

---

ABU DHABI – F2F meeting of CCWG Internet Governance  
Tuesday, October 31, 2017 – 12:15 to 13:15 GST  
ICANN60 | Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We'll be starting in two minutes so we can all get settled.

So, we're just waiting for the agenda to come on the screen.  
That's being loaded.

Let's start the recording, please, and start.

Okay. Welcome, everyone, to this meeting of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance where Tuesday it feels like much further down the road for many of us, and we have our face-to-face meeting taking place today. Joining me, co-Chair Rafik Dammak. Not sure Young-eum is in the room. She's probably on her way. And, of course, Markus Kummer, who's the Chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance.

Just as an introduction, yesterday the Board Working Group on Internet Governance had a meeting, which was one of these open meetings that the Board has with people being able to follow remotely, so I'm sure Markus will be able to provide us with some update on what has been discussed. Let's just go to

---

*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 first slide, please, and have a look at our agenda. Oh, there is no first slide. There should be.

Perhaps, Nigel, if you have the agenda. I don't have the agenda in front of me. If you have the agenda, could you please take us to the agenda? And I'm going to propose without slides that so at the moment, it says introductions then update on work for the new vehicle for Internet governance engagement. Then thirdly report from and discussion with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. Four, brief flagging of key issues on Internet governance for rest of year and, finally, a general discussion and AOB.

I was going to suggest because Matthew Shears, who will be the incoming Chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance, is not with us at present. He's currently busy elsewhere. He will make it here before the end of this session, so I was going to suggest that we move that the discussion on the new vehicle to the end, if that was possible. Are there any objections? Rafik, is that okay with you?

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Yes. I would like to joke that by vehicle, we don't mean a car or something but a new structure.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. So, then let's move directly then to Agenda Item #3. And that's the report and discussion with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance and I'll hand the floor over to Markus Kummer.

MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. Thank you, Olivier, and good morning or good afternoon.

It doesn't work [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: You want to try this one?

MARKUS KUMMER: This might be easier. Yes.

It's a pleasure to be here. I think we said that repeatedly that it's very useful to have this kind of exchange. The Board Working Group on Internet Governance has now been in existence for 18 months and I think it has helped also the Board to coalesce around an Internet strategy, which we had discussed previously with this group and also why the community and the need to have this discussion I think has also been recognized when you had a meeting with the GNSO in Johannesburg.

As a Board, we are agnostic as to the form the vehicle will take but we think it is important to have this group in one form or

---

another constituted and to have a regular interaction. One issue that comes up over again in Board meetings is also the scalability of activities of ICANN Org. There are five people I think in Tarek's team that do extremely good work and, obviously, there are other people helping them within the organization but there is so much going on that clearly it needs to be a community-wide effort to pass on the message in other fora on the multi-stakeholder model and to explain what ICANN's mission is.

You will recall that the strategy is based on the repeal, as I personally prefer calling it three concentric circles with the core mission at the very core and the DNS is at stake, then ICANN takes the lead, and the second circle, it's essentially defending the multi-stakeholder model where maybe other organizations such as ISOC will take the lead and ICANN as a supporting function, then there is the outer circle with selective engagement where there are new issues propping up such as previously regulations, GDPR, human rights, and we don't know in advance what they are but security, obviously, is an issue, which is on the agenda of many governments and also conferences and there ICANN obviously focus where it touches on the DNS.

So, this strategy I think has fairly broad support and it is recognized and endorsed by the Board as a whole and I think it

---

makes much sense. And this I think is the discussion we want to have also with you and, obviously, ICANN Org can fill us in on latest developments and the – what we hear from Nigel, I think, on the WTDC. The WTDC is a conference, which is usually very much the motherhood in [inaudible] conference of the ITU, which is development issues, which can be or should be a win-win for all participants, and I do remember the last one in Dubai was very smooth conference where everybody was happy. But at the last conference in Buenos Aires, some fairly contentious issues came up. I think they were resolved but they promised to pop up next year again at the Plenipot, so for those who think that the transition is the end of Internet governance, it was clear reminder that it will go on and also, obviously, we also need to involve discussions with the GAC. This is something we also can think on going forward.

But again, the Board Working Group on Internet Governance is not the decision making body. It is an advisory body to the Board and also to the organization and I think your group, your [inaudible] you're looking for, see that very much as a parallel structure for a community-wide body.

I think this is all I would have to say as an introductory remark. I don't know whether my – who's here from [four] colleagues – Avri is here. Matt said he will come later. [Lito] is here, whether they would like to add anything to fill in. I see heads shaking.

