
COPENHAGEN – CCWG-IG F2F Meeting
Wednesday, March 15, 2017 – 13:45 to 15:00 CET
ICANN58 | Copenhagen, Denmark

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, ladies and gentlemen. I'm going to call the room to order. We're going to start in two minutes, ladies and gentlemen. If you are not here for the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance, I shall kindly ask you to continue your conversation outside. Thank you.

[MARILYN CADE]: Chris. Chris, no more dial tone for you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Before we start and before any great movie, there are announcements, advertising, etc. We'll have Marilyn Cade. This is not recorded, please. Not yet.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. And thank you for bearing with me to do this. I'm going to take this moment to just remind people that today is the DNS Women's reception in the evening. I hope that all of the women will plan to come, and to remind or notify any of the other women who are here at ICANN to please join the DNS Women's reception. It's on the agenda.

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.

The second announcement I'm going to make, which is very unrelated, is to remind anyone who's interested in the work of the NRI, the National and Regional Initiatives network and the work that is going on might be interested in getting in touch with myself or Markus later. Markus is the Chair of the Internet Governance Forum Support Association. I know we saw many newcomers at that meeting yesterday, but I am running into people who are still looking for who to talk to. It's either him or me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this. Let's start the recording, please.

Good afternoon, everyone, and welcome to this Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance face-to-face meeting on Wednesday, the 15th of March, 2017. We've got a nice turnout in this room today.

Let's just have a quick round-the-table saying of your name and affiliation so we know who's in the room, and then we can proceed forward with our agenda today. We've got the public Internet governance session taking place tomorrow. We'll have to speak a little about its agenda. Then we'll have updates on the CCWG on Internet Governance report. We'll have the charter amendments, the liaison with the Board IG working group, Markus Kummer, and the working group parties for 2017. All of this – would you believe it – in an hour and 15 minutes. But we'll see.

So let's go quickly around the table. I'm Olivier Crepin-Leblond. I'm the Co-Chair of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance on behalf of the At-Large Advisory Committee.

RAFIK DAMMAK: I'm Rafik Dammak. I'm the Co-Chair for the CCWG IG from the GNSO.

NIGEL HICKSON: Nigel Hickson, Government Engagement Team.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]. Government Engagement Team.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Young-eum Lee, Co-Chair on behalf of the ccNSO.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Chris Disspain, ICANN Board.

LOUISE MARIE HUREL: Louise Marie Hurel, NCUC member and onboarding Fellow.

ISRAEL ROSAS: Israel Rosas, Advisor of the Mexican delegation to the GAC. Here I'm only an observer.

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: Renata Aquino Ribeiro, SWG member and NCUC member.

ADAM PEAKE: Adam Peake, Global Stakeholder Engagement staff.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Matthew Shears, NCSG.

TATIANA TROPINA: Tatiana Tropina, NCSG.

TONY HOLMES: Tony Holmes, ISPCP.

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: Elizabeth Thomas-Raynaud with the BC and NCSG and member of the IGF MAG.

CLAUDIO LUCENA: Claudio Lucena. I'm a first-time Fellow. I'm Brazilian.

RAZA QURESHI: Raza Qureshi, academia. I don't have an acronym to throw out. Sorry.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Yay!

FERNANDA IUNES: Fernanda Iunes with ICANN's Public Responsibility Department.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Lousewies van der Laan, ICANN Board, and member of the Internet Governance Working Group.

THIAGO TAVARES: Thiago Tavares, Brazilian Internet Steering Committee Board member.

RAFAEL LITO IBARRA: Lito Ibarra, ICANN Board member and also a member of the Internet Governance Working Group.

MICHAEL OGHIA: Michael Oghia, NCSG, MEAC Special Strategy Working Group and first-time Fellow.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: George Sadowsky, ICANN Board and member of the Internet Governance Working Group.

BIKRAM SHRESTHA: Bikram Shrestha, ICANN Fellow and [inaudible] Coordinator for Nepal IGF. Thank you.

MARILYN CADE: My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm a member of the Business Constituency and a member of the Business Constituency's Outreach and Awareness Committee and one of the participants in this working group.

MARKUS KUMMER: Markus Kummer, ICANN Board and Chair of the Board Internet Governance Working Group.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Christopher Wilkinson. Apologies for arriving a few minutes late. Participant in CCWG Accountability, among other things.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, everyone. The first topic on our agenda is the public Internet governance session that will take place tomorrow. It's tomorrow morning, I believe.

Nigel, do you have the exact timing? It's at 9:00 A.M.? Another 9:00 A.M. session.

Okay 9:00 A.M. tomorrow morning. The agenda has not been published yet, and that's my fault and the fault of a few other people also. I can share this with the people who have been helping in putting this agenda together.

I think I'll read through it. One of the reasons why we've put the agenda together as a small team outside the actual working group

itself – the working group mailing list – is that, in a prior occasion, we had a lot of e-mails talking about who was going to be on the panel, who was not, etc., and I think several voices came out and said, “Look, can you just take all of that organizational stuff to the side? People who are interested in putting this together, please go together, put something together, and then propose it when it’s at least half-cooked and not just when it’s absolutely raw,” which makes sense.

