
HYDERABAD – Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance - F2F meeting
Saturday, November 05, 2016 – 18:30 to 20:00 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: November 5th, 2016, 18:30 to 20:00, Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance face-to-face meeting.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Could I please ask everyone to take their seats? We'll start in two minutes. Good evening, everybody. Welcome to this face-to-face meeting of the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance. Today we have quite a packed agenda, so we'll try to go through it as quickly as we can so as not to stop you from going to the gala.

Next to me on my left is Rafik Dammak, the Co-Chair on behalf of the GNSO. Next to him is Young Eum Lee, the Co-Chair on behalf of the ccNSO. I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond, the Co-Chair on behalf of the ALAC.

Today, we're going to have to change the agenda a little bit around. We are supposed to start a discussion with Markus Kummer, who is the Chair of the Board working group.

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.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Recording has started. This meeting is now being recorded.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I'm glad I asked the question. So if we rewind, welcome everybody. Welcome to this meeting of the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance.

To my left, we have Rafik Dammak, the Co-Chair on behalf of the GNSO. Next to him is Young Eum Lee, who is the Co-Chair on behalf of the ccNSO. I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond, the Co-Chair on behalf of the ALAC.

To my right is Markus Kummer, who is going to speak to us a little bit – well, in a moment. He is the Chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance, but we're going to change our agenda a little bit.

Before we make our changes, there is going to be a sheet that will go around the room. We haven't got time to do a roll call as we usually do since there are so many people in the room, but someone will come over, and please put your name and details. I promise it's not for marketing reasons or anything like that.

What we will do is to start first with the updates, and I don't know why the agenda isn't scrolled up, but the second page of the agenda, I believe, is the updates on the WTSA, which has

taken place just a few days ago, finished just a couple of days ago.

Nigel Hickson has just returned from the beaches of Hammamet, and occasionally the meeting rooms over there as well. He's going to be able to talk to us about those, and we also have an update on the CSTD, which Peter Major – who is sitting on this side – will kindly be able to provide some details of.

After that, we'll just continue through our normal procedures, and hopefully, we'll finish on time. So, Nigel, I guess you have slides for this. I'm not sure who deals with the technical, but the floor is yours.

[NIGEL HICKSON:] Veni will start.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, is it Veni who's touching – okay. So Veni, the floor is yours.

VENI MARKOVSKI: I'm not touching the slides, but I'll give you some quick updates from parts of the WTSA meeting, and then Nigel can continue and add what I've missed. So, the WTSA is a conference that takes place every four years and covers the work of ITU-T sector, which is dealing with standardization.

The name WTSA means World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly. Our interest in that conference is that it has had resolutions through the years which are dealing with country code top level domains, IPv6, internationalized domain names, cybersecurity, and stuff like that which is clearly within what ICANN is doing.

This year, it became known towards the beginning of the conference – about ten days before the conference started – that there are new proposals for new resolutions or amendment of existing resolutions which were directly impacting what ICANN is doing, namely that became now known as Resolution 47, which is the current country code top level domain administration resolution which was proposed to include generic study of top level domains, policies, and stuff like that.

Unlike other such conferences, this one was not very big in terms of number of people present, and a lot of the people who – I would say a huge majority of the people who were there are actually people from telecom ministries, but from different departments than the ones who come to the ICANN meeting as GAC representatives.

So we had to do a lot of educational outreach and a lot of bilateral meetings and meetings with people on the ground to explain what actually ICANN is doing and why some of the things

that are being discussed there are actually being dealt with in the ICANN environment.

We had some good interventions from the GAC vice chair who is head of delegation of Thailand, who was actually instrumental in explaining that these issues, especially the gTLD being dealt with at ICANN, and all the issues that certain governments were raising are actually addressed here.

The conference was, I think, almost two weeks – ten, eleven days – and including Saturday and Sunday, long hours. The negotiations are getting really heated. We would start usually at 8:00-9:00 in the morning and would end at midnight with no breaks because there is a lot to be discussed.

There was also a number of other resolutions that were being discussed, including digital object architecture and data privacy. I would mention here only the data privacy one, which was proposed because it has direct impact on what we do as well with regards to WHOIS, but also with regards to what registries and registrars are dealing with in their national legislation environment in countries around the world.

I'm not going to spend time discussing the details because this resolution actually did not pass, but I think it would be interesting, especially for the folks on the GNSO, to take a look

and see what exactly has been proposed so that they know what is coming in the future.

Because this conference is – first of all, they're every four years, but in-between, there are other conferences like the Plenipotentiary which is in two years, which are much higher in the ITU space. They're actually the highest summit of the ITU, and their resolutions are much more tough to create, to build, and to work upon. You cannot change them that easily.

So I would pass the word to Nigel so that he can say what his observations are, and I'm more than happy to talk to any one of you. I know that we are limited in time here. Through the next few days, if you have questions, to come back to me and to Nigel as we are witnessing that. And I don't believe that there is someone else here, except for a couple of GAC people who have followed what's happening in Tunisia. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much, and I'll be very brief. I think Veni has encapsulated it. This WTSA was a difficult meeting. The proposals are in resolutions, and the resolutions mainly instruct the study groups of the ITU what they should do and what they

should cover. And the study groups work on particular issues, and then those issues go into resolutions for the Plenipotentiary, which is the sort of treaty-making part of the ITU which is happening in two years' time.

We were particularly concerned that the study group, particularly Study Group 2 which is a very important study group at the ITU, didn't start working on generic top level domains because working on general top level domains in a study group would have led to recommendations from the study group, which would have ended up as possibly resolutions at the Plenipotentiary, either instructing member states on what particular geographical name should be reserved, or whatever.

And we felt that this was something that the GAC were involved in very competently here, in the GAC working groups on geographical names of the community. We're also looking at country names and geographical names, and we thought that was the place where input should be given.

So, fortunately, we were able – because we were there, and as Veni has said, we were able to directly brief a whole range of governments and other stakeholders to inform them.

We personally met with the African Telecommunications Union and various other representatives and were able to inform them that these particular issues were discussed in ICANN, both

between governments and with the community. So I think that was helpful.