---

Other questions, comments. I'm ready to engage. Thank you for your attention.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Markus. And thanks for this overall view. I was going to ask whether the slides that you have used for the presentation in the Board Working Group session with the Board yesterday were available for download because I'm not sure that everyone here has seen them.

MARKUS KUMMER: I would have to turn to Nigel. Would they be made available? Presumably yes, I see it was an open session. Yeah?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you. Yes, we presented some slides, which I'm sure if the Board are happy, we could make available. Of course, yes.

MARKUS KUMMER: And also my apology, there was some confusion. We had decided the Board Working Group to have the session open but there were some leaches in the communication and also one thing, well I talked to that also with Tarek, and we have to think when we have an open session in location that we have also the room available [inaudible]. It was just in a small room. There

---

was physically no chairs and that obviously doesn't make much sense when the community is here. We had an open public session in the morning where some people had to be sent away because no chairs were there, but that's purely logistical issue. We have not thought of in advance but definitely this is something the Board will think about and ICANN Org also to have public sessions in the room where they can really be public, where people can sit in.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Markus, indeed the Internet works very well, so several people followed. Bill Drake.

BILL DRAKE: Thanks. First of all, of course, I applaud the fact that the Board Working Group meeting was made available to us. I think that's a very good initiative and I think it's something you guys definitely should carry forward because it's important that people in the community who do understand the importance of Internet governance issues for ICANN are able to engage directly or certainly be abreast of, but also it's important that people who are not particularly privy to the or are aware of the importance of Internet governance can watch.

---

The second point would be if I understand tomorrow, we have a public session, which is not on here, and a portion of it is supposed to be for a brief discussion, 30-40 minutes, I guess, of why IG matters to the ICANN community. Many of the people in the domain name industry and so on do not necessarily have experience with this and so it's useful. I would think that it'd be helpful if maybe at least one or two of those slides with the highlight – there's three prongs to what ICANN is doing, could be presented in that context and if Nigel or Tarek, I don't know if either of you would be here, but if somebody could say something on behalf of ICANN just to overview briefly for whoever attends what the nature of the participation is and then we could have community people respond to that and build off of it, I think that would be a useful thing because I think that there is an awareness raising issue, obviously, that has to happen. So just to put that on the table now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Bill. Very good point and I was actually thinking of the same sort of question towards Markus on this. Are there any other comments or questions for the Board Working Group on Internet Governance? Perhaps, I was going to ask Tarek as to your relationship with the Working Group. Is it through the Nigel in the same way as with the Cross-Community Working Group or in a different way?



---

TAREK KAMEL: Which working group?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The Board Working Group on Internet Governance.

TAREK KAMEL: The Board Working Group on Internet Governance is different. Mandy is in charge of the coordination and she does this with myself and with the new Chair in this case that Matthew Shears. The new vehicle, whatever it is that will be here, Nigel will continue to be definitely from the government engagement to be the liaison as such, but it's mainly Mandy that is doing the interfacing because Nigel is very overloaded.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this, Tarek. And the other question I had was with regards to the Internet Governance Forum. That's coming up very soon and I wondered whether you had any coordinated, you'd already put your heads together to think about any action plan or any coordinated intervention at the IGF from either Board members or the group as, well, the group itself. Tarek.

---

TAREK KAMEL:

Yeah. I mean, there are preparations going on concerning the IGF and we have a preparational group within the organization from different departments. There will be a fairly good participation from ICANN and a general that is planned. We have around 12 Board members that will be participating in different sessions with different – in day zero as well as in workshops as well as in the opening and inside events as well as a number of executives and staff member. ICANN also has been asked by the host country and also by the IGF Secretariat if we would be able to have a social event on the second day and we have arranged this together in the UN on Tuesday, we are all invited at the – what is the room of the name of the room? Yeah, Serpent Bar in the E building in the [inaudible] building Tuesday evening after the event.

In addition to that, we have community members. Mandy, do you know how many? Come to the mic, please, here.

MANDY CARVER:

We're still doing the verification between the application. There was an application process for those groups who believe they were going to put panels in. Those were granted funding. It's contingent upon the acceptance by the MAG. We're doing the validation process right now. It's someplace, so I don't want to

---

give you an absolute headcount. Between 8 and 12 community members.

TAREK KAMEL:

More or less within the range of the last year's participants. And concerning the session we have on the zero technical session about the identifier that IDL is putting together. As such, as you have Secretariat and the host has given us this opportunity, another session that Adam Peake and Jean-Jacques are working on related to civil society contribution within the IGF process from ICANN's perspective and then we have the opening definitely Göran will be there, and there will be probably also a role for the Chair, for the new incoming Board Chair. And then we have the session that is organized by you here as Cross-Community Working Group as such, and yeah, that's it.