So on this occasion, we ended up with the latest proposal as I see it. We’d have an introduction that would come from me and I think Rafik – both of us – regarding charter drafting and the year 2016 review, the two documents which have been presented to the chartering organizations barely ahead of this meeting.

Then we’ll have a look ahead. Now we have to start shifting things around because of people’s availability. I understand there is a meeting between the GAC and the GNSO. It’s at the contracted parties or non-contracted parties, I think. Some people might not be able to make it right away, so we’ll have to move them a little bit further down. Others can make the early part of the meeting but then are conflicted in the latter part of the meeting. The problem is that with shifting schedules for everyone, we’ll just have to see who’s in the room at any one time and then call upon them.

If things go according to plan, we’ll start with a look ahead to the main issues during 2017, touching perhaps on the enhanced cooperation working groups, CSTD, and for this we would have Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca, who has said that he would be available. Then

we'd be looking at the WSIS forum 2017, the ITU expert group on the ITRs, the preparations for the ITU WTDC (the World Telecommunication Development Conference), the G20, the OECD work on the Internet, the high-level political forum, the U.N. GGE. Now, some of these I don't even know myself, but there's just more and more these days. It's just growing at an incredible rate.

[MARILYN CADE]: That's the point of [inaudible] explaining the acronyms at least.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Explaining the acronyms will probably take the first half-hour of the meeting. It seems like acronyms make more acronyms with time. There's something dodgy about this. And there's the launch of the Global Commission on the Stability of Cyberspace.

For this, in no specific order, we would have also Marilyn Cade intervening and Thomas Schneider. I've been told that he would be available at that time.

[MARILYN CADE]: [inaudible] Matthew Shears.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Matthew Shears I think is intervening later because he is conflicted earlier on. So that's the problem.

Second, we'd review the main outcomes on the Internet governance front during 2016. So it's a little bit strange to look ahead first and then review what happened last year, but it's just due to the people that will actually be in the room at the time.

What were these? What were their implications on ICANN's mission? It really is a sort of review of where we are today. I think, Markus, you'll be able to contribute to this. We have Markus and Nigel on these because, of course, Nigel has been following all of these issues in 2016 and has been our link to the outside world. Markus is the Chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. So that's a good dynamic duo left and right.

Finally, we'd have a discussion on the Internet governance priorities for the Cross-Community Working Group, taking into account the new global political agenda. I think we all know what that is. And of course, for example, with respect to the rise of cyber sovereignty and Internet nationalism, which we're seeing at all levels in Europe, North America and elsewhere as well. And for this, we propose Tatiana, Rafik, and Bill Drake.

Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you. I'd like to see if I could possibly recruit Tony Holmes in particular for coming in on the list. The landscape of events is extremely broad, and I'd also like to propose to add one to it. That is the ITU's International Public Policy Working Group. There's three

there, at least: the ITU Expert Group on ITRs, the WTDC – and if we can add the International Internet Public Policy Working group, I think those are a cluster that deserves some expertise from someone who is actually quite expert in helping the ITU to stay on track and out of our track, meaning Tony. He could possibly also, I think, contribute to some of the other – because it's pretty robust and I know Thomas is not going to be prepared to comment on some of these.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Tony, will you be available at this time?

TONY HOLMES: Currently I do have a conflict. I'll see if I can change that. I'll have to come back to you on that. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay.

TONY HOLMES: I wasn't prepared for that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you.

MARILYN CADE: Since I surprised you on short notice, you could just do a mind-meld and transfer all your knowledge to me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I was just hoping that you'd say, "I'm not conflicted," in which case I would have said, "You're hired." Anyways, thanks very much. Please follow up immediately afterwards, as soon as you know.

Any other comments? George? No? No. Okay. We're not worthy for George. George doesn't speak to cross-community working groups.

Anyone else around the room?

Okay. I think we can move on then. Marilyn?

MARILYN CADE: I just want to reinforce a message that we've heard and heard and heard. And because we're being transcribed, I want to be sure that we reinforce, particularly for those who aren't able to be in this session and maybe aren't even able to participate remotely – because we've heard a couple of complaints on the list from people who say that we're making decisions and then nobody tells them about them. The decisions are documented in the transcript, but I want to reinforce the importance of, if you're not familiar with the work of this group, what a rich resource, really, there is in that documentation.

We have often asked for a room that would be more like this – or an open U with seats where we could be very interactive, but the rooms that have been available had not accommodated that. I think perhaps it'd be reassuring, Olivier, to report what the room setup would be like

and how dependent this session is on active participation. Do you mind describing that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you very much, Marilyn. To date, I don't even know what it's going to look like. I see Hall –

NIGEL HICKSON: It's the ALAC room.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Is it the ALAC room? That's going to be a U-shaped room, a horseshoe room. So that would work. That would definitely be helpful and conducive to good discussions and good interaction.

NIGEL HICKSON: Just to note that the request from this cross-community working group was for a horseshoe room to have maximum interaction. That's what we'll have, and we'll have a roving microphone as well. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. It's actually one of the trade-offs with not having asked for a high-intensity session, which ends up in a massive room and which is pretty terrible for interaction.

