SAN JUAN – CCWG-IG Meeting
Thursday, March 15, 2018 – 12:00 to 13:30 AST
ICANN61 | San Juan, Puerto Rico

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, everyone. We'll start in a couple of minutes while people arrive in the room. I understand this is a back-to-back session with the other sessions so people are just making their way down.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. This is the ICANN61 CCWG-IG Meeting on the 15th of March, 2018 from 12:00 to 1:30 p.m. in Room 102-ABC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We'll just start in a minute's time just to get organized. Thank you.

All right. Good afternoon, everyone. This is a meeting of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance. It's our face-to-face meeting at ICANN61 in San Juan, Puerto Rico.

Today, we have an agenda that reads out as follows, and I do apologize of course for the lack of Adobe Connect but I believe that we have people following us on the streaming. The agenda is on our wiki. It starts with a welcome. We'll then have

discussions with the Chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance, Matthew Shears. Immediately after that, we'll have a discussion on the feedback received from the chartering organizations on the new Cross-Community Engagement Group on Internet Governance new vehicle. After that, we will be looking at the planning for the WSIS Forum activities in 2018. And finally, a brief look ahead to the main activities and issues in the Internet governance space.

Are there any additions to the agenda or amendments that anybody would like to make to the agenda? Okay. So, Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Olivier. I would like to add under AOB a discussion about the ICANN budget and a specific discussion related to the IG-related activities because – and I'll just say why – I'm hearing a lot of statements in the hallway that are speculative sometimes because people haven't a thorough understanding of the budget and sometimes because they don't have a thorough understanding of the purpose of a particular external organization.

So, we can do that someplace else but I think it's really important to have and I would like us to – and I'd be happy to

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

say a few words at that time about the distinct independence of this group – maybe Matthew will say that – the distinct independence of this group generating budget impact.

OLIVIER CREPLAN LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Marilyn. Would you wish to put this in AOB or perhaps we could have this as part of our discussion with Matthew Shears?

MARILYN CADE: Fantastic.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I think that could probably be incorporated in this. Okay, thank you. Christopher Wilkinson.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Thank you, Olivier. I am not proposing additional discussion for today but for future reference, I would like to put the question of geographical names on the agenda of this group because I think there will be interactions between ICANN and other fora dealing with this question and particularly, since Work Track 5 yesterday got this subject well underway, I think in the near future we will have something to discuss. Thank you.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Christopher. I think perhaps if you could make this as a written request to the group for future consideration. I'm not sure whether it falls within the remit of this group or not and this is one of the reasons why because I don't think we've ever discussed geographical regions in this group so far.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Well, you had it on the agenda without a discussion at the previous meeting earlier this week so I thought it might be appropriate.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Christopher. Right. So, framing it as input or discussions taking place outside of this working group regarding geographical regions. Okay. That will be noted. If we can have this, Nigel, please, as an agenda item.

Well, we're not going to take time to introduce everyone around the table but I just want to acknowledge that Young-eum Lee is with us. At present, she's the Co-Chair of this group from the ccNSO and I believe that Rafik might be late or delayed. He has a number of other engagements at the same time.

I don't see any other hands up to amend the agenda so let's then proceed swiftly to the discussion with the Board Working Group on Internet Governance actually with the Chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance. Matthew, you have the floor.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Olivier. So maybe just before we have a discussion, let me just run through where we are on the Board Working Group on Internet Governance and what our latest meetings have been about and where it's leading us.

So, members of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance met informally in Geneva in the around the IGF to think about how we can make the Board Working Group on Internet Governance work and focus more future-oriented.

And out of that meeting came four pieces of guidance that we agreed on an informal basis which was that we would refocus the Board Working Group on more strategic policy and governance issues, that we would work more closely with government engagement and MSSI to more fully integrate the trends work and policy work and really take a more strategic and forward-looking approach.

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

The third point was that we would continue to build a relationship with the CCWG or its successor structure.

And the fourth point was to ensure that that board had a more fuller perspective on what was happening in the policy in Internet governance space and less of a focus on talking about particular events and how they would be followed, and taking more of a thematic approach if I will.

So, I think this is a general recognition of the need for the board to be more aware of what the policy horizon looks like and to be more aware of what critical issues are we may be facing tomorrow or three or four or five years out.

So, we met during the Board workshop here and worked some more on understanding what that might mean. We had presentations from Theresa Swinehart in MSSI on the trends work that they've been doing. There are some very good synergies between the trends work that's underway which is really more about the full horizon and the various policy focus of the work that she's doing. So that will be integrated into the work of the Board Working Group.

We also had an overview – and maybe Nigel can touch on these – we had an overview of government engagements priorities for 2018. And we talked a little bit about or had an update on, I

should say, on the new vehicle and where that stood. Then we worked through the events for 2018 where we anticipate there might be need for board's support or board engagement.

So we're really, I would say, trying to reorient the Board Working Group. We're still in early stages. But I think the utility of that – and it's an important issue for the CCWG – is really to be less surprised, shall we say, by policy issues that are coming that we should be more aware of and hopefully we'll be better prepared for those as we face them.

The reason why this is important for the CCWG is that we very much see the CCWG or its successor vehicle as being one of those information points feeding into the board what the community sees as the policy challenges and the governance challenges and the opportunities going forward. So there's a real interest in the Board Working Group to see the vehicle continue whatever its format may be because we see the flow of information from that vehicle or we'd encourage a flow of information from that vehicle to the board in terms of what the community is seeing as the priorities going forward.

Olivier, I think I'll stop there and turn it back over to you. I just wanted to give everybody an update as to where we are in our internal deliberations. And I should say that we will be having a

public session of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance in Panama. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Matthew. I now open the floor for comments and questions. First, we have Marilyn Cade. Who starts? Jim?

JIM PRENDERGAST: Ladies first, if you like, Marilyn. Or you're going to take us on a trip? Mine will be shorter.

MARILYN CADE: Yes.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Matthew, on that public session of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance, is that going to be one of those maybe Adobe observation-only or is it actually going to be a meeting in a room like this where people will be there?