And Nigel, is there another event? Yeah. The ICANN Public Open Forum on Public Forum, whatever it is called. So, we have four slots that more or less we are involved in.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Tarek. Any other comments or questions? So, just speaking about the IGF, one of the news we've had – and I'm turning over to Bill present, Bill was due to be the Chair of the session of the community session that we

---

were going to have but you've mentioned that you're not going to be able to make it, and so there's been some discussion among the Chairs as to whether, perhaps, Markus might be interested in chairing it. So, I think that we can just do as a follow-up later on. I don't know if anybody else has any thoughts. We can do a follow-up after this if you don't wish to discuss this in public and so on, but just to advise you that we will have another Chair for that session.

And I have been informed the IGF session – I've also been informed on the list of panelists, there is also, I think, this sort of backup panelist, we had Larry Strickling, and he's pulled me aside and said he would be available for this session. So, yeah.

And the session, by the way, for those of you that are not aware of the session, it's multi-stakeholder governance of the Domain Name System, lessons learned for other IG issues.

TAREK KAMEL:

Just to mention, for the open forum, I think it's 90 minutes or as such, there will be focus on different subjects but one of them will be the GDPR. Becky will be talking about it very specifically and update where we will be at that time, more from a privacy and data protection generic view than getting into the nitty-gritty of the GDPR implementation, as such. And yeah, there will be then also an update about the KSK rollover for the wider

---

community as such as we move forward. So, we look forward to that to be successful.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tarek. On tomorrow's meeting, there will be a section that will relate specifically to explain Internet governance and how it actually affects ICANN. We've had some pretty moderately strong – if that's an oxymoron perhaps – pushback from some parts of the community with regards to ICANN's mission and whether Internet governance is part of ICANN's mission. Are there any specific points that any people around the table would like to mention that we would have to push tomorrow specifically? This is all face-to-face meeting preparing for this. Is there anything, any angle perhaps that we might look to consider?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I think the strategy provides a very good framework for explaining this. I mean, the core really touches on DNS issue, opposite touches on ICANN. That's the core of the ICANN mission. But then also, a broader environment in which we operate in that that is multi-stakeholder friendly. The more you put issues into an intergovernmental framework, the more that gets tightened up, so that clearly also is part of the mission. And

---

then the outer circle that is selective engagement. You see that now in the GDPR, of course, that touches on ICANN's mission.

So I think it can be explained and when we have this joint meeting, the GNSO wanted to be briefed by the Board Working Group and we made this point and I think at the end, I felt that the temperature in the room was fairly positive. They managed to convince also the skeptics that there is a need to engage. But I think it's an ongoing process. It's not a [quiet] once and for all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Tarek?

TAREK KAMEL:

Yeah. Olivier, I think the importance, again – and we talked about that several times but it's worth to reemphasize – the message is not an update of participation and events. The message is why again and again. Why is Internet governance – Matthew, please come here. So, it's why are we investing as an ICANN Org, ICANN Board, and ICANN community efforts in this issue. They need to hear it from different people on the floor and reiterate it and maybe also we can mention some examples because this is the question that is still around that some people thought after the transition, “Yeah, okay, we can hide again,” and so it is the answer of why.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tarek, and as you were speaking, I noticed Young-eum Lee has also joined us, the co-Chair for the ccNSO and also Matthew Shears, the future Chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. We'll go to Veni Markovski. I think you put your hand up. No, you hadn't. Okay. You're pointing behind me, no, Wolfgang, okay. Sorry. Wolfgang Kleinwaechter.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: Yes, thank you very much. And I continue what Tarek just said why. Why the ICANN community should follow certain developments? Because we have settled a lot of issues within ICANN. But as an environment, which is not under control of ICANN, and there are groups who dealing with issues, which fall into the mission and the core business of ICANN. And we cannot control the agenda setting in that organization. And what I see at least in three intergovernmental processes, the DNS becomes an issue for the intergovernmental negotiations among groups, which has nothing to do with ICANN, but which are jumping now in this issue.

Number one is cybersecurity and it comes to the question of attribution. So, then you have immediately the issue of names and numbers on the table and this is negotiated. And I think we have to make a contribution and to explain to these people who

---

have no clue what ICANN does and have no clue what ICANN is [20 years], so how this is managed? So, that's reduced ambitions and aware that they have to collaborate with us and not to reinvent the wheel.