I think we can move on. So that's the current agenda for tomorrow. The overall theme, really – and this comes down really on the feedback that we have received from some of the constituencies in ICANN, and there are perplexities from some people saying, “Well, Internet governance is not really the sort of thing that ICANN needs to do. It's not in ICANN's remit to go to the ITU. It's not in ICANN's remit to go to the CSTD to be actively involved.” We really want to relay the message that it is important for ICANN to be present on those arenas for the very simple reason that if the multi-stakeholder environment in which ICANN evolves is under threat, it's a direct threat to ICANN itself. When your world disappears, you disappear with it.

So this is one of the things that we need to reinforce, and quite blatantly, I think. Let's stop being subtle about this and say we're doing a heck of a lot of work, staff is doing a heck of a lot of work, and the linking of the community with what staff is doing is really the main work of the this working group. We're an established bridge, a trusted bridge between staff and the community, and it's important that we're all aware of it.

With this, any comments or questions?

I've put you all to sleep, so let's move to number three, the updates on the 2016 report. We have sent this report. We've been helped by a contractor, Sam Dickinson, who has been holding the pen on this and has taken the input that we've sent to her. I think that it has come out quite well. It's quite a large report with a whole summary of all the meetings we've had, of the different discussions that have taken place

in the working group, of any deliverables that have been sent, and of any processes by which staff has used the working group as some kind of a soundboard to test out what response ICANN was going to have.

I guess that you've all read it. I hope that you have all had a chance to read it. Are there any questions regarding that report? It has been sent to the SO and AC Chairs. I haven't had any feedback so far, not even from my own Chair in ALAC. I'm not aware of any discussions on the ALAC about that report. Has there been any discussion on the GNSO?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Not on the report.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No? Nothing about the report. Young-Eum, anything in the ccNSO about the report? I realize it was only two days or three days before people flew over, and I'm sure they've got a lot of other things to discuss. Young-Eum Lee?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: No comments about the report itself, but it was acknowledged that they received it. It was my impression that people were basically okay with it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this. Seeing no hands, no one waving at me, Marilyn, perhaps?

MARILYN CADE: I really apologize, but perhaps I can turn to Elizabeth who has been, I think, attending more of the BC meetings than I have. So she might be able to report on whether it was discussed in any way in the BC meeting. It wasn't on any of the agendas, but Elizabeth could probably tell us whether it was discussed, and maybe Tony could tell us if it was discussed in the ISPCP, because the Council is just meeting today.

TONY HOLMES: No, that wasn't on our agenda.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That was Tony Holmes.

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: To my knowledge, it hasn't been discussed in the BC, but I haven't been at every one. I've been in the GAC more often.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this. I guess it was sent to the GNSO Council. I don't know how the information paths flow throughout the GNSO, but hopefully it will percolate at some point to your constituencies.

There was a discussion as to whether we should actually go and actively seek the input from your constituencies and meet with each

one of them. I think the offer was sent out through staff, but we haven't heard anything in response. So I gather no news is good news.

No further comments or questions on the report?

Okay. Let's go to number four, the charter amendments. I'll hand the floor over to Rafik Dammak, who has been in charge of this process.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Olivier. Maybe just to give the background, in Hyderabad we were tasked by the GNSO Council to work on the report regarding our charter because there were some concerns that we may be not aligned with the principles for a cross-community working group as described in the uniform framework principles.

Also, there was the concern about our deliverables, absence of a work plan as perceived by some in the Council, and because the idea of the working group is that usually there is a start and an end. However, when we are working on Internet governance issues, it's kind of ongoing things. It doesn't stop.

So we took the task, and within our working group we had a drafting team to go through the charter. What we tried to do, basically, was to take a model template from the framework which describes the part that should be in the charter, and we did kind of comparison to see what are the gaps or what is missing.

In many areas, we found that we are aligned, like in the [inaudible] and the consultation process and so on, but we spent more time to

elaborate in the area of objectives and scope and so on to clarify what the mission of our working group is and what we want to achieve. This is quite important to explain why we exist and are relevant to the community.

Also, we tried to elaborate more and outline what kind of deliverables we are thinking, in particular like a statement or a position paper. We tried to develop more about the reporting, because I think from the discussion within the cross-community working group, there is agreement that maybe we're not doing enough in terms of informing and raising awareness in our community about the work we are doing and why we are doing it. So we tried to describe that in the charter.

Another element is to have a work plan because we need to have a vision and plan what we'll do in the future.

With regard to the problem of starting and ending, what we tried to do is, "Okay. We can have a timeframe of two years to propose a work plan for that based on what kind of event, consultation, or whatever happens in the Internet governance space and put that in terms of planning." With the two-year frame, we planned the deliverables, like participating in public consultations.

At the end of that phase, we have to do a self-assessment or a review, and we can propose a new work plan for a new cycle. The chartering organizations can renew us every two years based on the work we'll do. So that's the proposal we have there.

Also, in our charter we added more language about how we will work with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance and try to elaborate the kind of process we have in mind and so on. So we tried to describe that.

What we delivered to our chartering organizations were two documents. One was to compare the revised charter against the model template. We showed what we tried to change, what kind of areas we feel there were some gaps. And another document, a comparison table between the current charter which they are still using and the revised charter to highlight the changes and make it easier for the different councils of chartering organizations to review that.