MATTHEW SHEARS: No. I'll have to look to Nigel and try to confirm that but I would certainly hope it'll be open for discussion. Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: I'm going to ask a follow-up question that's related. Are you planning this as a town hall listening session or kicking it off with actually trying to provide some information about the purpose of the Board Working Group and the areas of focus so far, because I'll just comment, Matthew, that as you well know and as the people in this room know of the probably 1600 to 1700 people who we've had here in Puerto Rico, I would say probably 15% are really steeped in understanding the implications of Internet governance on ICANN.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Marilyn. It's a great question. I think we have both the CCWG and the Board Working Group have a collective responsibility to inform the community and communicate more clearly why Internet governance is important. And so, I would fully anticipate that whether it is a town hall or whether it's a presentation by the board on where we are and what the issues

we're looking at, we will try to do so in a way that does address that particular issue. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Matthew. Next is Rafik Dammak.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thanks, Olivier. Just I want to make this one intervention because first, I have to leave to go to another session wearing a different hat. And so, regarding the updates for the third agenda item that will be done by Tatiana as she is the GNSO liaison to the Cross-Community Working Group. Yes. That's it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Any comment on Matthew's report?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes. So, I think it's good to see the support from the Board Working Group and also the clarification about what they are expecting but regardless what kind of vehicle we will end up. So I think that will help and also and the GNSO to understand more, we got several question during yesterday session. And I think we would need the staff and also the board help to get answer to them because it's related to what kind of engagement ICANN

has in the Internet governance space and also, in particular, the cost and budget.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Rafik. Any other questions?

Okay. So, I have questions. And that's based on what Marilyn has alluded to earlier in any other business, the budget, in fact, this has just been touched on also by Rafik. When it comes down to the budgets, does the Board Working Group on Internet Governance have any incidents on the allocation of the budget that goes over to Internet governance activities that ICANN undertakes? That's in the wider sense. And also when it comes down to internal Internet governance activities, how is that related and do you have any figures that you might know off the top of your mind?

And I'm sorry you're probably not prepared because we didn't have this on the agenda but if you do have any information, that would be helpful.

MATTHEW SHEARS: You know, Olivier, it's a great question. And as you guessed, I don't have any figures on top of mind but I'll certainly come back to you with a sense of that. Just to follow-up on what Rafik

said and I think this is something that maybe Nigel and others can confirm. From what I understand with regards to the CCEG that the budget, there is really no funding that's going towards funding people to go to meetings. And I understand that there is really no budget associated with the CCEG except in so far as its resource allocated from government engagement but I'm sure Nigel can confirm that. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you. Nigel Hickson, Government Engagement. Just to reflect on a couple of things, as Matthew correctly said, we had a good session with the Board Working Group last Friday. We reflected on a number of issues, very similar issues to which we reflected on in the Cross-Community Working Group session on Internet Governance early this week about the general themes of Internet policy issues that are emerging and how they affect ICANN whether they be to do with cybersecurity or data protection or other technological or business developments that affect ICANN such as 5G, etc.

We also reflected on some of the opportunities and some of the obligations that ICANN has in relation to the so-called third

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

[inaudible] of engagement which we have discussed in this group before whether our particular issues come up on agendas, whether those issues come up on agenda at the World Economic Forum or the WTO or all the GSMA, the World Mobile Conference. And these issues come up in different places as we have reflected on.

On the budgetary situation, there has been some dialogue in recent weeks on this. And I think it's important to clarify two aspects, if you like, for the record. First of all, the Cross-Community Working Group does not have a budget. As we have indicated in our reports of the activities of the Cross-Community Working Group, various community members from the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance have attended IGFs, they have attended WSIS Forums, etc. but they have done so either under their own steam, so to speak, or with funding from CROP or other vehicles. There hasn't been funding within the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance as such.

The Cross-Community Working Group is supported by ICANN staff and specifically within the Government Engagement team by Point 1 of a fulltime post of an assistant that's based in Diseri who's based in Los Angeles. She provides support for the wiki of

the Cross-Community Working Group and for managing the calls. And that's about 10% of her time.

And then there's my time which is probably between .1 and .15 of an FTE of my time in terms of my government engagement work. And that's it. Obviously, Tarek Kamal, as the Senior Advisor to the President in Government Engagement, has a role as well and other members of our team such as [Laurent] here, obviously, is engaged as well as I'm not pretending that no one touches this, if you like, but that is a fairly limited sway and there are no other monies. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. Matthew Shears.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes, thanks, Nigel. Actually, it might be useful just to say a word about for example, as a board member, I get a limited number of travel slots which allow me to participate in, for example, in my capacity as the Chair of the Board Working Group, to participate in Internet governance or Internet policy set of events or processes or whatever they may be.

And then there can be requests that come from the organization if they feel there's an appropriate opportunity or an important

opportunity that myself or other board members should be present at. But obviously that goes through a very rigorous process within the board to ensure that it's the right use of the board member's time. So that's just to give you another aspect of how resources are allocated to Internet governance matters and for that matter, for many other issues, of course, Internet governance is only one of the subject areas that a board member may travel for. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Matthew. Just a question to Nigel for any avoidance of doubt, there is no link between CROP additional budget funding, any of the travel programs that take place to send people to IGF or that ICANN does in maybe sponsoring IGF and things and the Cross-Community Working Group itself.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, absolutely. That's absolutely correct.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE:	Thank you. I think it's a really good idea we moved the discussion up to this stage. Well, we have Matthew and we're talking about the Board Working Group as well as the CCWG-IG and its successor.

I am on the Budget Working Group at the Business Constituency and along with two other members do a thorough analysis of ICANN's entire budget. And some of you have had to see me in three budget meetings over the past couple of days so you know that in fact, you've heard me say that we do a very thorough analysis of the budget.

But I think we have to be pragmatic that while there is no direct link, there is certainly a perception that some members of the ICANN community have that events that are requested to the special budget projects or that CROP is being used for also advancing travel that is related to Internet governance. And there is confusion, I think, since not everybody is able to study the budget as well or does not understand the external risk and threats issues that ICANN, the organization and the community are trying to deal with.

And so, they're confusing the fact that people that they see working within ICANN are also appearing in some of these Internet governance events and they are assuming that if they applied for special project – I'll give an example – to do a Day

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM
61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

Zero event at an IGF or a workshop at the WSIS Forum. They're assuming that that is being driven somehow by this working group.