The second thing is e-trade. So, you cannot avoid that in the World Trade Organization, people start to discuss Internet services and [inaudible] so that means whatever will happen in the WTO Ministerial Conference in Buenos Aires – and Richard is so very, very nervous and wants to say something – so that means these trade people have no clue what the Internet governance people have discussed for 20 years, and they create their own agenda and think that [inaudible] want to occupy us.

A less controversial but also difficult issue is privacy. So, that means the rapporteur on privacy, Mr. Cannataci, was in Copenhagen, gave a very good speech, and there are ambitions. It's not realistic at the moment to – I would not say to internationalize the GDPR, but to have a global convention on privacy, so this will affect WHOIS and assets in our field. So that means there are issues, which are not under control of ICANN, which we are as a group, define the agendas, and we have an [eye on it] and have to inform them, so that they know about it. That means it's not our business but we have to help them that they understand the issue and do not make crazy decisions, which will affect ICANN.



---

And it continues to [inaudible], Richard will know that better. We have the three resolutions and the Plenipotentiary Conference next year. We'll continue to discuss names and numbers and IDNs and all the things, so that means if ICANN would trust [inaudible] after the completion of the IANA transition, we can go back in the ivory tower. This would be a big mistake and would really undermine the future of ICANN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Wolfgang. Oh, goodness. I'm seeing a lot of hands, certainly. I wanted to close the queue because time is going. John Laprise was there. So Collin, Richard, and we finish then with Rafik. So John Laprise, please.

JOHN LAPRISE: Thank you. I just want to piggyback off of Wolfgang's comments, and that is ICANN is ground zero for the battle between multilateralists and multi-stakeholderists. And if we don't defend it here, it's going to get rolled back. And in these other venues, we're not really making inroads at this point but we're trying to. As Wolfgang says, we're not in the door quite in all these other venues but here this is the system we're using here, and we have to defend it.

---

And the work that we've been doing and I've seen this in action in the various accountability tracks that I've been working in, there's a strong impetus to push back against, to spike the gun as it were, of multi-stakeholderism. If multilateralists advance, act as bad actors in these discussions in cases, and this is something we really have to address. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, John. Next is Collin Kurre.

COLLIN KURRE: Collin Kurre from Article 19. I just wanted to bring up a constant thread that's been running through the NCUC, which is content moderation, and this is something that relates to what Wolfgang was saying. I think that's it's important to reiterate to people that despite the fact that registries and registrars are becoming increasingly involved in discussions of content moderation, the DNS is not the place to address these issues of hate speech, incitation to violence, and other objectionable content.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct. Thank you, Collin. Yeah. ICANN does not do content. So, Richard Hill.

---

RICHARD HILL:

Yeah. Thanks, Olivier. I was going to make my comment under AOB, but since Wolfgang introduced it, I'll make it now.

I don't think that anything that's proposed in WTO at this stage has any direct or even much of an indirect effect on anything that ICANN is doing, but I think the point is worth making that now there's a concerted push to negotiate issues, which are by any definition Internet governance issues just like spam, just to take an example, or even more delicate things like privacy and the interface between free flow data and privacy in the World Trade Organization.

Now for those who don't know, World Trade Organization is, I would argue, the least open and the least inclusive and the least transparent of any of those intergovernmental organizations. Most of the UN system have some system for allowing nongovernmental actors to be there as observers, or more in the case of IT or whatever. WTO has no such mechanisms. They do have open forums where everybody can come but when they actually meet as WTO, they only way you can be there is to be in a national delegation. Most national governments have very restrictive rules on who they'll allow in national delegations. They actually don't allow nonstate actors, or if they do, it's just corporate interests.

---

WTO has a, from my point of view, terrible track record in terms of the substance, not just the process. TRIPS – does everybody know what TRIPS is? Okay. If you don't know what TRIPS is, look it up on Wikipedia. Some people like TRIPS, if you're an intellectual property lawyer, sure. But most of us users don't think that was particularly useful thing to do.

And so there's a lot of criticism of the WTO and I'm now in a network that's trying to mobilize and say, well, whatever you do, don't discuss this stuff in WTO at least not until WTO has been changed to be much more open and inclusive, and Bill Drake has made some suggestions on how to achieve that, to which I reply yes, Bill, but I prefer to get rid of WTO, but that's a different debate.

I think we all agree that there is a need to improve WTO and I do agree realistically WTO is not going to go away. And so these negotiations will take place, so we have to be aware of that and have to mobilize and just be aware of that issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Richard. And I believe Nigel, the WTO is on your radar.

