
JOHANNESBURG – CCWG IG, F2F
Tuesday, June 27, 2017 – 11:15 to 12:15 JNB
ICANN59 | Johannesburg, South Africa

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: 11:15 a.m. ICANN 59. Boardroom 3. CCWG IG , F2F.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: They are bringing more, but it's the sound chap who has... Or are you dealing with the sound? Who deals with the recordings and stuff?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We haven't started recording yet.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We haven't. But you can [actionate].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Because I was waiting. I thought perhaps it's the other chap that had to [actionate].

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.

Good morning, everyone, and welcome to this meeting of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance. This is a face-to-face meeting of the working group, here in Johannesburg. There are more chairs coming in. As we have started this meeting, we only have one hour for today's face-to-face meeting on quite important issues.

I'd like to first introduce my colleagues. I'm Olivier Crepin-Leblond. I'm co-Chair of the working group for the ALAC. Next to me is Rafik Dammak, co-Chair for the GNSO, and Young-Eum Lee, who is co-Chair for the ccNSO, the three organizations of the co-chartering organizations for this working group.

There are a lot of people around the room, so welcome, everyone. We've got an agenda that's quite packed. We'll start with the discussion with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. I see several members of that working group around the table. Then we'll have a status of the proposed revisions to the charter of the cross-community working group. In fact, we'll probably extend this to reflect on what has taken place in the GNSO and the ccNSO in recent days, and also the comments that have been sent to the working group on this. So we might have to extend this to a bit more than 50 minutes.

After that, we'll have an update on the WSIS forum and the IGF for this year and finally a brief look ahead at the main activities or issues that are likely to happen until our next meeting.

Just a couple of words from Rafik Dammak and Young-Eum Lee.

Rafik?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Okay. I want to thank everyone for attending this meeting. We do have a packed agenda, but I guess we need probably more time in terms of discussion maybe about the structure but also the future of the Cross-Community Working Group. I hope that we will make a lot of progress today. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Young-Eum?

YOUNG-EUM LEE:

Thank you, Olivier. I'd just to say that I'm glad to see that there has been general agreement as to the importance of the presence of this group or the existence of this group, but we are still trying to formalize the structure of this group. I hope that today's meeting will help that purpose. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Young-Eum. Let's turn over then to Markus Kummer, who is the Chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. Markus, you have the floor.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you, and good morning, all. It's a pleasure to be here. If a packed room is a sign of success, then this is an outstanding success already – this meeting.

Yes, we had a meeting yesterday – The Board Working Group on Internet Governance – with the GNSO Council. They wanted to know a little bit about what we were doing and how we were interacting with the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance. I gave a brief update and recalled a little bit what we have been doing in developing a concept for ICANN's engagements in the Internet governance space together with ICANN org and how we discussed this with you.

I'm pleased to report that we had very good feedback from the GNSO Council. They recognized the importance of this work and that we, as an ICANN community, all sing from the same hymn sheet, so to speak. So that went, I think, extremely well.

There were some questions asked on how we plan attendance at the IGF, for instance, to make sure that we have a coherent message, and so on. I won't go into these technical details, but

the main feedback was that they recognized the importance that we as a Board have A) a coherent and a coherent policy and B) have an interface with the community to have this common approach.

I said in my introductory remarks, knowing that some questioned the structure of the CCWG, that I was agnostic in regards to the structure, but I was firm that we really need a group like that to have precisely this interface. I think there was strong support also from all Board members present in the discussion. I think it was Chris who said that, if there is need to help to find a new structure, the Board would be happy to help. I suppose that also the Board Governance Committee could give some input into that.

I'll leave it at that – my introductory remarks. I'm happy to answer any questions, and of course, also I invite my fellow Board members who are members of the Board working group to chime in. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Markus. Lousewies?

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Thank you very much. I'm also a Board member and member of the Internet Governance Working Group. Because Markus is on

his way out, I really wanted to just pay some testimony to the incredible legacy he's leaving behind and the fact that we now actually have a policy on this. This was a real process to do. As you know, in the Board, which is a reflection of the community, there's also debate. Should we be doing governance? To what extent should we be doing governance? Shouldn't other people be doing governance? What's the difference between governance on the Internet and governance of the Internet? Where should we be engaged and to what extent? That has been almost a two-year process which Markus has led, I think, tremendously well.

So I think it's a wonderful legacy that you're leaving behind, and it's great that we now actually also have structure by which we can engage on these issues. I'm sure that the discussions we had in the Board are the same discussions that we have in the community about to what extent and where and how and all that. So I think it's really great that we now have this, so my respect and compliments to you, Markus.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Any other comments from any of the other members of the Board Working Group or anyone else?

Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I'm just going to respond to a small part of a comment that was just made. We actually have a requirement of Board members, but perhaps that wasn't shared with them when they were recruited and that is you're obligated to continue to stay a part of the community forever.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. I don't see anyone else with their hands up.