Now, we know it's not because we're in the working group. And I know it's not because I can recite certain pages of the budget to you but I think we have to be thinking about actually preparing a statement that clarifies. And I say that because I've seen a distinct list of questions that's been publicly posted about – I'm just going to call it speculation. I was going to use the word suspicion but that's so unkind of me. The speculation that perhaps there is some sort of driving pressure coming out of this group.

So I want to put that on our agenda to think about as a work item not so much obviously here but for us to think about it and think about this as we need a communication that is clear.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Marilyn. Do you have a copy of that list? I've never seen it, that list that is circulating. Or is this circulating in the corridors of ICANN, the dark corridors of ICANN?

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

MARILYN CADE:	It was circulating in the corridors by people coming up and asking me questions and I told them that if they had questions, they needed to put them in writing and post them publicly because otherwise, it would be sort of a rumor mail. So as soon as I see it on a public list, I will post it to the group but I need to wait for it to be posted to a public list.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Yes, thank you, Marilyn. What it might say is if the questions are being asked, one could always put together an FAQ document, Frequently Asked Questions document perhaps. Young-eum Lee and then afterwards, we'll have Jim Prendergast. Young-eum, you have the floor.
YOUNG-EUM LEE:	Thank you. I specifically am glad that this issue is also being raised because during the joint session of the GNSO and ccNSO Council, this was their biggest concern. And I was wondering why. I thought this was all understood but apparently, it was only within this group that that was understood and I didn't understand why they would bring it up as such a big issue because it has never been one of our topics or whatever. So, thank you.

ICANN
COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Young-eum. There was a request for clarification from John Laprise. Perhaps, if it's okay, John, if it's just specifically on this point, please, John Laprise.

JOHN LAPRISE: So the meeting you referred to, which group was that coming from? Okay. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Joint meeting of the GNSO and ccNSO Councils. Okay. Jim Prendergast.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Yes. Marilyn, maybe instead of FAQ, it could be a Frequently Cited Suspicions. If I could just clarify what you said, Marilyn, and just use some examples. Tell me if I get this right. There's a misunderstanding in the community that when they see the extraordinary budget request from groups within the ALAC and the SSAC and others that ask for funding and the BC that ask for funding contingent upon a workshop being approved at the IGF, they think that's being driven by this group here?

MARILYN CADE: Yes. Or that ICANN is funding travel, for instance, this group is doing a workshop on Monday. ICANN is not directly funding it. We're drawing people who are there funded for a different purpose. I'm going to do a business outreach event for instance with International Rotary. I am at the WSIS Forum to do something else so I'm available to participate in the workshop.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. You mentioned ICANN is not directly funding this. I don't think it's funding this indirectly either. I think it's not funding any of it. None of the members that are there are funded by ICANN for this workshop, if I understand correctly.

MARILYN CADE: But I think we need to be clear in our explanation. The special projects funding, the application may have been about the Internet governance issue and the interest of people to talk about an issue that is also very relevant to ICANN. But this working group is not driving. Yes.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. In the queue, I have Matthew Shears and then Greg Shatan. Matthew.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes. And in the interest of total transparency about the WSIS event on Monday, I have been asked to go and participate in the workshop. So there is a consequent financial issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Matthew. Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. I think a lot of this comes down to communication which has not been our strong suit. And I think we've talked in the past about trying to have some more regular outward communications. Of course that's something that requires sustained effort and maybe even a little more support. But without communication, suspicion, innuendo, insinuation tends to rush in to fill the vacuum.

I'm not sure what the genesis of this is but it really doesn't matter anymore. It's become like a bit of a virus. It's hard to kill or like Kudzu if you're from the South, which I'm not. So we need to get stuff out there. We should be communicating whatever schedule we thought we should be doing, once a month, once every two months. We need to respond very specifically to the questions that we're asked, even get list of the secret questions or we're going to be judged on what other people know about us. And if we don't tell them what they know about us, then

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

they'll hear it from people who don't know what they're talking about. And that seems to be what's happening.

It's unfortunate but I think we've run ourselves a little too much but like a fight club, that the first rule fight club is no one talks about fight club. And we've kept as much information as possible out of the hands of anybody else at ICANN about what we're doing in here which is exactly the opportunity of what we should be doing.

And at one point, before the last IG Meeting here, somebody called this Rafik's little group and then I walked in here and every seat is filled from front to back. And Rafik's not here either but in any case. So, clearly, it's Olivier's big group now or maybe it's Tatiana's but in any case.

One last point is that I think that this point's at the critical nature too of the GNSO liaison from this group or to this group. Hopefully, you can find some way to use that as another channel to keep things open. And is Rafik the liaison or am I mistaken? Tatiana?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Rafik is the Co-Chair. Tatiana is the liaison.

GREG SHATAN: Okay. Well, I don't mean to give you an assignment, Tatiana, but I think you can very much help us understand or build the bridges of understanding because we've become this suspicious organization. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Greg. Tatiana, do you wish to comment?

TATIANA TROPINA: Well, I think that preferably it builds the bridge later to the Agenda Item #3 where I'm supposed to provide an update where I will talk about this as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you. Young-eum Lee.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Well, Marilyn just noted that Tatiana's role is a new role that I think is really needed at this point in time for this group and we are very appreciative of that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Young-eum. Just before you speak, Jim, I'm a little concerned about the comments that Greg made on

the lack of communication. The working group has sent a complete document at the end of last year about its yearly activities. It was, I thought, quite extensive, it provided full details of its activities and it also addressed the question of how many staff members and how many resources were allocated to it, yet we keep on hearing the same questions.

I also recall – and we might wish to check the transcripts or not – but addressing the GNSO Council with Rafik Dammak and answering questions especially on the topic of costs and of funding and providing exactly the same answers as what's been said here.

So either there's been a complete change of all the people on the council and the new councilors have not got that information and then yes, we do need to do a lot more to engage with them or there are some short memories. I don't know. I can't explain it. Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN: I was somewhat surprised too that questions came back that I thought have been asked and answered. And I think there is a problem of somewhat of institutional memory and somewhat of communication. I think if we're only sending out an annual report, that probably leaves a lot of time in between, a year, as a

matter of fact. We really should think about shorter, more relevant communications that are about things that are actually happening. And I think we also do need to point out – maybe you need to answer the questions repeatedly. It's just unfortunate part of human nature.