---

**NIGEL HICKSON:** Thank you very much, Mr. Chair. Yes, I mean, clearly, Richard Hill says there are proposals made to the ministerial in Buenos Aires later in the year on the e-commerce that range across a number of issues, and like other multilateral organizations, we do try and monitor what is taking place. Thank you.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you, Nigel. So, the queue is closed but I'm letting Bill come in just after.

**BILL DRAKE:** I just wanted to say since Richard referenced the point. There is an effort to try to develop a multi-stakeholder process around trade issues and I'm organized to work a roundtable at IGF on Tuesday and you're speaking on it as well as a bunch of other people on data localization and barriers to data flow, so people are interested, they should come.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Okay, that's great. Thank you, Bill. Finally, Rafik Dammak. And for those of you that are following the agenda, I think we're firmly into Agenda Item 4 already, the flagging of the issues. Rafik.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Olivier. I just want to maybe suggest that because I think you have presentation for the ccNSO and that slide you have like the list of threats. And I think also in the last activity report, we tried also to [put] those possible threats. If we can maybe create like a document and list that so we can map any what we see as a treat to ICANN. That will help us maybe to explain more in the community and to keep updating it because things are coming up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Rafik, so like a living document that will keep being updated. Perhaps a dashboard? Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much. Clearly, if the Cross-Community Working Group thinks that's a good idea, we can certainly provide that. I hope people around the table have read the report, given the work that went into it. This is the 2017 report we put on the list earlier this week, which does clearly spell out the issues that have been worked on in the Cross-Community Working Group, the advice that's been given to the organization and how the organization have consulted the Cross-Community Working Group on issues, and also notes some of the sort of direct sort of references to the Domain Name System that were in some of the proposals that were made the WTDC in Buenos

---

Aires a couple of weeks ago and are currently being discussed by the Enhanced Cooperation Working Group on – well Enhanced [CSTD], Enhanced Cooperation Working Group, which is currently meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Nigel. Are there any other key issues that we haven't mentioned yet that are on the radar for the rest of the year?

NIGEL HICKSON: Well, we're sort of bottoming out the agenda item, yes. So, all I was going to reference, and it's very good to see [inaudible] here, of course, from the IGF Secretariat and as is being discussed, ICANN is taking part in the IGF along with the community. ICANN as a community and organization and a Board is taking place, taking part in the IGF. That's the main item on the agenda. We're also involved in OECD work, on digital transformation, which is ongoing before the end of this year.

There's the Global Cyberspace Conference in New Delhi. This is the part of the so-called London process. Members will recall here that there's been a series of global cyberspace conferences starting in London in 2011, and in New Delhi in the end of November is, well, is the 2017 conference, which the Board and

---

the organization are taking part in and this will be a useful discussion, we think, on cybersecurity, which is one of the issues that Wolfgang flagged and others as being one of the themes that we're seeing pop up in a number of different fora. The advantage of the GCCS is at least it's a multi-stakeholder fora where this will be discussed. And finally, Mr. Chairman, the Wuzhen Conference. I don't think that's the right name for it anymore but it's the conference, which China, the Internet governance conference that China hosts and that's in December and we will have organizational representation there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thanks very much. I think we're kind of running out of time on these issues and I think we also need to spend quite some time on the new vehicles, so if no one else has any other points to make, then let's go over to Rafik Dammak, who is going to take us through the work on the new vehicle for IGN engagement.

Do we have a PDF of the vehicle that can go on screen? Veni will get it out. Okay, thanks. Over to you, Rafik.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Olivier. So, maybe first to give a background why we are talking and kind of in terms of process and structure. For



---

a few months at the GNSO level, there was a discussion regarding if the current format for the CCWG IG feeds what we are doing and if it's the right way to do things. And there were a lot of concerns about having CCWG to as a structure to discuss Internet governance but also about reporting of our activities and so on.

At the end, I think last August, the GNSO Council approved it to motion that asking us as a working group to make a proposal by next February with a new vehicle or structure that to respond to all the concerns that were expressed by our chartering organization. Maybe here the GNSO took the lead in terms of pushing that we need to make changes. It seemed that – I think the ccNSO expressed concerns but I'm not sure about the ALAC if they have any specific issues, however. Okay. They have.

So, what we try to do after getting tasked to work on this is it seems that the label or the name Cross-Community Working Group has some connotation and we try to move from that and going through what can be maybe the right or appropriate name, and we thought that if we call Cross-Community Engagement Group, it can be an acceptable solution. And so what we tried from there is to – okay, let's go with that name and we try to go backward and list all the requirement that the new structure should meet.

