiative, because a number of people were quite interested in that, and then there was initially a thought that the second-major topic, it would have to do with the relationships between staff and community, several people had suggested that.

Unidentified Participant: Which is exactly what we've been discussion here.

Bill Drake: Which is what we've been talking here and -- but when we had several consecutive calls from the people who had suggested that, weren't on the calls, and then when messages were sent on the email list we didn't get sort of replies. So we didn't really know what to do in terms of teeing up that question in a way that would work really well as a public performance. So, what we decided was that probably we should revert to our first idea, which was after talking about NETMundial, look more broadly at some of the developments that are going on, and some of the various intergovernmental spaces, and try to have an interactive discussion, rather than we had apparently, Wolfgang Kleinwächter, Marilia, Janis Karklins, Sally Wentworth from ISOC, Jandyr Santos from the Government of Brazil; and Nigel, I guess, will be making some initial sorts of comments that will weave in there to structure this discussion.

And if we run out of juice on that second set of topics around what's happening in these other spaces, we could then revert and add in a bit more of this discussion of the staff, relationship if that's useful. But I think, we simply have to kind of play it by ear and see, but it was impossible to sort of construct the whole session around the notion that we were going to do a deep dive into the staff-community relationship, and we didn't have the people that were suggesting that, and it wasn't clear what the agenda would be.

So, we will focus on the NETMundial Initiative a bit, which I think a number of people want to do, and then go from there to looking at something in the intergovernmental spaces, and get some updates and then solicit inputs from people.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: And maybe also, I think WSIS+10 and the other processes which are very important as well.

Bill Drake: Yes.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Marilyn Cade?

- Marilyn Cade: Thank you. Marilyn Cade, speaking. I think we need to pre-identify those spaces we are thinking about, because the community needs sometime themselves to think about what comments they are going to want to offer. There is a very large number of not -- even more people than those that are in the room, who have an interest in one or another, I think, of those intergovernmental events. So perhaps we would want to be sure that we -- if we could identify today, at least set up -- we could get those posted so they are on the agenda ahead of time, and people have at least 24 hours to be thinking about them.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I would certainly like that, and I thought that if your list of issues could be added to the website for the session, that will at least give people a common informational basis, since so many people have pages that would give them some update, the short paper. But in terms of things to emphasize, in particular, I mean, to me, I would think WSIS+10, and maybe IGF renewal are of particular interest to other people, and the politics around that, and the status of the IGF more generally. ICANN has contributed quite a bit in trying to support the IGF, and I think there's always been, in some people's minds, to sort of a mystical relationship between the NETMundial Initiative and IGF, and I think it's always worth clarifying. So that, you know, we could certainly talk about that.
- I don't know how deeply you'd want to go into ITU type stuff, because it's fairly specialized. If people are not really active in the space, I don't know how many of the people that we have here, will be coming up on what's happened in the Council Working Group on Internet Public Policy Issues, but I mean, I know you are. I mean --
- Marilyn Cade: Marilyn, speaking. Look, I think this is an opportunity. We need to decide if we are briefing the community or engaging the community.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: The idea is engaging, but sometimes you -- somebody has to key up an issue.
- Unidentified Participant: You have to have hooks and --
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yeah. Hooks in both ways; the punching hooks and the ones where can lasso things. Which is why, I guess they -- we invited these to be conversation starters.
- Marilyn Cade: I missed the meeting where we decided to do that, but okay.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. There are quite a few people who wish to take the floor. First I saw the gentleman over there. I'm sorry, I don't know your name, if you could, please introduce yourself.
- Walid Al-Saqaf: I'm Walid Al-Saqaf, for the record. I've been involved in ISOC as Chair of the Yemen Chapter, and also within ICANN through the NCUC, but I see that we may actually benefit from current works and beyond that, for example, the UNESCO study, Internet study, I'm not sure if you are aware of it, but there is a -- there's been a lot of work going on there, and I'll be speaking at the conference coming up next month, and one of the fundamental issues, is Internet Governance, and it's an addition to the WSIS, for you and the other aspects. It's important for us not to overlook that, and particularly that it's been, fundamentally, a research-oriented study, so that's my contribution.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much for this, Walid. And since, Bill, you are leading that session on Thursday, have you taken notes of this, and then we'll just add it, because I'm not quite sure. Renate, can we make the change on the main website? Is it possible to have that -- the list of topics that we are going to be discussing in that session? I've just looked at it at the moment, and it seems to be extremely (inaudible). This regular Internet Governance session will feature a community-wide discussion on topic of the NETMundial Initiative, and other current IG initiative. Can we sort of focus this?