In terms of the difficulty of the actual negotiations, of course it wasn't just on this resolution 47 that Veni has mentioned. The whole aspect of the ITU's work on technology called Digital Objects Architecture, which is a particular technology which can be used to identify objects in various situations, and the push from various delegations and some in the ITU as well to make this a fairly fundamental part of the ITU's work in terms of the Internet of Things and in other areas.

This, again, is something which we had concerns in, not because it directly relates to ICANN's pure mission, but because it detracts from what we're trying to do in terms of globalization and in general in our outreach and engagement.

So I'll finish there. The meeting overran. We didn't finish until 10:30 on the final night, which was somewhat unusual for an ITU meeting, but in the end, a satisfactory result, I think, was achieved. It does emphasize the need for people to be engaged in the discussion, because these are important discussions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. Veni Markovski.

VENI MARKOVSKI:

Thank you. I should also mention one thing which I believe is important for this particular group that we are here. There was a very good cooperation with many of the Internet-related organizations. We had representatives from APNIC and LACNIC there.

There were IEEE. Internet Society had a huge delegation which they built from around the world. They actually opened a request for participants in early October for people to come forth. Some of you may know some of those folks. Alejandro Pisanty was there on the ISOC delegation. He is a former ICANN Board member, a huge expert in Mexico and others.

We also – when we saw how the development is taking place around this now discussed resolution on ccTLDs/gTLDs. We reached out internally within ICANN and we put together a very quick response. We had a meeting with the Secretary General of the ITU, Houlin Zhao. Nigel and I went for that meeting, and then we had Göran send a letter to the Secretary General to basically explain that in the last couple of years, we had good relations with the ITU, and such a resolution is stepping into our field.

It was very written, very politically correct and in a nice way, but it was as clear sign that ICANN is taking this seriously, and we are reacting to something which we see as an immediate and

potential problem that may have between the two organizations, which contradicted what Houlin Zhao has publicly expressed in the last couple of years, talking about the good relations with ICANN and how the ITU is working with people, with us, and meeting, etc.

So, I think that's an important detail which I think is good for you to know, that we are not only watching and not reacting to the extent that we can. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Veni. I have put in the Adobe Connect chat a link to the working group's page on WTSA, which has inside it a link to the statement that was drafted very hastily by this community. I'd like to thank all the people who have been involved in this effort, and if you're interested in looking at this statement, you can of course click on this. It's all part of the pages.

Are there any questions or comments from people around the table? Yes, Jimson Olufuye.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much. I'm Chair of Africa ICT Alliance, member of the BC. I would like to begin by commending the team that was at the WTSA for their quick response. Very commendable.

My take, or our take, on signing the DOA – that is Digital Object Architecture – is that, really, we are quite alarmed. Speaking for the private sector, in some of the [consigned] private sector in Africa – because that’s what I represent in AfiCTA – are quite concerned that we're going to an era whereby government alone begin to control some key elements of this evolving architecture, and as mentioned, distracting away from the collaborative work within ICANN.

Two weeks ago, I think there was an agreement with the organization pushing the DOA with the South African government, and it has not really been productive in terms of government having the whole say when it comes to technology that is to benefit the entire population or the people.

So we are really concerned and we believe that we should take this very seriously. Going forward, we need to [think it] out at that level, like the working group one, maybe in-house cooperation where they're talking about things related to this issue – [inaudible].

But engagement is very good. We are concerned. We don’t want government-only control on anything that has a likeness to the current Internet architecture. It should always be inclusive, and it should always be on equal footing. So we appreciate the engagement and it should be sustained. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jimson. Any other comments? In the absence of further comments on this, I'd like to first thank the ICANN team for having, of course, been able to fight the good fight over there. Let's hope we continue working together and be able to actually continue and get that multistakeholder model to defend itself in these conferences.

We have a second update which is all about CSTD, and because we did start late, I'll ask if we can sort of go through it quite fast, except difficult. Of course, there are things that we need to be well aware of. Peter Major, you have the floor.

PETER MAJOR: Thank you, Olivier. I'll stop here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Are there any questions?

PETER MAJOR: Well, I just have one question to Nigel about the late session that you had in the WTSA. You mentioned 9:30 or 10:30 in the evening, but usually in CSTD, we have sessions up to 2:00-3:00 in the morning. And I'm in the CSTD right now. CSTD means Commission on Science and Technology for Development of the

United Nations, and it has two mandates: one is related to science, the other is related to the WSIS.

We are concerned here with the WSIS, and I come back to the WSIS outcome document of last year of the United Nations General Assembly, which instructed – amongst others – the CSTD and personally me to set up a working group, which has already been mentioned by Jimson, on enhanced cooperation.

And this is the working group version 2.0. We already had one and, previously, we had another working group which was on the improvements to the IGF. I am really proud that these working groups are really multistakeholder working groups.

It wasn't an easy task to do, but right now everybody seems to be resolved to the fact that, yes, we do have in the UN system a multistakeholder working group made up of about 22 state governmental representatives and 20 from the non-governmental stakeholders.

Enhanced cooperation relies very heavily on the three paragraphs of the Tunis agenda. I know you know the Tunis agenda by heart, so I need only to mention the appropriate paragraphs: 69 to 71. Basically, it is concerned with the role of governments in Internet governance, specifically saying that not involved in the daily operation of the Internet.

The group has been set up, as I said, after consultations with the appropriate stakeholder groups and since I have been reconducted as acting Chair of the CSCD, I felt it judicial that probably someone else would chair the working group and I nominated Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca from Brazil – who is, by the way, also Vice Chair of the CSCD – to chair this meeting.

The first meeting was [morally] procedural issues. It was a one day meeting, at the end of which the group came up with two questions to be answered shortly. The first one is to identify what are the issues which are of concern with respect to enhanced cooperation.

The other question was what sort of recommendations should this group give as a final output of its activities. The group should be meeting again in January for a two-day session and again in May, and the final recommendations should be presented in the beginning of 2018.