But to be honest too, Rafik didn't really have a really robust answer when asked by one of the councilors about what the expenditures were. I stood up and clarified further but it's still, based on what I've heard now, was not complete. Really, Nigel holds probably the biggest set of keys to that particular information. So, I think it goes back to the idea of an FAQ and maybe we need to send it to GNSO Council every month even if it's the same stuff. Obviously, everyone's drinking from the fire hose and it's much easier sometimes to remember old lies than new truths.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Greg. Of course there's a conflict for us with more reporting as drafted by staff which were therefore drive up the staffing resources that would be required to report more and at the same time keeping a very lean group that doesn't have much impact on ICANN finances.

Greg, you wanted to quickly and then I'll go around to –

GREG SHATAN: I just think we need to come up with communication strategy that isn't just staff draft stuff, whatever it might be. We have a number of members here. Several have been known to put pen to paper virtually in many ways over the years. Short is better anyway. So, I think we need to come up with something where the group generates communications because in essence, that is a significant part of the role of the group, is to communicate and if we can't, then we actually do have a problem.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Greg. So, I've got Jim Kalvin, I've got Young-eum Lee and we have Matthew Shears as well. So, let's start with Jim please.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Okay, thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Or Jim Prendergast. Did I say Jim Kelvin? I said that, yes. Scratch it.

JIM PRENDERGAST:	It's so late in the week. I'll answer that. I can take it at this point. So, ICANN is a huge organization. And I think where there's misconception and where there's uncertainty and where there may be rumor and innuendo, a healthy dose of transparency might actually help.

And where I'm getting to is when we were in Copenhagen, I believe, I asked Tarek what's the allocated budget of the ICANN support for IGFs around the world including the big one. And the response surprised me and I don't have a problem with it but it was that folks within the global stakeholder engagement division actually have check-writing authority to support local and regional NRIs at their own discretion.

So, that's one source of funding in the space that people may be confusing with what this group is doing. Are they also funding people to attend those national and regional NRIs or the big IGF in Geneva or any of the other ones? If we could get a little bit of more transparency around the whole pot of IG spend and where it's coming out of, I think that helps this group in demonstrating that we're not the source of those funds, we're not the drain on those resources, they're elsewhere in the community. If you got a problem, go talk to them. Don't pin it on us because it's not us.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jim. So, Young-eum, then we'll have Matthew and then Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: Actually, I'm going to ask to jump the queue because I can answer part of this if you don't mind.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If it's directly related, go ahead, Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: It's directly related. I know how much money ICANN spends on the support to the IGF and how much money ICANN devotes to the NRIs because of my very deep involvement with the NRIs. But I took the microphone and I'm happy to come back to Nigel and perhaps we can talk to Tarek about pointing out what that's related to, but I'm going to give you an example because I'm directly involved with many of them.

The financial contribution that I sometimes even encourage the NRIs to ask ICANN for is always accompanied by a request for a speaker from ICANN to talk about something that is going to help the community help ICANN. So here's an example. $1500 to sponsor a national three-day IGF and an opportunity for ICANN to speak about DNSSEC and to provide a security speaker. So, to

me – and by the way, that was done remotely, so the speakers were remotely.

So I think maybe, again, Jim, we can think about how do we go back with specific questions to ICANN but I think there's some misunderstanding also about, is ICANN supporting the NRI or is ICANN using the NRI to reach a much needed technical community that otherwise, they can't reach. And I have multiple examples which I won't give but that's one comment I wanted to make.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. No, Siva, we have to go back to the queue, please. So let's go to Young-eum and then we'll have Matthew Shears and then Siva. And I think we'll have to close after that because you probably have to run off or maybe we can move a bit further if there's anything else more than the budget. So Young-eum Lee.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Thank you, Olivier. I was actually going to talk about something else but directly related with what Marilyn was just saying. Korea now has been organizing IGFs and ICANN people, for the past one or two years, have been there to talk about ICANN and

introduce ICANN. So that's a very clear example of ICANN using the local efforts to introduce ICANN to the community.

The topic that I was going to talk about was that I think thinking about the yearly reports, if you look at the report, it seems that this group has been involved in so many things. And it was such a comprehensive list that it actually created this suspicion of how do they do all this? Within that report, a clear statement about the fact that we have not been actually supporting all of these needs to be included and we should just note that these are the activities that we are following. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Young-eum. That's a very good point that you're making. So if I actually take still Siva for one more comment and then you can comment on all of the things that you've heard about. I see you're taking notes. So, Sivasubramanian.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Yes. Sivasubramanian from ISOC [inaudible] ALS. I just wanted to quickly agree with Marilyn Cade for saying that this contribution from ICANN should be unconditional. What about the IG that happens in the broader interest of the Internet and it's ICANN's responsibility to make sure that it's well supported.

Then pay $1500 and then insist on a speaker slot and then spend $10,000 to send the staff member to make use of that opportunity. You could instead give $11,500 to IGF. And the participants take care of all the good will for ICANN, so I think this should be unconditional. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Siva. And back to you, Matthew Shears.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Olivier. So follow up on Greg's suggestion, I think that's absolutely right. I think we need a very, very basic fact. And I think that you could limit it to three or four questions and they would be in my mind if you try to think about what's the big concerns that had been raised. They are: one, why do we need this, right? Two, you could add in that where has it had an impact? Because I think that's something that we have to demonstrate. Three, what will it cost? And four, importantly because I think there's still a lot of confusion, how does it differ from a CCWG? If it's a CCEG, right? I mean, if you just have a one page of it addresses those four questions, I think you'll put to rest a lot of these concerns or probably the bulk of the concerns and well maybe the other ones.

ICANN COMMUNITY FORUM 61
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

On the budget, great question. I work with Nigel. We'll see what we can generate and Marilyn obviously done a significant amount of work in identifying where some of these funding comes from, but it's a great question. Hopefully, we'll be able to get a little bit more clarity on that.

I really want us, as a community, to move beyond these process vehicle questions. We really do need to start talking about substance. We need to start talking about threats and opportunities and how we're going to address some – as a community, that's the community, the CCWG or whatever it is, and the Board Working Group, working in tandem, I think there's great opportunity there. So we really have to get over this hump as soon as we can. We've got a number of things we have to deal with on the horizon which we talked about on Monday, so let's move forward. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this. Yes, please.