- Renate De Wulf: Yes. Of course. Actually, Nigel and I were waiting until the end of this session to finalize the agenda which will then be posted on the website.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Fantastic! So, Bill can work with you on that.
- Bill Drake: It's the conversation that -- I think you weren't on the last call, actually. The conversation we had was that after we've had this session, and hopefully things will be clear, and tuned up, and Nigel would then put together a tax, then we would go on to the website that explain exactly what we are doing.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Excellent! Thanks. Now I've got Marilia, Tarek and Marilyn; do you wish to -- No; maybe not. Okay. Marilia, please; Marilia Maciel.
- Marilia Maciel: Thanks, Olivier, this is Marilia speaking. Well, actually I'd like -- I'd like very much the report that was produced by Nigel, and I would like to suggest that we make this report something that is permanent. Like every three months that ICANN staff produces a report about the workshop, or the events that staff has attended. What were the main outcomes, and that we form the whole community, that we make this available on the website, not only for the CWG members but for everybody. And that, I think that this could save us a little time in our public sessions, when we are in ICANN meetings, because these kinds of briefings do not need to be made on person-to-person. If people have access to the report before, then they can raise the issues that they think are more controversial, and different people will have different interests, some will raise about ITU, others we raise about the WSIS process, but that will help us to get the discussion going.
- And the other point is that, I don't think we need to make a decision between briefing and engaging, I think that briefing can be done in a sort of short way, and briefings should come up -- the point that you just suggested, what are we going to do vis-à-vis WSIS? What are we -- are we going before the session, does community think this is a good idea? Because they think this hasn't -- it should be a session of the CWG together with staff, we should check with community if this is a good idea; if they have topics to suggest, for instance.
- So, maybe to break a little bit; and I agree with you on the topics. I think WSIS+10, and (inaudible) pretty much what is at stake this year, and then try to see if it's okay. If these are the topics, then what are going on to do as a community about that, and that's the ideas that we come up with here, and I think that you (inaudible) regarding a session in WSIS was a very good one for a start. Thank you.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Marilia. And your suggestion that Nigel produces regular briefings for those people listening in -- listening remotely, Nigel has a red tie, and his head has just turned equally as red, at least from this part of the -- this part of the world. Next is, Tarek.
- Tarek Kamel: I just wanted second what Walid had said concerning the UNESCO Paper, especially that there will be an Internet-related -- and policy-related conference for UNESCO on the first week of March, as such. It's not yet, 100% clear what type of input it will give to the WSIS+10 process, but it might be also an opportunity to build on. Yeah.
- Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you, Tarek. Marilyn Cade?
- Marilyn Cade: I just want to -- It's Marilyn, speaking. I want to really reinforce the idea that we do include information about the UNESCO, the report has four elements. The fourth one -- four areas -- the fourth one is the ethical uses of the Internet, and this is a very significant area of interest to governance, and in my dialogue with the senior leadership at UNESCO, one thing that people who are planning to participants should be aware of, is there will be an output document, which is a consensus document that is agreed to those who participate that -- and it will then go -- it will be considered in April at their Board. It will then go to the annual meeting in, I believe its October -- September? September, but it would be highly unlikely that it would not be approved to send

forward, if it has been approved by the Board. So I would encourage us. I think informationally, to the broad community, it would really be an added value for us to include that.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Can /// ask of the Moderator of the session on Thursday, who do I look to then, to talk about the UNESCO Report. Well, either you are on top of that --

Unidentified Participant: I have not read it.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: So who could actually -- we are going to be in front of 100 people, who can actually talk about it?

Marilyn Cade: It's going to be 250 people, and Walid could kick off, and I could follow.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Fantastic! Well that sounds like we've got a Thursday session; and of course we are running out of time. We are already behind the official closing time for this. Agenda item number four, was looking at the calendar forthcoming activities for the whole year, and I looked at the calendar, and it looks like probably needs an-hour-and-a-half just to look at that. I would suggest that since now we do have the link there, you, have a look at it, and we can follow up on this. I certainly take from this session that we now have some first step into implementing some relationship between staff and the community and being able to move forward with that. Perhaps, could I suggest that we put this as a pilot project until Buenos Aires, and then we'll take stock in Buenos Aires, how well it's worked; or, before -- even before Buenos Aires, who knows, but that's great.

So, I thank you all. I was going to say, other business, but it looks like if we start any new business, it's going to take another hour. So, I thank you all for coming here, and look forward to see you all in the session which will take place -- I don't even know the location on Thursday --

Tarek Kamel: 11:15 till 12:30.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. 11:15 to 12:30, and it would be on the -- it's on the schedule, so thanks very much to everyone, and see you on Thursday. Bye-bye.