I have a question for the Board Working Group. Reflecting on the discussions that you had with the GNSO yesterday, there was a discussion about Internet governance and what is Internet governance and what isn't Internet governance and whether these activities actually are Internet governance. I know that comes back quite often. What were your takeaways from this?

MARKUS KUMMER: Well, I think the discussion was not at this philosophical level. Well, it came up a little bit, but I presented, again, the three filters we have to look at Internet governance issues, and I think they prove extremely helpful. Filter #1 is essentially issues that touch directly on ICANN's remit. Filter #2 is where it's more the multi-stakeholder model, and that is where ICANN has a supportive role. But other organizations, such as ISOC, take the

lead. Filter #3 is selective engagements when issues come up that touch on some aspects of ICANN. Security, for instance, is an extremely broad field, and there ICANN obviously has a remit, like DNSSEC or so, but not on the broader issues. It's the same for human rights, for instance, as well. ICANN is not a human rights organization, but human rights have come into the ICANN mission.

That was not questioned, I think. That was generally accepted. I think that proves a very helpful approach. It's a fairly coherent approach. Obviously, there's no sharp dividing line that can go smoothly in, and you don't know in advance, actually, from a meeting, where all of a sudden something might come up. It happened in the WTSA, as we know. The IGF is a good example, where essentially all three filters apply. There are some issues which relate directly to ICANN's mission, and everything on the IGF is essentially relating to the multi-stakeholder model. Then there are issues where ICANN's selective engagements will take in. So that was not really questioned as such.

I also make the point that the transition is not the end of Internet governance. It's not so that it's over – the discussions – and we see that. We had a little bit of discussion on that. My point is that ICANN is maybe more vulnerable as a standalone organization, but that is not a consolidated view. That's my personal opinion. Others might have a different opinion.

The point was also made that, while a direct hostile takeover is maybe not on the agenda but [inaudible] stealth creeping in on issues such as the Internet of Things – the various study groups of the ITU that have an impact on ICANN’s mission. Also, the digital object architecture is another of these issues which may or may not have an impact on ICANN. These are issues that need to be watched. The staff of ICANN org alone do an awful lot, but there are so many meetings going on that they cannot cover everyone. So obviously they also rely on the community, and that’s why it is important that we have these exchanges. Some members of the community may know something. They may have attended a meeting of a study group in the ITU which others may not be aware of. They can signal issues that come up, and we can collectively see how we can actually extinguish the fires or make sure they don’t spread any further. That may happen.

So that was, in general, the gist of the discussion. Again, my main takeaway is that it was very positive.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Markus. George Sadowsky?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you. Lousewies said something very true, and that is, under Markus's leadership, this group has conceived of a three-level structure that allows us to understand how ICANN should become involved in Internet governance discussions. There are people who specialized in discussing Internet governance, but for the point of view of ICANN, it's a political rat hole and a semantic rat hole. I think we're on the right track.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this. I don't see any other hands around the table. We've spoken about the structure. Speaking about the actual substance on the issues that the Board Working Group is tracking in the outside world, are there any specific issues that you'd be able to point out? Any recent meetings? CSTD? WSIS forum, etc.?

Lousewies van der Laan?

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Before we go into specific subjects, one of the things – we raised this yesterday with the GNSO – is to look at more from the big picture. The key question always is: who should engage where and to what intensity? That's a question, I think, for this group as well. Because the Board does it one way doesn't mean that you,

the community – of which we are a part, Marilyn, absolutely – should do it the same way.

One of the concerns that I specifically raised is that there a lot of problems on the Internet. Especially governments but also driven by law enforcement and driven by public concern, they have a feeling that those problems on the Internet are not being fixed. They will look at the people who run the Internet – governance of the Internet – and look the logical layer and see if maybe the solutions are there because governments are so used to having a central switch or someone you can talk to, and the whole multi-stakeholder model is so uncommon to them.

Even if the guys sitting in the GAC – sorry, it’s mostly guys – go back to their governments and say, “Well, this is how the Internet is actually run, and what you want can’t actually be done,” their governments are going to say, “What? It’s a hippy kibbutz with democracy and everybody gets to...?” They don’t get it.

So, yes, we should continue to explain what it is. We should continue to advocate, etc., but unless we actually get governments – I think this is the real challenge now – and especially the GAC to understand the limitations of what ICANN does and what ICANN doesn’t do and to make sure that

everyone involved in the IGF is actually fixing the problems on the Internet, it's going to increase the pressure on us.

I personally share Markus's fear that there is a risk that certain governments are going to say, "Well, if we can't get our way in ICANN, then we're going to see if we can get our way somewhere else." The discussion I have with the technical people is that I don't think that there's a serious awareness that governments can legislate the Internet to death. If they really wanted to, they could. Yes, we could then build another one, but it's not going to be that easy.

So these are more of the high-level questions, I think, that are important before we go into the more specific ones.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Lousewies. Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I'm going to wear my "member of the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology for Development Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation" hat. Nigel is also a member. I'm looking around – I see Nigel. There are others here who do follow the work because our work is webcast and transcribed.