---

Also, we work with the previously in the revised charter that it was not approved but we are going to try to use it as a starting document and to make adjustment and amendments in several areas maybe to clarify in particular about the mission because there's some confusion why we need the structure. And also to add more clarity about the mechanisms for the reporting. It seems that we failed at some level to keep our chartering organization informed regarding our current activities and what we are doing, what we are discussing.

I think in the last month, we tried to fix that by issuing activities report with help of staff and I think the idea is to how we can improve that and to how we can build mechanisms to make it that more systematic. So as you can see in the document, I'm not sure if everyone can see that, at least in the Adobe Connect.

So in the beginning, we tried to explain what are the objective of having this structure and also explain the target, because we get really short timeline as a group to deliver proposal. So we are using this meeting as a milestone so we can have a discussion. Of the level of the working group, we set up a drafting team, just small group of volunteers to work on draft proposal, so let's maybe we can call this a draft zero, and the idea is to have a discussion around that. So I'm not sure that everyone had a chance to go through the document but I would like to jump directly to the specification section because I think that's where

---

maybe first part that need maybe to I think we have agreement at the drafting team but maybe if we need any input or comment from the whole working group on this.

So, I think it's clear for us that we need the cross-community structure because we need the whole community to participate in the discussion, and also that the structure that allows us for accountability and reporting in order to build awareness about IG issues that affect ICANN and its mission. So we have that need to build more and more awareness, and I think in the previous agenda items, that was what we discussed. So we need to find out how we can do that in more systematic way.

It's also about increasing awareness and the importance of IG to ICANN and the risk and threats to ICANN from other sectors is again consistent to what we discussed previously, informs the community, engage with ICANN Board Working Group on IG, and liaise with SO and AC about ongoing IG issues. Provide the community with updates at ICANN meetings and draft inputs to different consultation process.

I think that will be maybe kind of, not controversial, I will say that but we need to find a way how we can welcome to participate in all the consultation that ICANN is responding and how we can involve the community on this matter. So, I think we acted more on ad hoc approach but so we need to find a way

---

because if we are [shorted] by the different SO and AC, we need to get their approval before making any statement or say that's the position of the ICANN community, so we need to see how we can weed the process and feed that with all the constraints we have in ICANN.

So yeah. We said that we're the [inaudible], no, WG, see the needs for delivery both from ICANN community and IG matters, it will follow the usual ICANN process. To clarify that, we need some specific process that we consult our different SO and ACs.

Okay, so we added one, I think, item. It's important that we say that the CCAG will be clear that any other deliverable coming from the CCAG only is only – yeah, it's from CCAG only and not from the community, so we need to be clear about that in some cases.

Also, provide a mechanism for ICANN community discussion and input on IG matters. Builds an ongoing and two-way discussion with the Board to Working Group on IGF. I think that's already ongoing but we need to create process or more clarity on how to do that.

And also, I think one issue we had is there is position we are not getting enough resources. I want to thank Nigel and his team for all the help we get but maybe we need more support from our chartering organization on the matter. And so we are expecting

---

that ICANN support is for this group that like meeting room so we can ensure that we have our session and the public meetings. Also, support for the group ICANN staff for administrative secretarial communication support. Engagement with the staff to provide feedback to staff on policy inputs. I think that's ongoing but we need to formalize that. Have a defined channel to form the chartering organization of the activities. And last, define approach to seek feedback on some topics from chartering organization, especially if an external consultation is to be responded by ICANN staff.

So, this is the kind of specification and we are trying to reflect them in that revised charter, so we are using it as a draft. Okay, I think that's it for me and happy to open the floor for question. Yes, Bill, [inaudible].

BILL DRAKE:

So, I hope this won't be regarded as unconstructive because I know people worked on this and I didn't, but I just want to express a slightly orthogonal view and it doesn't have to – obviously, this is not where you're going to go probably. But I personally I don't really understand the need to be bureaucratize this so much. I mean, we had a problem, I was involved in CCWG IG from the beginning and we had a problem after NETmundial that we could never agree even discussing

---

drafting texts because there were always parties who said, “Well, chartering organization, my group won’t support this, etc. etc.” And if we continue to sort of frame it as this is a group that might be authoring texts and names to be chartered and we need to go back to these groups and get their approval, we create this whole bureaucratic albatross that I personally don’t really think is necessary to have a community focal point to interact with the Board Working Group and with the staff who work in this area because I, frankly, most issues on which we could probably get agreement in this community with regard to IG are going to be consistent with things that the staff would have said in their representation in these meetings anyway.