TAYLOR BENTLEY: Hi. My name is Taylor Bentley. I'm from the Government of Canada. I just want to go back to what you were mentioning, where some of the subjects in the agenda items that you would discussed. So specifically on the prioritization of government

ICANN 61
COMMUNITY FORUM
SAN JUAN
10–15 March 2018

engagement. I'm just wondering if you could add some more substance as to what's discussed, opportunities and specific issues that you were hoping to, I guess, address or objectives. So thanks.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes, so we did two things. We went through kind of the immediate priorities and then we looked at the year as a whole. I think what we're trying to do is move a little bit beyond what we tend to refer of as Internet governance and move more into policy issues as well. And I know it's hard to differentiate them but we tend to talk about Internet governance, we tend to get focused on events. And what we're trying to do is to move to a thematic approach. And Nigel referred to a couple of those things that we're interested in. One of which, of course, is cybersecurity and the threats to ICANN and the DNS which of course is top of mind for many.

The implications of policy issues that will affect us where they may have a regional – they may be orient from a regional perspective, they may have global impacts, so the perfect example is the GDPR. We need to become more aware so that we're not quite as surprised. Even though people have been talking about GDPR for a long time in the community, we need to, I believe, from a policy perspective, be more aware of what's

coming down the road towards us. So that's very much the focus of the Board Working Group is trying to identify what those opportunities and threats will be in the future.

And then we walked through – and Nigel touched one of it. He can go into it in more detail in terms of what the priorities are for government engagements for 2018. Obviously a big one there is IT [a plenty] part and there'll be other ones on the road. I mean, there's a [inaudible] for cybersecurity.

I think the important thing certainly from my perspective is let's look at these things from a thematic perspective. What issue areas are critical to ICANN? And let's understand how we engage on them rather than just saying, "Well, we got to list of things we need to do," but there may not be that continuity throughout, which I think we really need to boil down. Those are the priorities that we need to work on.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Matthew. Any other comments or questions on this? Did you want to build on this, Nigel or –

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you, Olivier. First, we could do it under Item 4, if that's okay with you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, that's what I was thinking somehow. I was just going to ask one thing with regards to your planning. Of course, we have a public meeting on Monday and there we really stuck to many of the topics. And we actually did in a thematic way, I guess. Will the Board Working Group be taking this in as well with the discussions that took place there? I know that you were insisting not to actually be a panelist per se.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Well, I mean it's very important. Knowing that we have these sessions, it's very important for me to listen and really taking on. So, yes absolutely. So the discussion that comes out of the session on Monday informs us as to the inputs from global engagement and other sources as well.

So I think the first time that we'll be able to really demonstrate the accumulation of that knowledge will be in Panama. When we have this public session, we can give a clear indication of what we're looking on. I don't think a lot of it will come as much of a surprise but I think you'll see that the approach is slightly different where we're weaving in the trends work and other things.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Matthew. And it's worth noting that the CCWG-IG or EEG or whatever will be by then, we'll find out soon, will not have a public session in Panama. So having the Board Working Group and Internet Governance session is particularly welcome. Jim Prendergast.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Yeah. Matthew, to take you up on your point about this group borrowing a phrase from the SSAC being a sentinel for emerging issues. Has anybody in this room actually been contacted by MSSI on their trends work about what's happening in Internet governance? Marilyn?

MARILYN CADE: I think they're working on what's happening overall on trends and risk, right?

JIM PRENDERGAST: Right. But specific on Internet governance issues, so might be beneficial to have them sit or at least listen.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Matthew Shears.

MARILYN CADE: [Inaudible] clarifying question.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I got three people only two ears, so I can have two of you speak at the same time. Let's start with Matthew please.

MATTHEW SHEARS: It's a great question, yes. Teresa's work is more broad, and so it's strategic threats and opportunities horizon scanning. What I've asked her to do when she comes to the Board Working Group is to focus in on the policy issues within that framework that she is rolling out. And, yes, it's on that point. It's incredibly important that she is approaching everyone through the various SO and ACs, and so it's incredibly important that you have the opportunity and should participate in that because that will inform us strategic planning overall for ICANN. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. And Marilyn, you wanted to mention something?

MARILYN CADE: Well, I did. But it's related to Jim's question. Yesterday, Jim in the Budget Working Group, [Natalie] was – who works with Teresa – was presenting the approach that they're taking in gathering the input. And I raised this question with her as well.

Because I do think there's a – and I'm satisfied with Teresa's response back to me. We had to check in with her today. I was additionally very concerned that since the sessions were only face to face that we might actually miss a lot of input from the Global South or other groups who may not have had the time here or in Panama.

My suggestion to [Natalie] and then with Teresa today was that there would be a step of allowing the group who had a session to send it back out to their broader constituency or membership to make sure that other comments could come back in. Because I think particularly with the policy forum, I feel concerned that there'll be a number of people who don't come to the Panama meeting.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Marilyn. I don't see any further hands around the table and we've spent a lot more time than originally allocated for the discussion with the Board Working Group. But it was a good and sustained discussion and that means we'll have to go a little faster for the next three topics that we have on our agenda.

So the next one is, of course, the discussion on the feedback received from the different charter or organization, the GNSO, ccNSO, and ALAC on the proposed Cross-Community

Engagement Group on Internet Governance. As you know, small group has put together a new charter that was broadly based on the previous charter but with some points being modified so as to a new vehicle as such. Cross-Community Engagement Group is not a defined term from previous discussions with the GNSO Council. The concern was that a Cross-Community Working Group is a defined term now. And so the contents didn't quite fit the box that they were in.

Anyway, the work was undertaken. The new proposed charter was sent to different chartering organizations. And I guess, we can start with our liaison to Generic Names Supporting Organizations since they were the chartering organization that actually asked for this work to take place. And so, I open the floor for Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Olivier. Hi, everyone. So what happened during the GNSO Council meeting, Rafik who was the Co-Chair of this group presented the new charter draft. And as you know, the GNSO plan to withdraw the chartering organization at the end of this meeting. And basically that's what GNSO is going to do. But there was a suggestion to immediately re-charter this Cross-Community Engagement Working Group.