There are two things to be aware of. I want to mention that there are very real proposals with very real possibilities of parts of them being accepted and implemented in the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation and also in the CSTD work itself. The Commission on Science and Technology for Development is responsible on advising on science and technology for development to the United Nations. They, however, have the responsibility for WSIS follow-up and evaluating WSIS follow-up. They are supposed to be composed of the science and technology ministers who are generally friendlier to things we're interested in and more supportive than the telcom regulators and ministers, who are captured by another U.N. specialized agency.

The work that is going on at the CSTD includes ideas about subdividing parts of what ICANN does and giving a U.N. agency certain parallel opportunities to contribute or to take on the roles on behalf of – this idea of six RIRs is still around. The idea of putting forward proposals on guidance, on gTLD policy, is still around.

Believe me, guys and gals. As somebody who follows the work of the ITU Council Working Group on International Public Policy, there is a very strong possibility – that is a closed working group. It is member states only and sector members. The WSIS-side member states and sector members only. The WSIS Working

Group is now not engaging in those issues. It is totally controlled by the group that is chaired by Saudi Arabia. Saudi Arabia is a member – very active – of the CSTD. There's a small group of companies of countries, and some countries that last year that are members of the [brick] five countries have improved their attitude are now going back to reading their previous positions of supporting giving a parallel role to the ITU on some of this.

I'm happy and Nigel I know is happy to go into more detail, but the point is there is a very strong possibility that, even if we're successful in preventing a complete shift in certain areas, we may end up with a not-so-supportive neighbor.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. George Sadowsky?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you. I guess I'd like to add to Marilyn's description. I don't think that the CSTD work and the ITU work is likely to be a real threat to us. But what's happening in the U.N.'s Cybersecurity Task Force is because I think that cybersecurity or the lack thereof, which is what we see now in the Internet, is going to be a forcing factor in the U.N. eventually questioning very strongly how the Internet should be governed – whatever they mean by that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, George. Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON: Thanks very much. Nigel Hickson, ICANN organization. I know we've got a section later in the agenda on future issues coming up and discussions, but just to flag two things, as George Sadowsky rightly said, there was a discussion in New York last week of the group of government experts on cybersecurity. There's been a program of meetings of 25 governments discussing cybersecurity, particularly in terms of national security issues and the call for some international response in terms of a treaty or something like that.

These talks didn't conclude positively last week. There is likely to be a report but unlikely to be a unanimous recommendation made to the U.N. This is in some ways increases the pressure in other areas.

As Marilyn has rightly outlined, the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation has got a number of recommendations before it. Its next meeting is in September. It has to report to the CSTD Plenary in March or April next year. It has to work by consensus, but, as Marilyn said, there are proposals that would undermine some of the work – not necessarily undermine but would cause

them to be discussed in other areas, some of the work that affects ICANN.

Later in the year, there's the fourth-ish iteration of the Global Conference on Cyberspace, being hosted by India in New Delhi in November. That I think is important. I'm not saying it's a threat in any terms. It's a fantastic vehicle for discussions on Internet governance. I think it will be an important meeting because it continues the London process. In view of what happened in New York next week, perhaps it takes on extra significance.

And of course, finally, the IGF. We can discuss that, obviously very important this year in Geneva. A lot of discussions taking place there. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Nigel. I note there are quite a few people following us remotely, including Tarek Kamel. If you have any comments, then just type them in the chat. I'll be monitoring this. Also, people sitting in the back of the room – I see more chairs having appeared and so on – if you have any comments and so on, you're invited of course to make them. You can probably either have a flying mic or go over to the table.

Seeing no more hands around the table, I think we can probably move on to the next part of our agenda, and that is the status of

the proposed revisions to the charter of the Cross-Community Working Group itself.

Just before that, how are you doing for time? You'll be here for the whole session? Okay. Perfect. Thank you.

So, the charter. There have been some comments and concerns from the GNSO and from the ccNSO, two of the chartering organizations, about how the structure of the working group is being currently a Cross-Community Working Group but not fitting within the box of Cross-Community Working Groups as defined by the Cross-Working Group on Cross-Community Working Groups.

One of the main things is it doesn't have a start. It doesn't have an end. There are no specific deliverables. I'm just summarizing here. I think we've all heard and all of us have read the points. Many of the people who are in the room here have been at the previous meetings. This working group has to now effectively think of its future and how it will evolve. I think that saying that it might remain – that's my just my personal comment; that it remains static and continues whatever it's doing without taking care of any of the comments that are being made – is pretty futile since it is being chartered by these co-chartering organizations. So we do answer to them.

There were some points made on the actual charter itself, which Rafik has very well worked on. I don't know whether you want to comment at this point, or should we just launch an open discussion on the future?

RAFIK DAMMAK: [inaudible] the context.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The context. Okay. So I'll hand it over to Rafik Dammak.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Olivier. Let's say the discussion started in the Hyderabad meeting when we heard about all the concerns and the working group was tasked to review the charter. The reference was to the uniform framework for Cross-Community Working Groups.