What can I report from the discussion today in GNSO Council? Unfortunately, I think we were under pressure to deliver, and we just finalized the revised charter a few days before the Copenhagen meeting. That was after the deadline to submit documents.

The discussion within GNSO will be postponed until the next Council call, which is scheduled for April. I think that will provide time for each group to review and see if there are any changes needed or any area of concern in the charter.

The few reactions I got today were quite positive. People were happy that we did our work to respond to the concerns from the GNSO Council. That's quite positive. I will check in terms of how we move forward. Maybe to propose a motion by the deadline. But still, for the charter maybe there will be some suggestions for changes as well.

As this cross-community working group, we have to liaise also with the other chartering organizations, so if there is any change, we have to inform them.

I'm not sure about the kind of feedback we got from the ALAC and the ccNSO. I think my colleagues, Olivier and Young-Eum, can give us more updates on that matter.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Young-Eum?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: The charter, along with the report, was discussed during the ccNSO prep meeting on Sunday. There is no plan for us to have a session on this, but I expect – judging by the responses along with my additional explanation regarding the charter – that we're in a pretty position to be chartered by the ccNSO as well.

I also wanted to stress that the charter actually seems to have made clearer or made more specific the things that we have been doing, so it's just that we didn't have a specific charter describing all the things that we have been doing. The charter actually clearly outlines it.

Also, during the ccNSO/GNSO Council meeting on Monday, there were questions about the term limits of this. Because the charter was sent relatively late, they didn't have a chance to see that the charter specifically stated that we will be reviewing the charter in two years.

So that additional fact also worked to our advantage in terms of at least the GNSO and the ccNSO approving. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Young-Eum. I can report that the matter on the ALAC has not been even looked at. The ALAC has been busy with a few other things, including its review, which has taken much time to read and respond to. I'm sure the ALAC will respond in good time.

Any questions or comments from anyone?

Yes, Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: I really want to agree with what Young-Eum just said. At this meeting, I've been doing quite a bit of work with the Fellows. There are at least four or five of the Fellows who are very interested in joining the working group in progress. The report was actually very helpful for me. I've got a good memory, but it's not always perfect. I was able to actually show some of the things we've done and then refer people to the transcripts of some of the sessions.

The second thing that might be of even more interest is that I met with three very high-level representatives of the GAC individually as governments, talking about the WSIS Forum and other things, and mentioned this working group to them and that it was open for attendance by individual government attendees.

So I just want to flag that interest – I think a very genuine interest. In particular, without naming the country, one of the representatives mentioned that they are going to be a speaker at the WSIS Forum. They were thrilled to find out that there had been a workshop organized by this group. Talk about branding and recognition. Perhaps we should also be thinking, assuming that we are able to continue, about how we are providing more information more broadly. Perhaps we should be considering, Olivier, in addition to the public session, offering a “What is it? What does it do? Who’s involved? How to get engaged in some way?” [session] as well.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Marilyn. That’s noted, and we of course always encourage having new members.

A question to you, Rafik – and I guess Young-Eum has touched on that – because we’re having a new charter – because this really is a new charter – does that mean that the group will have to be re-chartered?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Just to clarify, what do you mean by “re-chartered” here?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The group was chartered by supporting organizations and advisory committees in their own time. Now that the charter has changed, does the group then need to receive a new approval for the new charter

from each one of the SOs and ACs? So rather than saying, “Well, in absence of any response, it’s all fine” –

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [inaudible]

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry?

Well, I’m asking the question. I have no idea. So it’s an open question. Does it need to be re-chartered or not?

Sam, perhaps?

SAM EISNER: Hi, everyone. I’m Sam Eisner from ICANN Legal. I don’t know what exactly is written in the outcomes of the CCWG on CCWGs. There might be an answer in there that we can check.

I do know that during the CCWG on Accountability we had a charter change in the middle, and I believe that we submitted it for approval by each of the chartering entities. I can take that to the policy team and see if we can get a clearer answer for you guys.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, I think that’s it. That’s why I said, for example, that the GNSO has to make the motion with the charter to ask for approval of that revised

charter. So that's my understanding, but I can also check within the GNSO Council and the staff.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this, Rafik. Of course, one we've got the new charter, then we'll have to repopulate the group according to the new number of members, etc.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes. Also, in terms of the membership is that the language from the CCWG – I mean the framework in terms of participants and observers, which means that we are making it even more open in participation. I think the revision of the charter is important for us to make another call for participation, asking the different groups to appoint and so on. We need to use that as momentum to rejuvenate or restart and to get more participation.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Rafik. And I'd say, "Active participation." It's great to have 20,000 names on the wiki page. But only three turn up. We really need to have the active participation here.

If there are no other comments – I know time is of the essence – I propose that we go to Agenda Item number five, the liaison with the Board Internet Governance Working Group. Sitting next to me is Markus Kummer. Welcome, Markus. We're looking forward to your update and to a good discussion afterwards.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you, Olivier. Good afternoon, everybody. It's a pleasure to be here. I think in your introductory statement you made it clear that Internet governance doesn't just go away because we successfully went through the transition.