In order, it should be endorsed by the CSTD, later on by ECOSOC, and finally by the United Nations General Assembly. That's in a nutshell. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Peter. Are there any public consultations that we need to watch out for? Because I think we might need to schedule this in our work. This is a scheduling meeting.

PETER MAJOR: To my knowledge, it has been given at the discretion of the members of the working group to reach out the local communities. So probably, if there are consultations, they are being conducted locally. I am not aware that any inputs are being considered by this secretariat coming from others than members, and eventually, those who are observers with a certain status, that is they are WSIS accredited or ECOSOC accredited.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Are there any comments or questions from around the room?

Jimson Olufuye.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you. Let me first commend Peter Major for his [stellar] steering of the meeting of the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation 2.0 before you hand it over to Ambassador Benedicto. Indeed, that's as a good example of multistakeholder participation, and it should be sustained.

On the question you raised, Olivier, about input: yes, there's request for input from stakeholders, especially directly from those that are members and they're communities. I believe we've gotten one – maybe the ICANN representative Nigel – you got mail. December 7th is the deadline for a response, and I think we should robustly respond to those questions. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jimson. And Nigel, I'm turning to you. Can we launch a consultation among our group on this, please?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. There were two questions that came out of the first meeting on the 30th of September, which we're asked to provide an input to. ICANN is a representative of the technical community on this enhanced cooperation working group.

There are five members of the technical community. We have one place along with the ISOC and IEEE and a few other organizations. We did post the two questions on the CCWG list, but I think we ought to revisit that in the light of this discussion and seek some appropriate input because, as Jimson says, we're being asked to provide an input in a month's time. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. Let's have this as an action item, please. Anyone else around the table? Okay, I don't see anyone putting their hand up, so I think we can now move from the consultations and the outside work to our own work. We have Markus Kummer who is the chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance who has half an hour to discuss first the Board's work since we last saw him in Helsinki. And then perhaps we can start working as to how we work better together. It's your floor now, Markus.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thanks, Olivier, and good evening, all. I must say I'm overwhelmed with the presence here. I had not anticipated so many people would attend as we're competing against the gala that is beginning right now. My first point would be a proposal to amend the agenda and call it “Meeting with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance”.

As I have some colleagues here in the room who joined me and I think I would very much like to engage the members. I see Lousewies, [inaudible], maybe [inaudible], and Khaled, I think, is also – yes, there, our incoming Board member who will also join the working group is there.

And Becky, I think you are here in your capacity as member of CCWG, but you're an incoming Board member as well. And

[Young Lee], the liaison to the IGF is also in the room. If I've forgotten anyone of my colleagues, please shout.

Anyway, we met in Helsinki. We had a very good dialog. Our first meeting of Board Working Group was at that time also in Helsinki. We met briefly after. It shared a meeting with the CCWG. We had a great discussion in Helsinki and after Helsinki, we met again physically in –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Do you want slides?

MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, we can pull them up. We met physically in Brussels when we had the Board workshop, and then we had a presentation worked out by Tarek and his colleagues and we discussed this. We refined it again, had a teleconference, and we put it on the agenda of the Board here. And it is essentially a conceptual framework for engagement of ICANN in Internet governance-related issues.

As you're all aware, we had some heated discussions in the past of whether or not ICANN should engage in this or that activity, and the opinions voiced range from total abstention to full engagement. So we really thought there was a need for having some conceptual clarity.

The concept that was proposed by Tarek and his colleagues – and that was endorsed first by the Board working group and then also by the Board when we presented it – was essentially concentric circles of three categories.

The first category was the category of issues related directly to ICANN's remit, and I think the report from Nigel and Veni illustrated very well where ICANN really has to take the lead and be active when it comes to defending its own remit on essentially DNS-related issues. That is the core of these concentric circles where ICANN has lead – and recall, these are the leadership issues.

Then there is a second category where we talk about collaborative participation issues that are issues related to the multistakeholder model to the broader Internet issues where ICANN participates and supports other organizations and, essentially, the I* organization works closely with them but does not have the lead, and these would include issues such as the ones in the CSTD or IGF issues that come up there.

Then finally, there is a third category. And can we move to the next slide? We call that selective engagement issues, and these are broader issues that may seem outside of ICANN's more narrow remit, but they touch nevertheless ICANN's activities.

Cybersecurity, for example, ICANN clearly is not engaged in the broader issues of cybersecurity, but it touches closely on when it comes to the stability, security of the DNS, DNSSEC, or privacy. ICANN is not an organization dealing with broader privacy issues but, obviously, there is a very close connection when it comes to WHOIS or the new registry, the RDS issues as [inaudible] being developed.

The same on human rights. This is now in the Bylaw and we have to work out how to deal with it. Jurisdiction is another issue. Obviously, ICANN is involved in these discussions when it relates to ICANN. This is a Work Stream 2 issue. So this is not supposed to mean that ICANN is expanding its scope, but it clearly deals with other issues related to ICANN's scope and mission.

Then, ICANN – Tarek and his colleagues suggest that the Board working group could have a kind of triage function on new issues as it came up, and we should also have a kind of early warning system on meetings that deal with issues that might touch on sensitive issues related to ICANN.

And again, the WTSA is a good example. A few months back, people thought that would be a fairly innocuous conference and would not be particularly difficult, and in the few weeks ahead of

the conference, all of a sudden it turned out that it was a conference that could be full of potential dangers for ICANN.

So you never know that in advance, but you have to keep your eyes open and make sure that you are aware of what might come up and what might affect ICANN. And again, it's obvious that ICANN cannot be everywhere, but that is a need, also, for selective engagement on issues that touch on ICANN.

Now, as I said, we presented that to the Board and the Board was, I would say, in broad agreement with this approach. We think – again, we know it can be very sensitive for the community as there have been in the past discussions related to scope and mission, but we think this approach is very much within scope and mission of ICANN.

With that, Tarek, would you like to add a few words?