But then, we decided although that was a very good suggestion, I think that it would be better to have some conversation with ccNSO first to see where we are aligned on this. But I believe that those members of GNSO who actually started this discussion about CCWG, not being a proper vehicle for carrying out this work and for the necessity to adopt a new charter and for GNSO to withdraw and re-charter.

They were actually very positive towards the work of this group and what we are doing. And the point was only like the CCWG is not a proper vehicle. But other than that, we do support. As to the budget, there is no secret in those discussions. They're not gossips. If you go to the GNSO Council mailing list, you will see that there is a request from a couple GNSO Councilors to see what kind of budget this group has. And what I see here is it wasn't only about how much of FTE and financial support is spent on the course. But can anyone tell me does this group really pay the external consultant to draft the report?

So, yes, this issue was raised on the GNSO Council mailing list that according to the mailing list of this group, there is a payment to external consultant to write the report. And unfortunately, I cannot answer this anyhow because I [wasn't informed] this when the report was being drafted and submitted.

So there are some issues coming up. Maybe there is some sort of misunderstanding. The another issue which was raised but I believe that the group is saved here in terms of finance and that some of the reports were sent from [Colin] and so on were shared in the mailing list. And the issue was, is ICANN paying for access to some resources which are under payroll or the group members? So some of the documents shared on the mailing list, they are under the payroll. So when you have to pay to access certain library so databases and so on, when someone sends them.

So the question was –

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, exactly. Exactly. I'm sorry. So the question was if ICANN is paying for this? I believe that this is an easy question to answer. But the report… Was the report written by a private consultant and is it part of the budget? So I'm giving you the kind of early warning.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tatiana. Nigel, did you wish to answer this now or should we provide…? I am aware. We were transparent. I'm aware there is a consultant that wrote this report. I hope that they were paid because I wouldn't condone any other type of things that this… But…

TATIANA TROPINA: So I believe that if there is an issue – I mean if the question about the budget is asked, this group is better to make a list of all items, include the consultant, include any expenses you may think about that happened before. Otherwise, it's a bit damaging. Even a small item might be damaging within the context of the budget discussions. Oh my God. They said that they are only requiring financial support to carry out the calls, but they are paying a private consultant for report.

So that's just for you guys to know that maybe you better to consider something that you have forgotten. I don't believe that this is much money but… yeah.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah. Thank you very much, Tatiana. I do find this highly unusual, just for the record. As you know, I personally find this rather unusual and furthermore having to justify one zone existence, therefore having to write a report to justify one zone

existence and then being told, "Oh no, but you paid someone to do that," or it costs something is even more highly unusual. But fair enough, I guess, we will be receiving an official request or –

TATIANA TROPINA: I would say that this issue came up on the GNSO mailing list and I know if it will end up with the official request only with a note from – I don't know. Rafik or someone else is saying that it happened or didn't happen.

I mean, for me it's so quite unusual I would say because it's not like this group is flying 100 people business class from one part of the world to another. But this question came up and there is very little ICANN personally do about this.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Jim Prendergast.

JIM PRENDERGAST: I hate that we're back on this topic, Matthew. But I'm going to say one thing and that's it. I bet the GNSO Council catered launch cost multiples of what we paid the consultant to write the report. End of discussion.

TATIANA TROPINA: We had lunch only once. Okay, twice.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Now we're going onto catering, right? I think this is out of the scope of this working group but Marilyn Cade and then we'll have Greg Shatan.

MARILYN CADE: I'm only going one 30-second comment on this and then go on to something of relevance. My 30-second comment is I bet that private dinner that the councilors had cost more as well. So going back to work however, I don't think that's really the point. I think the point I take away from this – and I am sure Tatiana you were probably feeling this way as well. If there are so many questions then it's clear that what we need to do is put the questions in a document and some of us need to spend some time doing a draft. So we can then get back to work on the new approach that is proposed by the Board Working Group, so we can actually do the work that all of us care about. Because last time I looked, I actually have a lot of things I could do with my time.

So let's go back to, we heard this. Can we figure out what we're going to do about it and move on? And what I propose we do about it is – Tatiana, would you mind forwarding the questions from the… Are you on the council list? It's a public list, right?

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes, it's a public list but also I wouldn't say – well, first of all, I can't speak for the council even if I'm a liaison. But nevertheless, the questions are on the public list but this is the start of the discussion. I don't know if council will really ask this information or they were just happy to leave without it. Like saying, "Okay, it's not really a big budget." By the way, council was also paying for council dinner on their own, from our own pockets.

MARILYN CADE: So to conclude my proposal, I think I'll go look at the list and I think just as I will post some of the other questions I received and heard, and let's get a small group together and volunteer to start putting some of the facts. Facts are our friend. Then the rest of us can get – and I'll volunteer to be on both groups – then we can get back to the work.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Marilyn. In technical terms, this could be called the Denial of Service Attack. In political terms, would that be called filibustering? I can't remember. Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN: Thank you. I think the fact that we're back to this again – all based on kind of this feeling, this cloud hanging over our head is really based largely on nothing and slightly I'll say again on lack of communication. I'm reminded of the saying that a lie can go around the world and the time it takes truth to put on its pants, but we ultimately need to put our pants. I do have pants on. I just want to assure you that now. I need to get this out. We need to be crisp, concise, small group.

I was going to suggest that Tatiana and Matthew and I form a small reasonably priced consultancy given our successful drafting in the Human Rights Subgroup of the Accountability Group. I think we'll stick to the usual volunteer model for now. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Matthew.

MARILYN CADE: I was going to [follow] this.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We don't have any budget anyway for that. So Young-eum Lee, let's hear from you regarding the ccNSO Council please. I'm well aware of the time ticking.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Yes, moving onto the response of the ccNSO Council. Actually generally, this wasn't a big topic of discussion for ccNSO. We did an exercise in outlining the things that are of critical importance to the ccNSO and of less importance. And actually this group wasn't selected as one of the criticals or activities of the ccNSO. And that's very understandable because it is not directly related with the ccNSO. But I would like to say that there was no objection or any questions of the [inaudible] that have been raised by the GNSO.