The list of acronyms and the list meetings is actually quite staggering. If anything, there seems to be more going on – new commissions here, the G20 at that level. [I think] great interest. The ITRs have not gone away. So there's plenty to keep us active.

I think at the last meeting I introduced the concept for the engagement. We have worked with ICANN org and soft-developed a filter through which to look at all the events. There are events where ICANN takes a lead role. That is where the DNS is directly an issue. There are other events where ICANN takes more of a supporting role in support of the multi-stakeholder Internet model overall. That can be meetings like the IGF. It can be meetings also at the ITU.

The third filter is where ICANN takes a selective engagement; let's say issues like human rights, where ICANN clearly does not have a lead role but is tangentially engaged because it touches on ICANN. Or security through the DNSSEC or human rights are examples for that.

But these are not rigid filters. It can be that a meeting may be in a third category and then all of a sudden it shifts up. A good example was the World Standard Assembly with (WISA), where all of a sudden the DNS came to the fore and then obviously it moves up into the first

category. So you never really know in advance, and these categories are fairly fluid. Meetings may shift from one of the other categories.

Nevertheless, we thought of that as a useful model of looking at events. Clearly, ICANN cannot be everywhere. That is something that is also clear: how sustainable is actually our engagement when we have more and more events coming up.

We spent actually quite a lot of time discussing the IGF. We had a Board workshop in Los Angeles that was relatively short after the IGF. It was interesting to see that there was a very strong Board engagement in this discussion. On the whole, the Board takes the view that the IGF remains an important annual event. The prevailing view is that the role of the IGF is as a platform for non-decision-making dialogue which may shape decisions that are taken elsewhere; as a platform where some discussions get started but that might not be the end of the discussion. The end may be in other instances.

That is the prevailing view among the Board members, but there are also others who felt that the IGF ought to be more action-oriented. But that discussion is as old as the IGF itself.

As you know, we are not such a decision-making working group. We can also provide guidance to ICANN org. In that sense, our guidance is very much continue to support the IGF but maybe don't be in the front line of support but as more lead-from-behind as an organization, which has, right from the beginning, also supported the IGF, which relies on voluntary contributions.

There was also strong support for ICANN being involved in supporting national and regional IGF initiatives. Be that directly – usually it’s done through the regional V.P.s – or then through support of the IGF SA. That I think also has brought support.

There was one question on whether the support should be shifted away from supporting the global IGF toward more the regional. But my sense was that that was not the general feeling of the Board. The support of the global IGF remains important, and although it’s more than ten years old, it remains very shaky, the financial situation. It is important that the global IGF can go ahead and has the support.

However, the question may arise whether ICANN might not wish to increase the support for the national and regional initiatives, but this is something we will revisit.

Also, the question was asked what is actually our aim when we go to IGF meetings. We have fairly large part of the participation from the ICANN community and also the Board. I think, again, we have not reached conclusion on that. In some of the documents, it said that ICANN sees the IGF as a useful meeting to recruit newcomers into the ICANN process, but it was felt that this should not be a main objective, if anything, but more of a subsidiary consequence of our engagement, but not as an objective. And the main objective, I think there is fairly broad understanding that it is, again, in support of the multi-stakeholder Internet governance model.

This is my update of our discussions, but obviously, I would welcome other colleagues of the working group chiming in. I see that George has already put his hand up. Please.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, George. George Sadowsky.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thanks. I think Markus has given a fairly good sense of what went on in our meeting. It was a long meeting. It lasted two hours, and we needed every bit of it.

I want to highlight one other part of it, and that is the following. As you know, we have staff who are concerned with the governmental relationships and Internet governance issues, headed by Tarek Kamel who's in the Switzerland and Veni Markowski who's in New York. They went through a calendar of the events that were going to occur this year, and it was staggering I think is the appropriate adjective.

There are new initiatives springing up in various places with various aims. All of them touch on what ICANN does in one way or another, sometimes just tangentially and sometimes very, very substantially. All of them therefore pose either – depending on how you look at it – an opportunity or a threat; an opportunity to educate and to present the case for ICANN and the multi-stakeholder organization, and the threat, of course, of – if I can use the term – invading the mandate of ICANN.

I think it's really important to understand what's happening there and understand what is in ICANN's mandate to connect with these groups and what we as individuals – again, I'm taking off my Board hat here – can do independent of the ICANN structure in this area of more rapid flux with respect to Internet governance. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, George. Marilyn was passing around –

MARILYN CADE: [inaudible] has more of them?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Well, I don't know if you have more of them, but I was just going to pass at least one copy around that could go around the table so people could see the shock of all the meetings which George was alluding to. There's so much of it.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

[CHRIS DISSPAIN]: Marilyn, when are you going to produce the embroidered quilt with these on them?

MARILYN CADE: Actually, what I was thinking about doing, Chris, is I'm going to print out all of the versions from the five years I'm been doing it and make them into quilt squares.

[CHRIS DISSPAIN]: Even better.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. We had Christopher Wilkinson and then Michael. Christopher?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Olivier, and thank you, Markus. Very briefly, I would support the continued support for the global IG. I have reservations about supporting regional IGs. Of course, they're a good thing, but there's a risk of a zero sum. I'm aware of the brow-beating that has to go on to get at least some of the regional IGs properly funded. If ICANN comes in there too, that would very easily become an excuse for others to scale back.