TAREK KAMEL:

Thank you very much, Markus, for laying the ground within the concept. And I think it is also an opportunity to present this here for further discussion at the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance as a proposal. We are coordinating very closely with the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance, and Nigel is our liaison in that for the regular calls as well as for the face-to-face meeting, and we would like,

definitely, to have the feedback of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance on that.

I would like also to take the opportunity to thank Olivier and the co-Chairs, Rafik and Lee, and everybody in supporting us at the WTSA via your statement. This encouraged us also and encouraged the CEO to issue the letter as such, talking on behalf of ICANN and ICANN constituencies that this is a direct conflict, resolution 47 and the other resolution was ICANN's remit.

So thank you for helping us in that, and we look forward to working together.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Maybe before handing back the microphone, I'm looking to my colleagues on the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. If there's anything I have left out or should be added, feel free to jump in. And with that, I hand back to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Markus. It appears that you have covered all angles with your group. Before opening the floor for questions, one of the things that we have been doing in the working group is to start discussing how we wish to build a relationship with you and a kind of a framework of engagement that we should have.

The last time we met, it was more of an introduction phase. Now we're moving into the next stage, I think, and I hope that this is also the idea that you have on your side, to expand collaboration and to find out how we work together.

MARKUS KUMMER I think my proposed amendment to the agenda gave a first indication that I see that as a meeting between the two groups.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you. We haven't seen your slides before, so obviously, it will take us some time to digest them. And of course, now we're discovering how you're seeing the overall landscape out there. I was going to call upon Matthew Shears perhaps to start a little bit the ball rolling on the whole engagement and framework of engagement between the two groups. Matthew?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Olivier. I think what the WTSA issue has raised in everybody's mind is that while the transition may have occurred, many things in the Internet governance space are continuing, if not becoming more pressing. And this needs to be seen in the light of some new initiatives within the community here that are questioning the need for the CCWG-IG, whether it's from a substance perspective or from a structural perspective.

And I think that we need to look at the work that we're doing and we need to see value in that, and I think an expression in that was the statement that the CCWG-IG put out during the WTSA on resolution 47.

Now I think we've kind of batted around some ideas in terms of how we can engage with the Board working group on a more productive and cooperative basis, and I think that we've kind of come to a point where we see two particular sets of actions, if you will, that would be incredibly valuable to the Broader community.

The first is really to see the CCWG-IG as a monitoring and identification entity that really raises issues of concern, assesses a level of concern to the community into ICANN, and then communicates that concern as it did with the WTSA statement to the broader community to then encourage the community to act upon that concern. The resolution 47 was a perfect case of that.

But that can't happen in isolation of working with the Board working group, and so we'd like to propose a more elaborated engagement model for working with the Board where, in many ways, we would be seen as kind of working together to identify those opportunities and those challenges in the Internet Governance space that are within ICANN's mission, to identify those and to assess the degree of challenge or urgency, and to

propose ways of addressing those challenges and those concerns.

I don't think that we see the CCWG-IG as being able to speak for the community, but rather we see it as a mechanism for bringing issues of concern to the community. And we can only really do that by working together with the Board working group

So I think we would like to see a much more elaborated and closer and more ongoing relationship with the Board Working Group. Perhaps I'll leave it at that and maybe, Olivier, if I've missed anything – but maybe that can tee off the discussion. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much, Matthew. In a way, I think one could call it industrialization of a relationship. Effectively, we've engaged, but now we really need to have some kind of a basis to know how we engage, how we move forward with things, and how we actually structure our work according to your work, and how you structure your work according to our work.

That's the only way that we'll be able to keep in sync. I think it's important, and to engage early on this.

Lousewies.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: I just want to give a little personal comment because I joined the Board one year ago and I come from that world of UN and government relations and this thing. And I have, over the past year, engaged a lot with the ICANN community. And one of the things I've noticed is that in the broader community, there's still a lot of parts – especially the techy parts – who don't really understand, I think – I don't want to say the threat that comes from the ITU or the UN, but it's really important to get everyone to engage.

And this is not something that ICANN staff or the ICANN Board in any way can do this. We need the whole community to engage, and you guys have the technical knowledge and the expertise, and all the tools that these governments so desperately need.

So the way I always try to explain it is that governments can legislate the Internet to death if they want to. So they see all these serious threats to them and to their voters, to the constituents – whether it is pedophilia, crimes, terrorism, and all these things. And they are ready to take a sledgehammer to eradicate those problems.

But I think if we can help them find the tools, the tiny screwdrivers, or at least to say, "Look, if you want to fix that, don't come to us or don't do this. Don't kill the whole thing." This

is so important, but it can only be done if the whole community does this together. And I think it's wonderful that we have this, the cooperation.

I really think that – I hope we can expand it so that it's not always the usual suspects because this is going to be an ongoing work. I think Matthew is absolutely right. Don't think that this is over now that the transition is over.

There are those who think that what happened in Tunisia was not coincidental timing-wise. So we have to be constantly alert, and the way I explain it, it's like gardening. When you have wanted your garden to bloom, you have to pull out the weeds, you have to water the plants, and you cannot, at any time, stop and think, "We're done now."

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I think that Veni wanted to speak, but Becky, did you want to respond directly to this? No? Okay, so we'll go over to Veni Markovski and then Becky Burr.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Thank you. I would use the analogy with the grass at Wimbledon when somebody, some Bulgarian asked, "How do you get this grass?" They said, "Oh, it's easy. You just cut the grass and you

put some [oil on it], and you do it for 200 years and you have the grass."

But I wanted two points. First, in the chat room there are two links: one, there was a question about the DOA that is a very good paper written by the Internet Society on the DOA, and I've put a link. It's a little bit above there.

The second thing, which, again, touches to the understanding of the governance about the technical issues. This is where, really, all the folks who have technical background will be crucial. This is the statement by the South African Minister one day announced the signing of the MOU with DONA, the Digital Object Numbering Authority Foundation, that they see this, the development of DOA, as an alternative way of managing information on the Internet.

So that's what I was saying earlier, that there is a misunderstanding about what actually DOA is. And some governments believe this is a replacement or an alternative way, and when the government say it's an alternative way but we support it. That was the big argument at the ITU, that the ITU should not support one technology, especially that it's not really open. It's proprietary, trademarked, etc.