What we did at that time is we went through the charter and saw where the gaps were and tried to align it with the Cross-Community Working Group framework. I think we did a good job there.

Probably there is still work to be done, taking into account the comments that we are hearing from the GNSO because we delivered the amended charter by the Copenhagen, but since

then, the GNSO Council has the topic of the Cross-Community Working Group as a discussion item in each Council call. There was not enough time maybe to go through them, but in the last call, some Councilors shared their concerns about the charter. There are still questions about maybe the mission, and as you said, more rising is the issue of structure and if the Cross-Community Working Group framework vehicle for that. It's also about the start and end and about deliverables. I think we are taking this in consideration seriously.

So in terms of structure, I guess – this is my interpretation – we have to maybe come up with a new beast since we need to come up with something new. I think we can learn from previous experience because in the working group every time we discuss that, with Internet governance, there is no real start or end. It's something ongoing. So learning from that, we can maybe try something like a standing committee and so on and use that as a basis to start so we can move from a Cross-Community Working Group as a model and try to come up with a new one.

So this is maybe a start for us: to discuss within the working group and see how we can work on that. But in the meantime, I think it's also the role of the chartering organization to maybe provide some more guidance and their expectation because, when there is a working group, usually the chartering organization may be initiating a drafting team and so on. But

here we are in a strange position; that we are asked to respond to that. So we can maybe start prep work and see what kind of proposal we can make and see how we can move forward.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Rafik. Young-Eum, did you want to add from a ccNSO perspective?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Yes. Thank you. Well, the ccNSO seems to have much less concern about this group than the GNSO. It seems that the GNSO has a much more serious concern. The concern of the ccNSO was basically not being completely satisfied with the way this group had been updating ccNSO and whether it would be possible in the future if the ccNSO becomes a chartering organization that this group has the potential to express opinions on matters related to the ccNSO. Those were the two main concerns, which I think we will be able to address more adequately.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Young-Eum. Keith Drazek?

KEITH DRAZEK: Thanks. Good morning, everybody. Keith Drazek. I'm with Verisign, Registry Stakeholder Group. I'm one of the members of the CCWG IG.

I want to reinforce some of the thing that Markus has said, as well as Olivier, Rafik, and Young-Eum. I think there is very strong support for the work of this group and the engagement of the ICANN community, the ICANN staff, and the ICANN Board on issues related to Internet governance. I have actually heard no one say that this is not important and that this is not appropriate.

So I think setting that as a baseline is important as we talk about questions of structure and whether a CCWG is the right model of it something else might be more appropriate. I think it's just really important for everybody to understand that the work of this group and the engagement of all parts of the community in this is critical.

I think, as Olivier noted at the beginning of this conversation, the CCWG IG was established following the Montevideo events and heading into NETMundial. It was recognized that the ICANN community needed to have a vehicle or a mechanism to provide input to the Board and staff on issues related to Internet governance. Absolutely appropriate and necessary at the time.

But the CCWG IG was formed before the output of the CCWG on CCWGs, and we now have a structure that came out of that effort, a community-agreed-to structure, that established what a CCWG is and how it is supposed to operate. So I think that's where we're finding a bit of friction or a bit of a challenge; in that, as Oliver and others have noted, the Internet governance issue does not have a beginning, a middle, or an end, and there are no deliverables.

As one of my GNSO colleagues, Heather Forrest, noted yesterday, there needs to be a feedback loop so that there is an ongoing exchange of information between community, staff, and Board, and to ensure that messaging is up to date, agreed to, and validated by the community organizations, the chartering organizations.

So whether it's a CCWG or something different – a standing committee, a community discussion group – whatever we call it I think is less relevant. We must make sure that there's no gap and that this community engagement and the Board engagement can continue.

I'll stop there. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Keith. Lousewies van der Laan?

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Thank you. I fully agree with what you just said. I just want us to be aware of one risk. If the impression is created that this is going to be a mini-IGF or a pre-IGF for the ICANN community, we are inviting in exactly the kind of stuff we don't want to invite in because one of the strengths of ICANN has been to say, "We're a technical body. We make sure the Internet works. What happens on the Internet is somebody else's business." If the impression is created consciously, unconsciously, or because of the charter or because of how it's organized or because this subject is being discussed "This is where ICANN precooks what they're going to do – at the IGF" this is just going to be fodder for those who are trying to say exactly this.

So I just want us to be really, really aware of that because we don't want to create the kind of risks that precisely we're trying to avoid. So it will depend not only the structure but especially on the charter and the work and how you define and delimitate things. This is precisely why in the Board we have said very clearly "Level 1. This is where one talks about the governance of the Internet and how it affects the DNS." That's very clear we need to be involve. But the other stuff that [inaudible] the green light. But when it's red light and orange light, let's make sure we don't start going down the lanes where we're going to get into traffic trouble.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. I've got Elsa Saade and then Chris Disspain. Elsa?