So I'd avoid a zero sum in that area regarding the national IGs. I just think there are far too many of them for ICANN to responsibly fund and control and account for their contributions. But that's none of my businesses.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Christopher. Michael Oghia is next.

MICHAEL OGHIA:

Hi, everyone. First of all, I found one of the points that you made, Markus, very interesting, because I was one of the people who originally went into IGF and then was recruited into the ICANN structure. I was told to join these two acronyms, NCSG and NCUC, before I ever actually went to a meeting, which was more than a year ago.

With that said, of the two of the initiatives that I'm involved in in Europe, one is the European Dialogue on Internet Governance, and the other is the Southeastern European Dialogue on Internet Governance. In line with one of the messages that I gave to the Board a couple days ago, I cannot stress enough how important it is for ICANN to engage regionally, because many of the initiatives that take place – the NRIs – if they don't have ICANN funding specifically, they definitely have ICANN support. At least from my perspective, that has been instrumental in ensuring that these very important events take place.

While I do recognize that, yes, there are many events that are taking place, I definitely encourage the Board especially, but also this group in particular, to take stock of those events and think about which ones should definitely have our support, even if that means somehow extending that in one way or another through local representatives. I'm not sure how that could work, but trying to build capacity through local volunteers. Perhaps that's one way to also alleviate the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this, Michael. Marilyn Cade? Do you wish to follow up?

MARILYN CADE:

I want to speak about the NRI issue for just a minute and also respond to Christopher. I'm not going to take a lot of time about this, but some people in the room know that for the past year and four months or so I served as the [substantive] coordinator appointed by the MAG Chairs, Jānis and Lynn, to enhance the visibility of the NRIs and to strengthen the reflection of the engagement between the national IGFs and the global IGF.

There's a lot of work that's gone on that I think has really been substantially supported by the fact that ICANN does participate actively, substantively, and provides financial support. But ICANN support – I can tell you from the work that I've done there, and during the time that I worked with Anya, the focal point, we have grown the number of NRIs from 60 to 91, including a new announcement from both Afghanistan and Nepal, both countries that are very challenged to put an NRI together. In both cases, the interest of having the technical participation and speakers, as well as the funding from ICANN, has been very important. Those are just two country examples.

I do want to make a point that supplements something that Christopher said. The national and regional IGFs and sub-regionals do not have and will not have a direct relationship of accountability to the United Nations as the global IGF has. They are organic, bottom-up, and they reflect the needs of the community. That makes them an incredibly influential and important organic part that can help both Internet governance and ICANN in terms of legitimacy.

Perhaps at a later time, if there's sufficient interest, I would be happy to work with others who are in this room who are involved with NRIs to even do a short briefing that highlights some of the work that is going on that is very augmenting to ICANN's agenda, but it's happening in a very organic.

I'm just going to give you one quick example. In Nigeria, during the preparation for the ITU Wicket, the delegation was of course all government and the national IGF from the floor. There was a call to the minister to change the representation to multi-stakeholder, and they did it. They increased their delegation to the ITU Wicket by that 25 people from across the stakeholders. Now that's an outcome.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Marilyn. George Sadowsky?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thanks, Olivier. I support strongly both what Michael said and what Marilyn has said. I think it's important to ask the question: if ICANN as an organization, as an echo system, is going to support these organizations, the question is, why? I support the global IGF. I think it's a good thing, but it's sort of in the nature of a contribution if I were to make it personally, that I support something which I think good.

But from ICANN's point of view, I think we have considerably more leverage at the regional level and at the local levels, where we're not ten people out of 3,000 people and the money contribution really isn't seen by almost everybody who's there, whereas at the local and the

national levels – selectively, because somebody has made the point that we can't do it all – we have a greater visibility, a greater presence, a greater I think willingness to listen to the things that we say about the policy space and about the organization of multi-stakeholder organizations, etc. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, George. Any other comments?

Yes, please, Renata.

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: I would just again come back to Mike Oghia's point about this dynamic relationship between the IGF and ICANN. The IGF is becoming an interesting dynamic year-long policy arena, because the intercessional activities are becoming really important in its development. Before, I think the CCWG has concentrated on looking at the IGF as this once-a-year event, and that's not really what's going on anymore.

For example, we have here a GAC participant, an observer from Mexico, Israel with me. We are building a BPF from remote participation. We just need one MAG member from the private sector – and, yes, I'm looking at you, Elizabeth – and other partners to help us move it along even more and to try and bring this year-long activity in Internet governance, because I do not think – I don't want to put this bluntly, but it's not ICANN's support that we are looking for anymore. It's ICANN's onboarding, bringing its actions and bringing people. In return, we can also participate more.

Mike is coming as a first-time Fellow, and he's already been to all sessions of working groups. He's much more active than I have been in years. So that's an interesting way to think about this. It's not once a year or one opportunity that ICANN can support. It's about thinking about the year-long IGF activities.