And just because GNSO Council had mentioned that they are going to talk to the ccNSO, I think they will find that the ccNSO generally supports this, the new vehicle. There wasn't – I mean great support but there was no questions or suspicions or whatever within the ccNSO. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Young-Eum. Will the ccNSO withdraw at the end of this meeting from the Cross-Community Working Group?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Actually, that wasn't even a subject to be – I think it was just a general understanding that when this group comes out with the new vehicle that the ccNSO is generally willing to accept.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you. Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN: Just to follow on that last point. Listening to this discussion at the GNSO ccNSO Council appear that – however the ccNSO had handled this in terms of documentation allowed them to be nimble and basically just move from one structure to the next. Whereas the GNSO's [drafting] kind of left them with more of the need to kind of uncharter, re-charter and basically kind of painted themselves in a corner in terms of their parliamentary and formal options. So I think that reflects the relative sense of concern and ccNSO versus GNSO. And I do have to say I think ccNSO got it right in terms of the level of concern, but such is life.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: All right. Thank you very much for this, Greg. I was going to just say one more thing with regards to this process for the ALAC. So the ALAC has considered the new charter and there is, at present, no negative feedback about it. It's been shown to its

members and the ALAC is agreeable on any kind of vehicle that follows the same sort of lines as what we've seen so far with the CCWG or CCEG.

So Matthew Shears has to leave for another engagement but just before that I just wanted to close off on this. If I understand correctly, we should know this afternoon when the GNSO meets up. If it would [inaudible].

TATIANA TROPINA: What exactly would you like to know? No, we withdrew after the meeting yesterday.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's withdrawn, okay.

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes, it's withdrawn.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So the Cross-Community Working Group is now officially of the ALAC and the ccNSO without the GNSO being involved?

TATIANA TROPINA: Yes, exactly. But again I will reiterate that the decision or to re-charter to be a chartering organization for this Cross-Community

Engagement Group, it wasn't made by GNSO officially, right? Because, I mean, there was a proposal from the person who actually suggested to withdraw, to re-charter the next meeting. But then we decided it would be much better if we talk to ccNSO first. But I believe that the attitude is positive, so it's not like we are abandoning this group [and] leaving it as it is.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you. I find this quite incredible. I think we need clarity on these points. Because once we have the agreement from the existing chartering organizations in terms of their approval for the new vehicle, then we have to go to the other chartering organizations. There's many other organizations that we will need to approach in terms of involvement in wider picture.

So I think we need this clarity from the GNSO because I heard in the one breath that they were not withdrawing from the CCWG until further discussions on the new vehicle with the ccNSO. But if that's not the case, then I just think we need this clarity.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. I think that either way, because this group is open for everyone to participate. Those members that are present in the room would not be kicked out in any way possible per se. I'd like to move on as well and let Matthew Shears go, but Greg did you have just like 30-second tweet?

GREG SHATAN: Just another clarification as whether GNSO is no longer chartering this organization, do we no longer have a liaison?

TATIANA TROPINA: Yeah, that was my clarification actually. I'm still liaison, so it's just this time in between, but you can kick me out of this meeting. I would gladly take my plate. It's outside.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Tatiana is still – so she said she's still the liaison. I understand that Rafik has told me that he feels that he's no longer Chair or Co-Chair since the… But we have to obtain clarification on this. Matthew Shears. And I'm sorry to put a plate of food in front of you. I know you have to go.

MATTHEW SHEARS: I know. Yeah, I have to get lunch. No, so we've got to go to set up for the public forum. I just wanted to say, I'm hoping – well

hopeful that maybe we can – this might be the last of these kinds of conversations and the next one we have will actually be – you know, this is a charter. This is what we're doing and this is how we're taking this forward. We really look forward to that and just to say that the Board Working Group is supportive of this initiative, obviously. Otherwise, I wouldn't be here, and we wish you the very best.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Matthew. And let's move onto Agenda Item #4, and that's the planning to June 2018 with an immediate activity that will take place next Monday at the WSIS Forum in Geneva immediately after this week. And that is one of the works that we've done in past years as well. So there is a workshop that is organized by this working group with people traveling entirely by themselves, paid for by themselves.

And I'm going to ask perhaps Nigel to give us some quick rundown on the workshop or should I? I have a copy of the first the WSIS Forum and then we can have a look at the calendar year ahead. So WSIS Forum is a wiki page here in a set of wikis. The final submission for it is a dialog on different cooperation models for approaches to Internet public policy development.

That's based on Action Line 11 and so far, the people listed for this workshop… The moderator will be Marilyn Cade and

Matthew Shears from the ICANN Board is taking part. Nigel Hickson will be there. [Louise Herrell] who is listed on the wiki page unfortunately cannot make it. She'll be in London, I believe. [Joan Akroleska] as well will not be there. Preetam Maloor for Strategy and Policy Adviser for the ITU. Torbjörn Fredriksson, Chief of the ICT Policy Section at UNCTAD, and Changhong Hu from UNESCO.

Nigel just a few words on this please.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you, Olivier. I think Marilyn could cover this but yes, preparations are in place for this. We've also approached some government representatives. So we should have a robust panel. Marilyn sent information out to the panelist, asked them to address certain questions. So we're looking forward to this session with optimism and, yeah, pleasure.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And, Nigel, I actually noticed two more names. It's just a long list. [inaudible] and Tatiana Tropina as well.

NIGEL HICKSON: It's only Tatiana. Yeah, she should have been listed. I do apologize.

TATIANA TROPINA: I'm fine without being mentioned. Yeah, it's okay.

NIGEL HICKSON: I mean you [are on the list]. Wolfgang is unfortunately not able to join us in Geneva next week.

MARILYN CADE: I just want to make a quick comment. [Joan] is not able to join us in person. I invited her to provide her comments in writing. And I have committed that I will read them into the record. She is in literally in flight or she would be participating remotely so that this would be a good workaround. And of course, did I miss this so did you leave our last speaker out of your list? We do have Anja.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I haven't seen the list. Well I've got list which might not be up to date, so forgive me.

MARILYN CADE: I think yours is not up to date because we have Anja Gengo speaking about the NRIs primarily related to what's going on in that space. And I just want to note that it's good to acknowledge

that we have both Anja here is the focal point for the NRI and also Chengetai Masango.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Welcome, Chengetai. Welcome, Anja. Thank you. Any other comments or questions on this workshop? I'm not sure because it takes specifically after the ICANN meeting how many people will be able to make it there. But it's always a very good engagement over there. There are more and more participants and I think that our workshops have always been well attended.

And now, for the other activities this year and it's the latest version of… Oh, Chengetai Masango.