So these are issues where the community, the experts in the community, especially around the world – because you have

members of the technical community here. We have this morning from 130 nations in this meeting, so they could reach out to their governments and do more educational work.

This is indeed the crucial thing, and I'll finish with that. But I believe, also, what ICANN has been doing – and hopefully will be doing – is a little bit of educational effort with regards to the folks that can decide the fate of our core activities, which are the governments.

The way we reach out to the GAC members, we should be reaching out to others who have influence on what we do. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Veni. Becky Burr.

BECKY BURR: I would like to just urge a little caution when we talk about what the GNSO resolution is intended to do. I've spent some time talking with the folks who introduced it and people who are supporting it. They stress that they think this work is important and that it needs to continue.

Their concerns are that we now have a kind of standardized format for best practices for CCWGs, and this doesn't quite fit

very well in it. The charter is pretty old, and maybe we should revisit it and think about what the proper format is. But I would hate to have people walk out of here and say, "The GNSO thinks that Internet Governance work is not important or not relevant," because that's not what they're saying.

So I do think the charter is old, and it's time to think about whether this format is the right way to do it. We all saw with the statement for WTSA that there were time constraints that just didn't permit us to really go back to our communities and do what a CCWG is supposed to do. Let's take it as a challenge.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Becky. We'll talk about this actually in about ten minutes when we finish with this because we do have a section on the future of the working group itself, and that would be the time to discuss this in further details. John Laprise, you mentioned something about ITU engagement.

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you. In listening to Markus and listening about the events at WTSA, it strikes me that perhaps our engagement with ITU might be raised up a notch from category three, if this becomes a [consistence] trend.

MARKUS KUMMER: I think that may be a misunderstanding. If we can go back to the slides, that would be clearly – that was category one. That was a resolution relating to the DNS, to geographic domain names.

JOHN LAPRISE: But we figured out the resolution 47. It came very late.

MARKUS KUMMER: I mentioned that example more as the need for having an early warning system because it didn't look like a problematic conference to begin with, but then it was clearly category one, touching on the very heart of ICANN-related issues. So that was category one.

But then there were other issues at the WTSA which are then maybe more category two, where other I* organizations take the lead, where ICANN needs to take the lead. The RIRs were there and ISOC was there.

Anything to do with numbers, that will be clearly the RIR. So that's supported, of course, by ICANN. That will be category two. So that was a misunderstanding.

As I have the microphone, if I may continue, just obviously I also very much support Matthew's proposal that we need to notch up

a bit our engagement as the two groups. But again, the Board working group is essentially a low level of formality, as it's only a working group with no legislative power.

So we are here to advise the Board, but we clearly felt it was necessary to have these discussions. Quite often, before it was [inaudible]. Now the whole Board is responsible for that, but then you have the whole Board responsible for it and you never discuss it.

So that was the attempt to have a more focused discussion where we can actually inform the Board to have a common position, a common conceptual framework. But we are not a decision-making group. But having said that, obviously, to discuss with the group, CCWG, that is important and we feel we cannot live or work in isolation. We need to have the support of the community. We cannot run away if the community doesn't follow.

And it's important – as Lousewies has said eloquently, it's important to engage the community as much as we can in these efforts, and also convince those who are maybe less convinced of the need for that – that it is important and can touch on the very essence, the very livelihood of ICANN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Ron da Silva.

RON DA SILVA:

Thank you. I just wanted to add to Lousewies' comments. I'm a relatively new member of the Board. I joined a year ago, and my background is from the numbering community. I have technology and engineering in my past, not politics, and I just wanted to point out the value of creating these bridges with the technology community and the political community, or the governance community. We see in the service provider space a lot of interest from law enforcement with respect to privacy and efficacy, and serving subpoenas when there are illegal activities.

There are a lot of great synergies that are happening across the service provider community with these types of issues, and coming in and seeing there are a lot of issues. And I think to the extent that we are successful at communicating in a way that makes sense to the technology side of our industry and reflecting governance concerns in a way that makes sense to them as technologists and as operators of service providers. Then I think we get that successful bridge between technology planning and political planning.

I've seen that in the last year, and I just want to encourage this group that the more I think we're able to do that and speak in a language or borrow some translators from folks who are here

who can speak both languages and build those bridges, it'll go a long way in helping put value to this effort and what we're doing with respect to governance as a whole.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Ron. So where do we go from here? How do we build this up? How do we build a stronger relationship or some kind of engagement on this? I must say, when the resolution 47 discussions came up, it kind of caught pretty much everyone by surprise. And the amount of time that we had to respond was very short indeed.

I was surprised – perhaps not surprised, but I was – yes, surprised I guess, that we didn't quite know what was the feeling in your group and what was the level on which you were in your group regarding this. So we were pretty much working in the dark pretty quickly.

MARKUS KUMMER: We had not discussed that in our group. I discussed it briefly with Tarek, but we essentially let staff move on. As you said, it was very short notice. But cases like that, again, a kind of early warning system, maybe a joint call between the two groups – and obviously staff – would definitely make sense.

I think as next steps, definitely, let's make sure that we have a meeting between the two groups in Copenhagen, and maybe a call in-between if and when necessary, I would say. We don't need to have a call for a call's sake, but if anything comes up that we feel we ought to discuss in preparing a meeting in Copenhagen, then let's have a call.

That would be my suggestion, to take it step by step and start with baby steps.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Markus. One of the things that this group often does during its calls is to look at the forecast of what's coming up. Nigel, of course, is very good at being able to provide us with some of this. I also think of Marilyn, Kate, and others who are involved in the different parts, and I'll come to you in a second, Cintra.

But in being able to share that information, I think, it would be good because sometimes what might be important to you might not be important or might not be seen as being an issue in the community, and vice versa. So as for you to be aware of the issue that could be raised in the community.

You mentioned earlier that you're a non-decision-making body within the Board, and this group is a non-decision-making body

as well. It's there to – well, not only discuss, but obviously, to recommend, effectively. And the thing that we have sent, the statement that we have sent to our chartering SOs and ACs was going in that direction.