There are dates already for the next open consultations. They will be around WSIS. I just saw Nigel's e-mail about the workshop on the 12th. That will likely clash with the second open consultations day. I think we need strategies to continue this dynamic relationship as well.

The other point I was going to bring is about the events which grow with not really ICANN participation. For instance, one event is the Internet Freedom Festival, which just happened in Valencia. That was also a once-a-year, localized event, hack-a-thons. This year, there were requests to do this regionally, so there will be national and regional Internet Freedom Festivals because the participants organized themselves as such.

We did have one Internet policy-making conversation there – completely informal – and 30 people showed up on a patio in the Spanish sun to talk about Internet policy-making.

So these are things that I think we need to think about. How do we organize ourselves to participate in these spaces and continue this conversation?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Renata. Any further – oh. Sorry. [Lorain Faralee]. I just find the French GAC – sorry. Not French GAC anymore. [Lorain], go ahead.

[LORAIN FARALEE]: Thank you. We have a question from Jim in the chatroom. “How many dollars does ICANN currently spend on supporting both the big IGF and regional IGF?” Does anyone know?

MARKUS KUMMER: I think it would be best, maybe, to ask Tarek to answer this question.

TAREK KAMEL: Thank you, Markus. Indeed, this question comes up every now and then from the community, and we have been recently talking about it in the Board Working Group on Internet Governance that Markus was chairing on Friday.

We have been consistently providing support to the trust fund of the global IGF for \$150,000 U.S. Part of it or most of it is in [kind] services for scribing and other activities during the global IGF, as well as during the MAG meetings and the open consultation. The rest then is being provided directly cash to the U.N. trust fund, with the total sum of the \$150,000. This decision had been taken six or seven years ago, and it has consistently been going on with this sum.

When we look at the website of the IGF Secretariat, ICANN is number five for total support for the trust fund since the IGF has been

established. There are a number of other governments that have been providing higher support in the last years, but indeed ICANN is probably number one when it comes to the technical community.

In addition to that, we are also providing support to the IGF SA. The IGF SA is the IGF Supporting Association. It had been established in Switzerland, triggered by ISOC. ICANN is a founding member of it. Markus took the chairmanship recently from Raul Echeberria. I'm a member of the Executive Committee, and ICANN is providing \$50,000 per-year support to the IGF SA that is also providing its support to the national and regional IGFs as well as the trust fund.

I think, Markus, it's now 60% to the national and regional and 40% to the trust fund?

MARKUS KUMMER: 35% goes to the trust fund and 40% goes to the national and regional IGFs.

TAREK KAMEL: Okay. It happens also that the national and regional IGFs approach directly our regional Vice-Presidents for support. It's within their decision that they provide small amounts of \$1,000 or \$2,000 U.S. to the national and regional IGFs, according to the need. This varies from one year to the other.

So that's more or less the support that ICANN is providing to the IGF ecosystem, if I may call it that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tarek. That's very clear and it's on record. So that's great.

I had one question before we really have to move on because we only have ten minutes until the end of this meeting. That's to do with the activities in – well, we've spoken a lot about activities in New York and Geneva, but what about the activities in Brussels?

I was yesterday at a meeting of the European stakeholders, run by the Global Stakeholder Engagement department's European Vice-President. There was discussion of what was going on in the Council of Europe, Commission, etc. Is that a completely different department? I wasn't quite sure whose patch of grass this was supposed to be.

TAREK KAMEL: We are working very closely with the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team that is led by Sally Costerton; we as a government engagement team.

Brussels is on the top-priority agenda of Göran, and for obvious reasons, but also because Brussels is very important in the overall ecosystem. When it comes to the engagement with the European Commission, as well as with the Council of Europe since they are more or less governmental or intergovernmental organization, Nigel is leading this work in cooperation with Jean-Jacques Sahel and his team.

When it comes to the rest of the ecosystem in Brussels, it's Jean-Jacques with [Andrea] who are working on this agenda. I'm not talking on behalf of the management, but I am expecting that there will be empowerment of the Brussels office, again, within this calendar year and within the next fiscal year, fiscal year 18. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Tarek. I guess the natural question to this group is then, should this working group also interface with Jean-Jacques? Bearing in mind that this is also Internet governance that has serious implications for the ecosystem.

TAREK KAMEL: We invite him, by the way, to our meetings. If there are any specific questions to be put on the agenda of any call, then we'll make sure that he attends, either himself or [Andrea]. Sure.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Excellent. This is still number five, actually, so I'm sorry. I've just hijacked your agenda item, Markus. Is there anything else that you need to speak to us about regarding the SO?

MARKUS KUMMER: Well, just to come back to sum up the discussion, I think that, as I said, we had the Board more brainstorming on what it should be. The question that was asked, should more of the support be shifted? Was more in the form of a question when looking at the overall figure. But

there was not a sense we should change anything. There's strong support for continuing to give financial support to the global IGF, that is into the U.N. trust fund.

The question may come up whether more should not be given in addition to the national and regional IGFs. But that would not be taking away [and a] shift from the global to the national and regional IGF. It's good to see that this strong support is echoed also by the broader community, that the broader community finds the engagement with the IGF – and thank you to Renata for reminding us of the intercessional activities. Looking at Olivier, you're one of the early adopters, a member of a dynamic coalition. There is also that work going on.