ELSA SAADE:

Thank you, Olivier. I just want to mention that there's a session going on right now at the GAC. Niels is currently presenting the human rights standards and everything. I would like to just concur with Lousewies because it's important how we're framing whatever we're doing right now to the GAC in a sense where we're not going into human related or IG-related issues. It's rather very focused, ICANN technical issues and how ICANN is going to be responsible as a corporate institution. It's really important not to divert ourselves into a wider scope of things because the GAC already is very sensitive about these issues, and internationally, governments could be completely abrupt about this issue and just leave whatever we're doing right here. It's good to smart with small steps and just be focused in a sense.

Then, if we need to be more included into IG-related issues, it's definitely good to be vocal there. But just in ICANN-related issues, let's be focused and serve whatever we need to serve based on our mandate.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Elsa. Chris, if I may, Marilyn wanted to intervene, just as a response.

MARILYN CADE: As one of the pioneers of the drafting that created the Bylaws in response to the White Paper, I think we need to remember that there was a huge debate at that time about the terms and related policy. I think this conversation we can take further, but we need to remember that we had that debate and we've continually had that debate and you cannot actually completely separate the interaction of what we do, which is at least Levels 1, 2, and 3, and getting into 4 and enabling 4 – and I think we need to be careful to understand we are not completely a technical body. If we pretend we are, then we're going to go back to the days when the technical community – I worked for AT&T Well-Net and they [inaudible] part of that and thought they could [route] around governments.

So I urge us to be a little bit more flexible in our thinking about understanding that we cannot have a complete segregation. We're not becoming a mini-IGF, but I think we ought to be thinking about ourselves as really needing to be informed about what's happening in the rest of the Internet ecosystem that may have significant consequences for ICANN.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Chris Disspain?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Olivier. I apologize. I've been doing the classic ICANN thing, which is trying to do six things at the same time. So if something I say has already been covered, then I apologize.

I think Cade's point is a good point; that there is now a process for setting up a CCWG. I think we need to ask ourselves questions as to whether a CCWG is the right thing to have in respect to Internet governance. If it doesn't fit into what we have decided a CCWG should be for, then it should be something else. I'm not saying it shouldn't exist. I'm just saying it should be something else. CCWG has taken on a meaning in this community, and it's not a concept and indeed its factual existence has to be very carefully managed. Otherwise, we'll have CCWGs all over the place. And there are certain consequences that flow from being a CCWG. So that would be my first point.

My second point would be: in my head, a CCWG is a kind of problem-solving exercise. You have a CCWG to do something, to solve a problem. The community needs to get together. I don't think this is this. I think this is more a community interface or community project where the community can come together and talk about Internet governance issues.

I also think it's incredibly important that we're very careful on outputs from whatever this entity is. This entity cannot speak for the community in respect to Internet governance issues. The only people that can speak for the community with respect to Internet governance issues are the community structures. The GNSO can for the gs. The [CF] ccTLD can for the cs, and so on. Of course, the Board can as well.

So I wonder if this is about forming opinions. Is this about forming positions? Is this about updating? Is this just about keeping people up to speed? Is this about getting everybody together, so whilst you can't go out and talk as a group, you can go out and talk authoritatively individually, which is also perhaps a worthwhile exercise?

So I think there are a lot of questions that need to be answered for the future of this. I completely acknowledge that there are differing views about ICANN-as-a-body's role. Marilyn's view? If other people share that view, that it's perfectly. Other people say it's purely technical and we shouldn't get involved.

My view, for what it's worth – I know that a number of other Board members hold the same view – is that I think or role in respect to Internet governance is to stand at the back of the room and to offer to come forward and assist and help if we can in respect to stuff that is within our remit. That's my personal

view, but I acknowledge that others have different views.
Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Chris. Next is George Sadowsky.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you. Two follow-ups. First of all, with respect to this group or ICANN not becoming a mini-IGF as Lousewies and the lady next to you said, I'm in whole-hearted agreement. The Board Working Group under Markus's leadership has established this three-tier structure of how we view Internet governance events. I think that's a very good structure for our defining the terms of our engagement with Internet governance issues, no matter how we perceive them. We're proactive where it really matters to us. We're neutral at the second level. I say we're reactive at the third level. We define those. The Internet governance community, however defined, including the IGF, doesn't define that. And that's the way it should be.

Now, with respect to the CCWG, following up on the comments between Chris and you, there's a general rule that form should follow function. That is, you decide what you really want to do and get out of something, and then you decide what the appropriate structure is for getting there. When you're talking

about the new CCWG rules – I must admit, I’m naïve in this; I don’t know what they are – and what you want to do, Chris is right in saying maybe the CCWG form is not the right thing for our function.

So the way I would go about it would be to look at what people get out of meetings like this and figure out how to make sure that stays active and that you’re not forced into a position where you’re doing things artificially because you want to have a certain form, unless, as was suggested, you want to be able to speak as a community organization. I suspect that, based on what I’ve seen here, the information interchange is perhaps the most important thing that you get out of this group. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, George. Elsa Saade?