Cintra Sooknannan.

CINTRA SOOKNANAN: Thanks so much, Olivier. I have a question with regard to how the CCWG engages with other I* organizations. Does it have the authority to do that on its own or is that something that's done through ICANN staff? How do you engage with other I* organizations?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We don't want to engage, ourselves. Obviously, ICANN engages with other I* organizations as part of the work that they do. I don't know. Nigel, did you wish to say, or Tarek? Briefly.

TAREK KAMEL: Thank you, Olivier. Indeed, we have an ongoing coordination mechanism with the I*s on a CEOs level, via the CEO I*s meeting, and then via other vehicles as well, via the Internet collaboration working group that we are participating regularly on their calls or in the field. For example, like it happened in WTSA or it happens

in Plenipotentiary or in New York at the WSIS follow-up process, or at CSTD, or at different occasions.

Then we have regular calls with the I*s and we have regular coordination mechanisms with the I*s. I would recommend that we make sure that, via our liaison, Nigel, that the CCWG-IG is then also informed about these steps of coordination on a regular basis that are being taken on the ground or within the calls. I think this will help, and we'll promise to do that here.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tarek. And clearly, some of this liaising, some of this information is just regular information. Some of it is proactive, some of it is reactive. So we'd really appreciate this to happen.

Jimson Olufuye.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Just to suggest – because if we look at the line of discussion, there is need for more engagement. Is it possible that the Board Working Group on IG can be observers on the CCWG-IG list, and vice versa?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jimson. Is it Nigel who acts as a liaison, or any of you? I think that you are on the list, aren't you, Markus?

MARKUS KUMMER: I'm not.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You're not on our mailing list? Do you mind your mailbox being filled? I thought that we had actually discussed this in Helsinki and there had been an action item that you'd be put on the mailing list, but maybe I'm wrong.

MARKUS KUMMER: It's easy to be implemented.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Easy to be implemented, yes. So, really, I think that perhaps one of our next steps – because we do have to move on – one of our next steps will probably have to be a small group in our group here to work with you to put together perhaps a first draft of how we are going to engage.

I'd like to sort of have this a little bit more structured than just saying, "Oh, we'll keep in touch and call you later," type thing. "I'll call you when I call you," or "See you on the internet" type thing. So if we can do that, I'd like some volunteers in our group. And perhaps Matthew would probably be the first one to move

on this, and we'll follow up with the mailing list and if anybody else wants to work on this.

Irrespective, of course, of what happens to the working group afterwards. I believe – as Becky said – that there is an interest in this activity to continue, so we'll seamlessly move to whatever it is that we'll move to later on. But this really has to be established anyway between this group and your group, so that's great.

Any other questions or comments to Markus Kummer? Yes, to the gentleman, please introduce yourself.

THATO MFIKWE:

Thank you. I'm from South Africa. I'm a new fellow in this process of ICANN. So I just wanted to make a comment in regards to challenges that are faced, especially in regard to the continent of Africa.

With the South African government, there are issues around transparency because they are more used to ISOC because there are [inaudible] within the country. So it's easier for them to relate with ISOC. Maybe that would be one of the reasons why it's difficult for them to adopt some of the resolutions that are coming from ICANN.

And then, number two, there is an issue of capacity on their behalf because if you don't have capacity or you don't know that

the industry is about, it's very difficult to truly make a decision. So it means that they need to be engaged more so that they're able to understand what is involved and what is it that ICANN does.

Because when we're looking at Internet governance, it's something that we have been driving [on part of] Internet society [inaudible]. So we've been driving Internet governance for a very long time within the country, and they've started being part of the process, although we do invite ICANN to come and make representation in these types of events.

So those are just simple comments. I'm not sure if it's in line with the discussions that have been in here, so I just felt that I should just make that contribution. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, and we certainly welcome fellows taking an active part in ICANN. So welcome to this community. Any response or any comments on the – [inaudible]. Okay, thanks. Right, so then perhaps – oh, Khaled Koubaa.

KHALED KOUBAA: This is just a comment and an answer and follow up on the gentleman's comment. I'm an incoming Board member from

Tunisia. I have been in the Internet Governance space since many years.

I think that when I look at the table here, I see great diversity, regional diversity, so I take this as a big asset for you guys. I encourage everyone to make themselves comfortable with the local government and local regional actors that have certain influence and work on the Internet governance.

They can do a lot of activities within what is going, or they can be leading other activities and initiatives. I'm sure that the other I* organizations would be happy to support as well. So I see as an asset for everyone in the CCWG. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Khaled. And so we'll move on to Veni. Last comment on this and then we really have to discuss the Internet.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Just one thing which to reiterate. With the transition over, we should not forget that the WSIS+10 is not the end of the Internet governance discussions at different venues. It's just one step. Some people mistakenly believe that because the outcome document mentions the multistakeholder model as the way forward, that means the end. We saw it immediately that it's not. Just one point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Veni. So we have until 8:00, which gives us another about 15-20 minutes to discuss a next topic, which is the future of this working group. As you are aware, the GNSO council has put in a motion to stop its support for this working group. Becky has already explained that it's not that it finds that the work is not useful or is not needed, but that the vehicle itself that is being currently used is not appropriate for the way the working group is working.

The standard vehicle for a cross-community working group has a start, middle, and end, and an end point is not a thing that happens in Internet governance. It's one of these perpetual machines. Did you want to say a few words, as you are the Co-Chair of the GNSO?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thank you, Olivier. Maybe just also we need to clarify that we have a motion for discussion and vote at the GNSO council, but there is no position yet within GNSO council. And I don't think we had real discussion about the topic, [even] we – it was like since Marrakech were reporting and there was some question.

But for the time being, it's still just a topic that the different constituency and stakeholder group within the GNSO didn't

make any decision yet. There are some concern for some groups, maybe about the format and the point highlighted that maybe it's not aligned with cross-community working group framework principles.