CHENGETAI MASANGO: I just have a comment. We're going to be having our IGF MAG meeting. I don't know if you're about to say that. And on Tuesday, there is this agenda item after lunch updates from related Internet governance initiatives and processes followed by an open discussion. So I think ICANN is invited to give a little presentation on the activities and how we can collaborate.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Chengetai. Did you want to mention this, Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON:	Thank you very much in this, Olivier. I was going to mention this under Any Other Business. No, no, not at all. And thank you, Chengetai. I mean traditionally, the MAG meeting has this open consultation and it allows various organizations to give an update. And we, as an organization, tend to give an update on various issues that ICANN is working on some of which, of course not necessarily related to this group.
	But with your permission and with the support of the co-chairs, I would certainly report on what we have been doing in this space. Thank you.
OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:	Thank you very much, Nigel. So now we have a wonderful page with tons of boxes on there and that's the latest version of the calendar. Not a full calendar of forthcoming activities, but a calendar of the main – which would we say – meetings that are taking place around the world that relate to Internet governance and that includes many of the processes that are out there.
	Did you wish to take us through this, Nigel or should we…? I'm not sure who wishes to go through this. This is the first time we actually show it so there might be some additional things to add to it. There was a question. I'm not sure. So the first question actually I have about is did you pay a consultant to make this?

MARILYN CADE: That was a joke.

NIGEL HICKSON: No, we did it also in the office as you can see, so my graphical skills are minimalist and I did have help on this, so it's a work in progress. I'm beginning to enjoy this meeting slightly better than I did the first but we presented this to the Board Working Group on Friday with due apologies for the diagram as well. So essentially what we've tried to do is group a number of activities. And as our chairman talked about earlier, in terms of grouping these activities, we also tried to identify various themes, but it requires further work. I mean the middle section is ICANN obviously and that just lists the various ICANN meetings. The top tends to be the UN meetings and then ITU and then IGOs and another.

What we tried to do is identify the meetings where specific themes are coming up. I mean, we can't spend a great deal of time on this but in answer to our Canadian friends, so the question. I mean, some of those themes relate to data protection and privacy. Some of those themes relate to DNSSEC and cybersecurity in relation to that and others relate to jurisdiction and another issues there. In terms of the ITU plenipotentiary that falls within the, if you like, the first category

that we've talked about of the three categories, there might be proposals there that impact on the ICANN mission whether they're on geographic names or country names or distribution of IP addresses or whatever. We've highlighted WIPOs as well in that category because as it's been mentioned as well, the standing committee on trademarks and WIPOs is considered domain names and geographical names in terms of their Intergovernmental process.

At the bottom, we've identified a number of other activities which, if you like, our activities which we are involved in depending on the nature of the discussion. And often we're involved in with other Internet organizations such ISOC and the [IRLs]. And then of course we had the G7 and we have the IGF, etc. and the G20. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. And I open the floor for questions and we have Christopher Wilkinson.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Digitally, I think it's brilliant. It answers so many questions that we've had in the back of our minds in recent months. I think is worth putting it on the mailing list so that we can actually take it

home and read it carefully. And I think it's worth the rolling update every three months or so.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Christopher. Let's say we have to link it to our homepage replacing Marilyn's calendar which –

MARILYN CADE: Well, you don't have to replace Marilyn's calendar. You can have the official ICANN calendar and then you can also have Marilyn's calendar when she gets it done.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Of course, the question will be whether Marilyn's calendar will be available free of fees.

MARILYN CADE: Marilyn's calendar regrettably has always been available free of fees.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Any other questions on this calendar and on the activities that we have? John Laprise.

JOHN LAPRISE: So Marilyn, is your calendar a Google calendar? I haven't used it yet so I don't know.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That is a topic that's out of the scope of this working group. Now Nigel, looking at this calendar ready next three months are going to be effectively Com-ITU from the 26th to the 29th of March. And then we have of course the IGF MAG and the WSIS next week, of course, and then the WIPO Trademarks. And after that, UNCTAD e-commerce, is there anything that we should be today focusing as a working group and be proactive about?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you, Olivier. I'm conscious of the time and people got other commitments. What I think will be useful to do and perhaps we need to do this on a call is focus on the big events coming up: the Com-ITU is just the European preparation for the 2019 plenipotentiary which starts directly after the Barcelona meeting. And I think as we go forward and we understand better where the regions are coming from in their proposals for the plenipotentiary then it will be very useful to get the input and experience of this group on those issues.

And indeed to engage GNSO colleagues on those issues because I think as Marilyn and as others have said, some of the proposals

being made are directly relevant to the work that goes on in some of the PDP processes. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this. So I think that would be an action item then coming out of this working group. And we probably would have a call in the next few weeks hopefully on this topic, right? I don't see any other hands being up around the table so we can probably move on after, of course, the second action item. So add this to the list and I think we'll probably to have a good cleanup of our wiki in the next few weeks after this meeting.

The part of this meeting now is Any Other Business. Now we've treated the budget topic so please do not bring the budget back into this discussion. Tatiana Tropina.

TATIANA TROPINA: Sorry, I just want to add to the clarification, the one Nigel asked for. Yes, [very true]. At the end of this meeting, GNSO is not the chartering organization anymore, so actually I'm not a liaison anymore. You can give me some applause for serving in this role so briefly. No, I'm sorry. That was a joke.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Actually, thank you very much, Tatiana. I guess respecting protocols and I know we've got Chengetai in the room, so I'm not as knowledgeable about protocol as he is but I would gather that the working group would thank the GNSO for its contribution over the years. And to [inaudible] being somehow sad to see the GNSO go and to also thank by round of applause both the liaison to the GNSO current and past.

And also the chair, the co-chair of this working group current and past, I guess, as well, so really thanks for this. Acclamation. And with this, Nigel Hickson last words?

NIGEL HICKSON: Only to say Mr. Chairman, I do endorse that and thanks for all the co-chairs for their work. But obviously we hope in the new vehicle, that the GNSO along with other SOs and ACs would be re-chartered, so we'll see [chartering] again. We hope.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much. And with this, this meeting is now ended so thank you and speak to you soon on a conference call near you. This meeting is ended. Thank you.

MALE SPEAKER: And thank you, Olivier for your chair.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]