ELSA SAADE: Thank you, Olivier. I was in IGF, and basically what I’ve seen from ICANN in terms of sessions was more informative sessions about what NCUC is and what we actually do as ICANN. But I think, maybe looking forward, it would be a good idea to engage people in these forums to actually look at what we’re doing in terms of our Cross-Community Working Group and engage them in the policy development, not necessarily for actual policy

development but just for them to engage and give us their opinion as a multi-stakeholder group. Back in IGF, for instance, it's a huge community, as we know, so maybe going forward we could think of restructuring our presentation of what we do as ICANN and what we do as NCUC and other working groups and get input from them as public comments, basically. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Elsa. I don't see any other hands. Maybe Young-Eum, but I was going to make a proposal. But let's –

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Thank you, Olivier. I think a lot of us in this room are generally in agreement as to what this group is for and what this group should be doing. If I may just read the goals and objectives of this group as has been proposed in the charter is to increase awareness about the relevant Internet governance and policy issues and enhance cooperation between the CCWG IG and the ICANN government engagement functions.

So it's not to set policy or propose policy or to get involved with any real content or content-intensive issues but generally to inform and exchange information and just to keep the ICANN community and the external community more informed about what ICANN is doing and what the external community is doing.

So I think, in general, I think that's what we are generally in agreement on.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON: Nigel Hickson, ICANN organization. Just two very brief comments in view of this discussion on the work of what currently is the Cross-Community Working Group. We have accomplished a number of activities and commented on a number of issues, and we did produce a report at the last meeting, which I think was informative, about what had taken place so far in the working group. There will be another report, depending on the structure going forward.

One thing which the ICANN organization finds very useful from the discussion we have in the Cross-Community Working Group, both physically here and on our calls, is the discussion of Internet governance issues which the organization is involved in, pursuant to the structure that Markus Kummer has outlined. We hope that the abilities of the staff are that they faithfully represent what ICANN is all about in terms of our charter and our remit. Bouncing ideas and having input on papers, etc., from a wider set of people, many of which are experts in their own right,

is always useful. That's part of the process which we undertake in many other areas.

So I think this factor and this usefulness of what the Cross-Community Working Group has done on input on proposals [of] the ITU or the CSTD or wherever is a useful factor. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. I wanted to have a show of hands here. Is anyone married to the CCWG structure? What I mean by that is they're insisting that this working group or group should remain a Cross-Community Working Group.

Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: I'm not married to the structure, but I am married to the need for support for this. Let me make two comments about that. The CCWGs automatically have the right to ask for public sessions, and they have the right to ask for meeting rooms for this, and they have the right to ask for support from ICANN.

So what I'm married to is the need for appropriate kinds of support and access to ICANN resources and this ability to use Adobe Connect and other more virtual meetings the ability to schedule face-to-face working sessions with rooms that are

perhaps a little bit larger, usually, and the ability to also periodically have a public sessions for the full community as they fit into the overall agenda. So I would say I am married to that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Lousewies?

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: I think the other thing which is really important is that, whatever it is, even it is a [boff], that it's cross-community. I think the key thing is that, if you don't have every single part of the community participating, then you don't get that mix. Then there's a risk that we stick in our silos, and that is the biggest concern, especially on this subject. So if there is another construct and way of doing it which guarantees that every part of the community participates and that, when there is something consensual coming out, you won't have one silo going, "Hey, wait a minute. We weren't involved, and we now reserve the right to ignore or go in a completely separate way" – it's also about building understanding and about getting to know each other. Again, it doesn't have to be a CCWG for that, but if there's another way to keep everybody involved, that's key.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Lousewies. If a vehicle was to be created that would contain the points that Marilyn and Lousewies have mentioned and retain formal channels to the Board Working Group and to staff and to chartering organizations – therefore being answerable to chartering organizations, but not a Cross-Community Working Group – something else, with these qualities and this ability to remain cross-community and with this requirement to remain cross-community, would there be any objections to this? Would this be something that could fly? Renata?

RENATA RIBEIRO: I would just like to make a very naïve question, perhaps. What would be this something else? The human rights, for example, Cross-Community Working Party has had some challenges exactly from being a working party. It has worked also in some aspects for some of the actions the group pursued. But I am really not understanding. Since the nature of this working group so far has been so diverse and has integrated so many parts in ICANN, what would be this other thing? Perhaps if we could have some idea of that, it would make it easier to understand.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Renata. I'm not sure I wish to answer this because we're going to launch into another half-an-hour discussion on this.

You mentioned the Cross-Community Working Party, and that is not chartered by any parts of ICANN. There is a cross-community committee that exists on accessibility. We can call it anything as long as we have the functions that we think are important on there.

So perhaps I should suggest that, as next steps, this working group draft the requirements that it needs, circulate that among chartering organizations, and then take it from there.

Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: Very quickly. I do think there can be a longer outside conversation about some of the questions. I think what we should do, if you don't mind me proposing it, is ask for some volunteers to put together the ideas and come back on the list with "Here's the concepts that we think need to move forward." As to the question of chartering organizations, let's propose that what we want to see is general support.