I do think maybe it's an opportunity for us to revisit the charter to review what can be amended. But we need to keep this working group until we maybe find a new format. We cannot – I don't think it's really good that GNSO withdraw now, and so let's work maybe on what can be the right format.

Even maybe the cross-community working group principle may be not necessarily appropriate because there is the time concern – the start and end time and deliverable – while Internet governance issues are always kind of ongoing.

So we can have that discussion regarding maybe the format, but we need to keep this working group going on for the time being. And we will see what can be the decision in the public meeting this Tuesday. So for now, it's still kind of up and I hope that we can – should not worry about this. Let's just see it as a good opportunity to revisit and to improve things.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rafik. And in the absence of anyone putting their hand up or waving, for the time being, my concern is, of course,

that all the time that we spent on process, we don't spend on actual policy and on actually opening our eyes to what's going on outside.

So Young Eum, you wanted to – of course, in the ccNSO council, I have seen that there was a meeting with the GNSO council today. So Young Eum.

YOUNG EUM LEE:

Yes, this topic was a topic of high interest during the ccNSO-GNSO council meeting, but I think it was encouraging that many of the opinions that were raised, or many of the statements made by the contributors or that the issue that this group is dealing with is something that is very important, and there was general recognition within the GNSO also that the issue was very important.

However, as Becky said a couple minutes ago, the concern was that they were not getting, I guess, enough information, and so aside from the fact that the structure or the operation of this working group is relatively different from the usual cross-community working group structure or the output, the fact that they were not getting much itself was a problem for them.

There were many suggestions that the conception about cross-community working group should not be as rigid as they

conceive it to be, but that, as Rafik said, we need to maybe come up with a different type of mechanism for getting the information out. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Young Eum. And in the chat, yes, I have noticed that. I've also got somebody in the front, but I was just going to mention a couple of things. First, I guess the initial thought when the motion was seen on the GNSO council list was that it was – I wouldn't say hostile – but it was certainly a case of, "Oh, perhaps they think the work is not useful and that no work is required by ICANN and ICANN is basically doing more than what its actual mandate is asking it to do."

I have since received – or met with several members of the contracted parties house and with registries and registrars – and of course, as Becky has said, this is work that is important, but it is just a vehicle which they think needs to be amended or worked on.

Now, when it comes down to the charter itself, yes, maybe we have to work out our charter. Maybe we have to perhaps see how we can better communicate.

One thing that has struck me is that everyone I spoke to was not aware of what this working group was doing really and thought

that we were just sitting around discussing general issues, but not actually speaking to staff and receiving information from staff and then responding to the documents that staff were sending us, and the amendments actually being made in those documents which were position statements that were actually being made out there.

So perhaps first we have to formalize this or document all of this, and then we certainly have to establish channels, clear channels of communications with the different chartering organizations so as to regularly provide them with details of what we're doing. However, this requires resources.

We are working on a very lean – that's the other thing. They thought that we're working on a huge budget. In fact, one of the things that I've heard today was, "Well, there are dozens and dozens of people from ICANN that go to the IGFs, all funded by the CWG, and we want to cut this down."

And I thought, "Well, wait a minute. The CWG doesn't fund anyone." It could not even probably fund a bag of crisps, so it's just one of these things that comes. So perhaps we have to sort of create something so as to have a better way to communicate, and I don't quite know what the resources are for being able to do that because, obviously, the amount of time that volunteers

here spend in communicating is time that they don't spend in actually studying what's going on.

Tarek, sorry.

TAREK KAMEL:

Thank you, Olivier. And indeed, we will make sure that there are [human] resources that would really support this better communication to the constituencies from now on, since we realized that this is definitely an issue of concern. So I will talk to my colleagues from the executives team and make sure that we'll provide additional support.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tarek. We have a queue. Cintra Sooknannan and then after that, Greg Shatan.

CINTRA SOOKNANAN:

Thanks, Olivier. Because of the overarching nature of IG and the fact that it's so critical in the role of ICANN right now, perhaps one structure that might work is if staff directly takes control. For instance, like in the [ALAC] space, those working groups. So it's direct.

All the work of that group comes directly under a staff member, even though the members are cross-community. Because they have that area of interest, it works without a charter.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you, Cintra. I might answer this quite quickly. The group has three Co-Chairs, and I would sense that the committee would probably not want a staff member to run its calendar and things, and that certainly doesn't appear to be the wish here. I understand how ALAC space works and so on, but... Let's see Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN:

Thanks. I've listened and we've had quite a bit of discussion in my own constituency of the IPC about this motion and about the CWG, and I think putting aside the formalistic question of whether we're a CWG like other CWGs and what do we do about the fact we're not. Let me put that aside.

The problem, I think, is a question of what value do we bring to the multistakeholder community, and I'll speak mostly for the GNSO. What value have we been bringing to the GNSO, and if we are bringing value to the GNSO, do they know it?

The answer to the second question is no, so it almost doesn't matter what the answer to the first question is. If the answer to

the first questions is we are bringing no value, then let's all go to the gala. But I do think we bring a great deal of value to this community, but we're falling down, as you said, on the communication side.

We need to – one of the things that they pointed to in the CWG model is that there need to be deliverables. What are our deliverables? In some sense, our last deliverable to the community was the NETMundial statement, which was pre-historian, almost.

So we really need to find a way to bring what we do out to the community. Otherwise, we're just a discussion group. And we may be helpful in working with and informing and being informed by Nigel and Veni, but that doesn't matter in the IPC. It doesn't matter at the council table.

So the question – what we have to do is to be regularly reporting out. If we're not emitting information to the community in a regular was that's timely and useful and ultimately moves the ball forward for the community, then we have a huge problem. And we just haven't been doing that.

I share my piece of the blame. I haven't done a great job of informing the IPC of what we do, but I think it should be incumbent on each of us to go back to our particular sector of the community to give information. It shouldn't be incumbent on

each of us separately to write up and prepare briefs, drafts, and reports.

We need to have a centralized methodology of providing an output that goes to the community and that goes to the council table every month with a report and a liaison statement every council meeting, and in particular, at the live meetings like this. There needs to be something that goes out in front of the stakeholders and the communities.