I mean, we could agree that somebody should say something about multi-stakeholder in an IGO context or something like that or that there’s existing process, but we’re not going to agree on intellectual property or some other kind of thing and we don’t have to. So, for the issues that have to, that ICANN actually has to represent, I think Tarek and Nigel and the rest already do that. We’re not going to be writing statements so then why do we have to have this whole complicated thing?

I mean, I would rather we just had a cross-community interest group that was a focal point for people in the community who are interested in working on in a particular set of issues and tracking a particular set of issues, etc., and I actually would like

---

to see interest groups more generally in ICANN as a flexible cross-silo way of organizing people who want to talk about some things without having to have the whole bureaucratized thing. So, if we could have made it work with this, then it might have been a model to do for other stuff.

So, I wish we weren't going this way but if people are all wedded to it, then I roll with your judgment.

YOUNG-EUM LEE

This is Young-eum Lee at .kr, co-Chair for the ccNSO. Kind of to add to what Rafik had said and to kind of answer what Bill had said, I mean, the word or the new structure that we are seeking actually may be what Bill has been proposing because it's not – I wouldn't use the word "bureaucratize" but I think we still need some sort of a new structure within ICANN, you may call it an interest group, you may call it an engagement group, but the nature of this group is not to engage in discussions that will eventually affect ICANN policies, for example, and that's what working groups are, and I think that's where we got kind of mixed up and that's why GNSO was concerned about that.

And so this group is actually, I guess, a much more loosely knit group than the other working groups but it is very important to note that all the communities need to be involved and all the communities need to be aware of what this group is doing. I

---

know Tarek and Nigel are doing a wonderful job but it is the support of the community that they need in order to perform even better, so I think that's the general purpose of this group, but we do need some kind of a structure for this. Thank you.

STEFANIA MILAN:

Partially addressing Bill's concerns, I see where your concerns are coming from, but I wish to actually congratulate the people that drafted this document because it reflects, I mean, responds quite nicely to the pushback also within the GNSO Council about the entire operation on the ground that we didn't have enough deliverables, enough metrics, enough success and impact, right? So, actually, I think this is a good starting point. If anything, I probably would even like to see more deliverables.

Why am I saying this? I mean, maybe you have more clear timeline, which simply silences certain critics, but allows for the flexibility that you're talking about, so we need a special discussion. We might want to fit in the process and the requirements of the community, a community there is more and more concern about metrics and deliverables. And then you still keep a space open.



---

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Let me speak as a member of the CCWG IG first. So, I think Bill actually makes a really interesting point but I think it's something in between the two. Right? I think what we've been striving for is a mechanism that would provide a certainty to the SOs and ACs but at the same time, I very much appreciate and agree that there should be some flexibility in that.

One of the problems that we had, unless I'm misinterpreting, was that we were not reporting back to the SOs and ACs on a regular basis, so there's not an understanding of what the CCWG IG was doing, and that caused some concern, and then there was the issue with what authority it speaks when it responds to consultations and things like that. So, I think there is a need for some structure.

Now, building in additional flexibility may be something we should go back and look at, but I agree with Stefania. There needs to be some mechanism by which there's an output, whatever those outputs are, and I think they're listed quite nicely in the rest of the text, as well.

The one thing that just jumps out at me in the specifications that I don't think we've quite captured well enough is that we need to be very explicit about bringing Internet governance issues to the attention of the community because we've had a lot of discussions about how our role is very much as a working group

---

in the past is to inform the community so that they are informed so that they can go do something about it, if they so choose, right? I think that was one of the things that we talked extensively about. So, I think we probably could be a little bit more explicit about that in the specifications.

Now if I can switch hats, so to speak. As an incoming Board member, as you may know, we had an open session on Sunday evening on Internet governance and I covered the new vehicle in that session. The session was done by Markus. What I said at the end of that, just so that everybody's aware, is that there is support for continued engagement by the community on the Internet governance matters, obviously, the support from the Board for this vehicle as it evolves. There's also a sense that it would be good to have a closer interaction with the community and with this vehicle with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance going forward in some form or another will yet to be defined, although there are some elements sort of been written into the document here.