But I don't know if we can say "chartering" until – I think we want to have relationships with, feedback to. I think the first thing we need to do is to lay out a structure, how it would work,

and the basic requirements, and then we can figure out what the relationships requests are that go back to Supporting Organizations and Advisory Committees.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Just a personal comment on this. I mentioned chartering because of the requirement of a chartering organization to follow the work of the working group. I'm just cognizant of the possibility that there could be drop-outs, if you want. That really requires commitment, not only from the working group but from the different organizations. "There's a charter," was the thought I've had on this.

Okay. We've spent quite a lot of time on this. I think we've advanced a little bit. We have some action items here. Just to mention, you said here there should be a small group drafting something [inaudible]. I hope that it's not going to be one of these massive things that's going to take up all of our time and we'll be again digging into process and not having to do anything with substance. I do find that we often have this problem in ICANN.

The next part of our discussion today is an update on the WSIS forum and the IGF. I note we also have Chengetai Masango here. Was Nigel going to give us a quick update on these things, or –

then perhaps I could call on Chengetai to speak to us about the IGF.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you. I think Olivier and perhaps other people in the room involved in the session we did at WSIS could reflect on this. I think just a brief word on that would be useful. Then Chengetai could perhaps say something about the IGF, and we could note the workshop that was rated fairly highly.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Who wishes to take the floor on this, then?

LORI SCHULMAN: Nigel, [inaudible]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Oh, Lori, sorry. I have an eye missing on the back of neck. Do we have a flying mic or do you want to join us at the table, please, Lori? Lori Schulman. Lori was one of the panelists at the WSIS forum.

LORI SCHULMAN:

I want to thank ICANN for putting together the WSIS panel and for allowing INT to participate. This was something I did as an INT representative as opposed to my constituency, per se, IPC.

The panel focused on ways that different organizations are working through education for capacity building. How are we building the next generation or even the current generation of participants in the multi-stakeholder process?

While ICANN was the host, it wasn't necessarily the complete focus, which I thought was very good. We had a series of panelists representing different organizations that talked about very innovative programs that they're doing, more based in the academic field. Wolfgang Kleinwächter described his program. He has a summer school that's been very good in producing participants in the multi-stakeholder process. Jenny Chung spoke for .asia, where they basically have a model ICANN program.

What was really interesting in her session – there was the other woman on our panel, and I'm blanking on her name, Olivier. But there was another woman there, too, that was leading sessions – Stefania, yeah – on how to train people to engage productively in multi-stakeholder discussions. One of the points is that they teach people how to cope with being tired, being jet-lagged, or having to get off a plane and getting to a meeting without

acclimation. So very practical, physical things, as well as the more academic and esoteric things that we may focus on as a group.

I focused on how a trade association works. I was the only person up there, I think, that wasn't an academic, per se. One of the reasons that I volunteered to participate was in response to a call from a private sector participation. It was really felt that a lot of the panels that we have tend to focus on academics and on NGOs. Even though my organization is an NGO by definition, we represent very large private sector interests. So I felt we could add some balance there about how we prepare members and how we are preparing youth. I focused on program that we have for youth about being good Internet citizens and how to prevent online counterfeiting – not buying counterfeit goods, not contributing to social harms by ignoring good practices for buying authentic products online. So it went that way.

The panel was moderated by Bill Drake and the format was fairly straightforward. We each had five-minute opening remarks, and then we had some questions from the floor. Bill had offered some questions as well to get people going.

One of the first questions Bill asked is “Is there any common themes?” because we had such disparate speakers coming from all areas of life, all regions of the world. One of the conclusions

that we came to is that building alumni programs – when you have these capacity-building programs and you create these graduates, that the graduates remain active, that they recruit others, that they become active participants themselves. Then it’s through the use of this chain reaction of alumni involvement that you truly build capacity.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Lori. Just briefly for those people that didn’t follow, the workshop there was “From theory to practice: Capacity-building programs at ICANN and elsewhere.” In previous years, the working group has also prepared similar fora or similar discussions. One was “Stewardship transition: A live example of multi-stakeholder process,” which I think was last year—no, 2015. In 2016, the topic was about CCWG accountability. We had each time panelists not from the working group itself but the people that were actually involved in this.

Just to add that the participants are not funded to go there, so they all came on their own dime, in case some people are a bit concerned about this being a travel allocation.

So in a way, that’s one of the works of the working group as well: to publicize the work of ICANN and not just having the CEO talking about the work of ICANN but explaining to other

communities from our community what we're doing. It's a bit of an extension that has happened in that way.

How are the topics chosen? There's an open call for issues on the working group mailing list, and then volunteers step forward to put things together once we've decided on a topic.

I realize we're one minute away from the end of this meeting, and we have another two issues. First I wanted to give the floor to Chengetai Masango on IGF 2017, and then we'll probably get Nigel to speedily tell us about the briefing to look ahead the main activities, and perhaps also Marilyn Cade as well on this if both can be brief on the brief look ahead to main activities.

Chengetai, please, you have the floor.