I don't know what the best methodology is, but – a newsletter, even. Something that's informative and that draws people in and shows why this all matters. I think there are a lot of people within the GNSO community who are very aware of and engaged in other IG matters outside of ICANN, but there are also some that are terribly not.

I didn't even know that IG beyond ICANN existed really until NETMundial. And then after that, I saw the horizons and the horizons after that. But there are still people who kind of stuck with the idea that ICANN is Internet Governance to them, and maybe in ISOC. And they don't know what the other stuff is. They're not informed.

So we need to really figure out how we can provide timely and useful information in a way that gets in front of people and that

provides a value for this organization to the stakeholders.
Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Greg. Tarek, did you wish to just quickly respond to this? And then we've got Matthew Shears. And time is going. We only have about three or four minutes left.

TAREK KAMEL: Thank you, Greg, for sharing this concern with us. And it brings us back to what we have been saying a couple of minutes ago. We'll make sure with our executives team and bring this definitely to the attention of Göran as well in order to make sure that we provide additional resources as an organization to reflect that to the constituencies, so that the value and the position statements that this group is preparing becomes clear what role is it playing and what value added is it providing to the ICANN community and to the different constituencies.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tarek. And specifically with regards to communications, I think it's something that really has stood out. So we've got Matthew Shears and Jimson Olufuye, and we'll close the queue after Jimson. Otherwise, we'll miss all the gala.

Matthew Shears.

Matthew Shears: Thanks, Olivier. Just a very quick point. I think what Greg said is absolutely essential and it dovetails nicely with what Veni said, which was that people think that the Internet governance space has come to an end with the WSIS resolution in December 2015 with the transition.

And I think this points to the fact that we need to be able to talk about Internet governance and the spaces it's spilling over to and out into new spaces. And I think that's part of our responsibility going forward.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Matthew. Jimson Olufuye.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, just quickly. To the contrary, in the BC you have quite a number of members who are engaging in IG. So we do have some briefing and even at the executive committee – the last one we had about a week ago – there was a briefing on the current IG issues. But it's quite important that it be formalized, really. I think that is the message. It needs to be formalized.

And on the occasion whereby we just had victory. Against all hopes, people said the transition will not happen. And it's happened. We are happy. That is when we should really be more aggressive in getting the message forward, doing more outreaches and engagement.

So, it's not a time to relax. More a time to refine our strategy, especially in the ICANN strategy. We have that global engagement. We already have that, so it's just a key goal indicator to make sure that we realize that objective. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jimson. And we do have one more item on our agenda, which we'll probably just fly over very quickly since we have a couple of minutes left. Of course, there's going to be the vote or the presenting of the motion of the GNSO council.

The concern is that we end up with no vehicle. But have no fear. We'll continue operating one way or another and try and find another vehicle if the current vehicle is basically taken away.

But really, the structure, I think – whether it's a working group, a cross-community working group, whether it's any other structure – as long as it has the same ability to formalize things and the same legitimacy within the ICANN space, it really doesn't matter what the vehicle is. It's really down to what we do.

So I'm glad to see that we're putting together some plan on this, and that at the end of the day, we'll live through this, and hopefully we can continue the good work here.

The last item on the agenda was just talking about what's coming up and what we have done in the past as well, and that's probably one of the deliverables that has happened.

We had WSIS+10 for two years, we had IGF last year where we defended the multistakeholder model in which the IANA Stewardship Transition plans were built. And this year, we have one about the ICANN Accountability Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2 – in Guadalajara, that's right.

So one of the questions really from this is, what other activities does ICANN have? And we have a wiki page, actually, which we have created, but it's desperately empty at the moment.

And I know that there are a lot of things going on, so perhaps we can follow up by e-mail afterwards and get you guys to feel at least what ICANN is officially doing.

And if I can ask people around the table, if you are involved in any other workshops in Guadalajara, then please fill in that wiki page. Maybe we can e-mail this out.

We're one minute over time. I'm usually used to being late, so one minute is fashionable. Do we have any other points, Young Eum or Rafik?

YOUNG EUM LEE: Just that the ccNSO council, actually, in our own preparatory meeting, discussed this and the general consensus within the ccNSO that this was important work that needs to be supported.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks. Hopefully we can bring better news on Tuesday and see what will be the vote for the motion. And I think we do agree about the [inaudible] to improve the communication when we get more resources and so on. I think that will help a lot on that matter.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rafik. Yes, Lynn St. Amour.

LYNN ST. AMOUR: Yes, just one quick – more a request, perhaps, for some time on one of the future CCWG-IG calls to update you on some of the

things that we're actually doing within the IGF and the MAG and some of the plans we're trying to get ahead of for future years.

There wasn't time on this agenda, and I think the items you had were more important to catch up on, but if we could just book some time specifically. And of course, everybody is warmly welcome to the IGF in Guadalajara in early December. And as we do every year, the MAG will be turning over approximately a third of its representatives.

So we are still looking for a lot of good candidates to come through the various community processes, and we're also searching hosts for the next nine years for future IGFs.

And of course, another little advertisement. We're always looking for contributions to support the work of the IGF as well, because it is a voluntary project of the UN. It is not supported through UN member fees, and a tremendous amount of work is done with a very small secretariat, four people and a few part-time consultants. So we're looking for good support for the MAG and certainly good support on a hosting and resource level as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Lynn. So if you have a house with a large back garden, you know that you can speak to Lynn for hosting an IGF.

So, thanks to everyone. I'm actually very pleased with the turnout today.

There were a couple of meetings that we had at the height of the IANA Stewardship Transition where the air had been taken away from all of the rooms except the IANA Stewardship Transition room, so it's good to see that there's life again in this working group.

We've got our public session on Monday night I believe, also, from 6:30 to 8:00 in the main hall. We'll be speaking about fragmentation during part of the discussion, and Matthew Shears will be moderating with his expert moderating skills. So we look forward to this, and in the second part, there will just be a few updates on what we've actually been talking about here when it comes to international governance. Thanks very much, everyone.

This meeting is adjourned. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]