And also, one thing I think that we need to think about is how we build something that allows for the community to bring issues into the working group or whatever it is. In other words, we should encourage a two-way flow. It's not just the working group going out to the community and saying, "Hey, pay attention to this," but there should be a mechanism so that we

---

encourage that inflow of information and issues that arise and concerns that arise. Thanks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you, Rafik. I want also talk on the same direction that Matthew has been talking with the hat of the CCWG IG member responding to what Bill has said. Bill, what you have said is a pragmatic approach and this reflects the reality, that too, but we need some structure because with the new Bylaws, with the Empowered Communities on a midterm basis maybe not now or next fiscal year but afterwards, with the new strategy plan, we are godfathered now with the current strategy plan of what we are doing. But we could be faced in one or two years on the midterm where is the mandate from the community for ICANN Org to work on IG issues, from the SOs and ACs, and this could become then an issue in terms of provision of resources, availability, and even participation in events. And so beside having a pragmatic approach of discussing issues that we are already doing, we can easily take forward, we need some flexible structure using the words of Matthew has said, to provide us with the safeguard as such on the midterm because I honestly could see it coming in one year or in one and a half years from different community members and different constituencies if we don't cover ourselves with that. Thank you.

---

**RAFIK DAMMAK:** Okay, so I was reminded by Olivier that we are running over time, so please make your comments quick and also understand that Markus wants to say something.

**MARKUS KUMMER:** I have to leave for another meeting, so allow me just to say a few words of thank you, it was a pleasure working with you guys and I know we are in safe hands with Matthew as my successor for Board Working Group, so I'm sure the excellent cooperation will continue. But as this is my last time with you, I'll take this opportunity to say goodbye and thank you. And I'm sure we'll meet in other fora, maybe next time in Geneva at the IGF. Thanks.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** And Markus, as you know, we're going to lose one of our members going to the Board but, perhaps, we can count you as a new member. You're very welcome. Please, yeah, just finish off your section. We're late because of you. No, I'm kidding. And we'll have to close soon.

---

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. [inaudible]. So, we have Wolfgang and Bill. Please just make a short intervention. Thanks.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: I think Tarek's statements made a lot of sense but we should keep it as simple as possible and exactly what Tarek said. We have to create a legitimacy for the ongoing work and that's it. Do not overload it with a lot of structures and mission statements and things like that. It's so simple and nothing to add to it, Tarek.

BILL DRAKE: So, I was not arguing against a structure. I was only saying that if you have to have an SO/AC chartered activity and you tell them that we're going to be adopting statements, then people are going to respond to the structure, the vehicle, the platform in a particular way and I don't really think that we need to be doing those statements and telling people that we may be doing those statements because it arouses their interest and opposition, so that's why I was trying to say something more flexible.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Bill, and Wolfgang, I think we can take all those comments and try to see how we can adjust on the specification and continue the work anyway. So, over to Olivier.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thanks, Rafik. I had to actually put my card up to comment on that section, but we've kind of run out of time, so we'll discuss this afterwards.

Any Other Business? Veni Markovski.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Thanks. Actually, if you are in the chat room, there were a couple of comments. If you can just take a look at maybe respond to the people because they took the effort to participate remotely. I can put it up on the screen but, apparently, when I pull it up on the screen, everybody sees it so it becomes too big. Can [inaudible]?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Could you just read through them, please? Yeah, if you could be our remote participation moderator, that would be great.

VENI MARKOVSKI: First of all, Lori Schulman said on the IGF that the International Trade Association is actually sending people to the IGF, so they pay attention to the IGF. It's not only [inaudible] and stuff.

And secondly, we had a question from Abdeldjalil Bachar Bong who says whether we have some capacity building session and

---

whether we are working on inside ICANN ecosystem of also outside. I try to clarify the first question and he says that whether there are some online courses about CCWG IG that they can learn a lot from.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: No online courses yet. There is ICANN Learn and I think is there a course? There might be a course participating in Internet governance that... Adam Peake.

ADAM PEAKE: Yeah, apologies. Adam Peak, ICANN staff. Yes, ICANN Learn does have some Internet governance courses and I believe it has a link to a video from gentleman to my right, two to my right, Wolfgang, so I think you'll find yourselves speaking on that. Wolfgang. Yes, there are courses on ICANN Learn.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And that's learn.icann.org. Any Other Business? Okay, well thanks very much, everyone, for being here for this hour. It's been a bit short. We've got a different process, hopefully, for the next meeting to get a slightly longer amount of time. That's also something that's being discussed with the Chairs of SOs and ACs, SGCs, etc. But thanks, everyone, and see you tomorrow in the open public forum that we'll have. Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: This isn't important but just to say that the IGF session of the Cross-Community Working Group in Geneva in December is on December the 19<sup>th</sup>, which is the Tuesday from 9:00 to 10:30 – 90 minutes.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much. This meeting is adjourned. Have a good day.

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**