CHENGETAI MASANGO: Thank you very much. I'll try to be quick. The Multi-Stakeholder Advisory Group had our second open consultations and MAG meeting on June 12th-14th, during the WSIS week. The main part of that meeting was to select the workshops. Over 80 workshops were selected, which are definitely in. We have other categories, about ten, I think, conditionally-selected. They'll be sent out e-mails, told to change a few things, and then they'll be put in. Then there's some workshops that are waitlisted. If there's

space after everything else has been put into the schedule, they'll be put in.

On the 29th of June is our deadline for open forums. ICANN, of course, is invited to put in an open forum proposal. This year as well with the open forums we are trying to get International Geneva involved. We're going to have four or five open forums, which will concentrate on particular issues – big data. We have CERN and those organizations that deal with big data and Internet governance. We have trade and Internet governance and humanitarian efforts, which will try to involve WHO and UNHCR, etc. That's of interest which is new this year.

Also on the 21st of July is our deadline for IGF Village booths, like the exhibition center. There's going to be another virtual call on the 5th of July, where we are going to discussing national and regional initiatives and also the main sessions. The MAG is going to – we are trying to give space for the national and regional initiatives within the main schedule because we think that they are very important. The national and regional initiatives are also going to have their main session workshops.

Also, this year we are going to try to do the opening session a little bit differently – more interactive so it's not just going to be a conveyor belt of speeches.

There still in intercessional work that is going on – Connecting the Next Billion and a few other things that are going on. So I would encourage everybody to just look at our website and try to get involved in those. Also, the best practice forums.

I think that’s about all. I just tried to be very, very quick.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Chengetai. The working group has submitted a workshop – “Multi-stakeholder governance of the domain name system: Lessons learned for other IG issues.” That’s been accepted by the MAG. Further details are all included on the wiki of the working group, so you can access them and it’s got [four] details and so on. Again, thanks to those people who have contributed to building this.

Agenda Item 5: A brief look ahead to the main activities. Who wishes to – let’s start with Marilyn, and let’s be brief, please.

MARILYN CADE: I’m just handing around for your look – please don’t keep it because it’s totally out of date – what is called either some of the WSIS-related +10 SDG and Internet governance events, or Marilyn Cade’s crazy calendar. It is undergoing update, but there are some events coming up that I’d like people to be particularly aware of, and that is the September meeting of the CSTD

Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. There is a very strong possibility that some of us who are involved in that will be doing outreach to some of the missions to Geneva and some of the IGOs, in particular around the issues of Internet governance.

I flagged that because Jimson and I are just now putting that together. But if it happens, Nigel of course is a member of that working group. So are several others. We have some very friendly government colleagues that we would be including in that. This will be a very decisional meeting. It will be webcast.

There are also a number of other things that are one here. One that I would suggest that we need to be aware of and figure out a way to have more feedback from is the proposals going into the ITU WTDC and the proposals that come out of it. I will just say disappointedly that most of the governments that are going are not taking multi-stakeholder advisors. If they're taking somebody, it is their sector members that are going on their delegation. That is a problem. There is at least one government that has made a commitment to take multi-stakeholder advisors, and that is Nigeria. Jimson and I are working very closely on that.

We can talk later about how we get access to the proposals that are going in. They are just being finalized, so there is no point in our paying attention to them until they're actually final, coming

in from the regional groups. That would be an educational moment for us to then look at who are friends are. It is typically not the GAC member who carries the ITU WTDC portfolio. There are a few of them, but not typically.

I really hope that people will take very seriously the preparation for the IGF and plan if possible to attend it. It's going to be quite important in increasing the visibility of all of the participants with a very broadened group of international organizations and IGOs who also have influence, where we may actually be able to broaden our messages about what ICANN does, what it doesn't, how it does, etc.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Just for the record, I believe the U.K. government will also be sending a multi-stakeholder group over to WTDC. They have so little else to do than to send people away. Of course, it's in Argentina, isn't it?

MARILYN CADE: Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So there's also another sense to that. Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON: Just very, very briefly on the WTDC, which is the World Telecommunications Development Conferences that Marilyn has flagged, what we're able to do through our global stakeholder engagement network – Sally Costerton touched on this in a report to the GNSO yesterday – is monitor and be involved in some of the regional proposals for the WTDC. So we are keeping abreast of what's happening in Africa, what's happening in the Middle East, what's happening in Europe, and what's happening in Latina America, looking at the proposals coming forward.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Nigel. I'm afraid we have to draw to close since we've run out of time. Last question: is there anyone in the room that is not on the group's mailing list?

Okay. Asha, and George, and Nick Shorey, and Lousewies – and you're not on the mailing list? I thought that you were on the mailing list.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No. May I suggest that we have a joint mailing list for the Board Working Group on Internet Governance and the [CCWG]?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Let's work this out together. Your people and our people will come together and we'll make it happen.

Thanks very much, everyone. It's been a great meeting. I wanted to do a special thanks to one gentleman who's sitting right at the back over there who doubled the number of chairs in the room. Please stand up. Thank you.

Thanks, everyone. This meeting is adjourned. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]