I know many members of the community are engaged in this work throughout the year. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Markus. We still have working group priorities for 2017. That's Agenda Item six. Bearing in mind that the working group is more of a reactive working group than proactive, as you never know what's just around the corner with Internet governance, are there any suggestions on specific topics that you would like to see the working group focus on in 2017?

Let's just make it a three- or four-minute brainstorm, please.

Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: I'd like to highlight the last item we're going to talk about in our public session tomorrow, and that is building a better understanding by the broader community of what the implications are of the rise of national sovereignty in Internet policy and the continued implications to ICANN and the Internet of the risk, threats, and attacks that are going on.

In particular, the reason I would like us to dwell on this for some time is that governments have a choice about where they go, and the ITU Plenipotentiary will be in 2019. There is – sorry. 20 –

UNIDENTIFIED MALES: '18.

MARILYN CADE: 2018. Sorry. Which is only next year. The expert group on the ITRs is underway. If you did not attend the discussion between the GAC and the Board this morning and don't understand the concerns that are being expressed by the parts of the governments who do not come here, the friendly parts of the governments come here. The other parts of the governments work in other settings, and they are more than happy to look for alternatives to ICANN about some of our work.

I'm very concerned that most of the contracted parties and particularly the new ones – I do spend time talking to them – do not understand at all the risk that is represented to them. I think we as a cross-community working group owe it to the community to take

these issues and examine them, listen to the community, but also help to broaden the understanding, because nobody who is running a registry has the time to do a deep dive on understanding what is going on at the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, and they cannot attend the ITU Plenipotentiary.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. That's noted. Any other topics? Renata?

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: I want to throw a very out-of-the-box idea for the CCWG-IG. Cross-border data flows and cross-border Internet governance discussions. One of the priorities I think I had for Copenhagen was arriving. I didn't really know where my flight was going to go. There were stories of many participants who actually almost didn't. In a time where borders are so conflicted, I think it would be important to think of this from an Internet governance angle.

Again, I think we are talking about more and more events, interchanging knowledge, interchanging information, how to discuss Internet governance, how to do Internet policy-making from a cross-border perspective?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Renata. Next is Matthew Shears, with apologies for having skipped you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Olivier. I'd like to second what Marilyn said. I think that's a very important point.

Also, I have to take issue with the notion that we are mostly reactive. That may have been in the past, but I don't think that's even at all tenable in this very quickly changing IG world that we are now surrounded by. So I would suggest that we do need to sit down and spend some serious time – not at the end of this meeting – assessing what those priorities are and mapping out the landscape, because I think we will see that we have a lot more to pay attention to than perhaps we imagined. Then we should prioritize. But we need to be proactive.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If you had five to just shine the light on today, which ones would come out in your mind?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Well, Marilyn has highlighted one: the developments on the possibly-new ITRs. I think there are tech-related developments like DOA, for example. That is one area that obviously is another issue that is going to be – and we're going to see other developments as well. You could go so far as to say that even the lack of standardization around IOT or even 5G standards could very well impact the DNS. So I think we just have to spend some serious time thinking about this and then mapping accordingly. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Matthew. Any other... I don't see anyone putting their hands up – okay, Michael. Quickly. Michael Oghia.

MICHAEL OGHIA: Very quickly, we have a lot of programs that already emphasize onboarding new faces within the community, as well as individuals who can help share the work. I look around and I see the people at the table and I recognize that almost everybody here is incredibly overworked and incredibly overinvolved, including myself.

While that's definitely a voluntary aspect of the work that we do, perhaps one thing we can focus on is retention when it comes to capacity building. Retention and getting people involve, and in some way figuring out how to incentivize them or make sure that we are giving them reasons or they have the capacity that they need to stay involved, to join working groups, join these different initiatives, and take on the work themselves so that each of us but also other members of the community can focus on what they are doing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Michael. We'll take note of that. Just last words for Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Just two points, really. First of all, in the report which Olivier mentioned earlier, and hopefully people will read and give us feedback on, because we'll do another one for 2017 – so feedback is

appreciated – we include a graphic on priorities for 2017, so it would be good to get feedback on those priorities. I’ve inserted some narrative text as well in the report on those priorities. So again, feedback on that would be welcome.

Tomorrow, the IG public session will reflect a bit on the CCWG input to various events in 2016. And I think addressing Matthew’s point, we will show that although some issues have been reactive given the nature of Internet governance issues, on others we’ve been proactive in giving input into an ongoing dialogue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Number seven: Any Other Business.

Okay. There being no other business, I’d like to thank you all for attending. Apologies for being one minute late. This meeting is now adjourned Thank you.

MICHAEL OGHIA: Olivier? Olivier, over here. How can new members get involved in the CCWG-IG? That’s the one thing I didn’t ask.

MARIYLN CADE: Michael, since we’re not in meeting, we made the decision among ourselves. We don’t treat observers differently than we treat participants. I think that’s one of the unique things about this working group, wouldn’t you say, Young? We all said, “No, no, no. There’s no

inequality here. Observers are as equal as participants.” I can tell you how to get involved: show up and do the work.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]