PANAMA – CCWG IG Face-to-Face Meeting
Wednesday, June 27, 2018 – 12:30 to 13:15 EST
ICANN62 | Panama City, Panama

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: ICANN 62 Panama City. This is CCWG IG Face-to-Face Meeting in Salon 6.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: We have quite a few spaces around the table, so if people who are sitting over in the back wish to move to the table, they're absolutely welcome and in fact encouraged to do so.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Including if you think you're here as an observer because we can't see you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: It's the anonymous crowd. Well, good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to this cross-community working group on Internet governance face-to-face meeting. Today we have only 45 minutes to go, so it's a very sort meeting, but it was needed because we had a few items on the agenda that needed immediate attention or at least raising at this point in time. So, we'll start with discussing for about ten minutes the transition from CCWG IG to CCEG, the cross-community engagement

group, with a charter that we have sent quite a few months ago and there's some discussions around this. Then we'll hear from Matthew Shears, who is sitting to my left, the report on the board working group on Internet governance. Then we will be discussing the CCWG IG priorities hand in hand I think with the board working group as I would imagine they are the same priorities, or very similar or at least they are aligned. Then we'll have any other business, if we still have time, as you know. It's interesting we have two threes on there, so we have five items. But, two threes.

Is Young-Eum Lee with us yet? There you are right next to me. One eye obviously doesn't work. Young-Eum, do you wish to say just a couple of words as an introduction?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Yes, thank you, Olivier. But, before I start, Marilyn wanted to say something.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I just wanted to – you mentioned any other business. Even if we don't have time to get to it, I do want to reference it, so it's in the transcript and we can talk about it in case we don't get to it.

I would like when we talk about the communications between the board working group on Internet governance and this group, I'd like to highlight the importance of our ensuring that there's communication about discussions that may end up in actions by ICANN that have not yet been really, I would call it, fielded with this group. I'll use as an example that some of us in the community were quite blindsided to hear in a recorded meeting that there's consideration about becoming a member of a UN specialized organization and there has not really been an opportunity to air the concerns that might have implications, reputational wise or other, related to Internet governance. I'm not talking about this group saying yea or nay; I'm talking about the importance of making sure that there's a dialogue that goes on before decisions are taking. We don't have to go into it in detail, but I want to just talk about a process to make sure that there's a flow of [inaudible].

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. We'll take this into account in part three of our agenda. Young-Eum?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Yes, thank you. I would just like to report on the activities within the ccNSO with regard to the [inaudible]. The charter was presented to the ccNSO during last meeting and they had a

couple of questions which we are just getting to address and are trying to come up with a community consensus so that we can report back to the ccNSO.

There is the Google doc that I think Olivier has sent links to, to all the people that are included in the mailing list. So, I would appreciate it if you would go to the link [inaudible] and send in your comments so that I can report this back to the ccNSO. Although we're not going to be able to present a finalized version, I will try to report orally today during the council meeting. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Young-Eum. So, that takes us then into agenda item number two, the transition from the CCWG IG. Young-Eum, one more?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Yes, one more thing. I would just like to report that we had a joint ccNSO-GNSO Council meeting this morning and the issue was included as an agenda. I just reported briefly with regard to what's going on within the ccNSO. Heather Forest from the GNSO specifically mentioned that the decision by the GNSO not to become a chartering organization for this group is not based on the fact that they don't agree with the substance. They do.

They're very concerned about the substance. It's just the vehicle, again, that they're concerned with. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Young-Eum. And that provides a good intro into why we are looking now at a cross-community engagement group rather than cross-community working group. I'm going to ask Andrea to switch to go to the document itself. We have a Google doc that's been shared with the mailing list. We are building our responses to the ccNSO. And as Young-Eum mentioned a moment ago, we probably will not have it finalized and of course will full agreement on the working group. We can't do that in 24 hours. But certainly Young-Eum will be able to pick from that document based on the discussion we're having now. We've got another eight minutes for this.

So, were there any specific parts? I assume everyone had read this perhaps, hopefully. Were there any specific parts that anyone had? Any reservations with regards to the answers that were provided there? Or should we go through this question by question. I'm a little concerned that going question by question, it is a three or four-page document, it will take more than eight minutes. So, let's not do that. Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I think we can't go through it item by item, but I just wanted to make an overarching point that I think is important to all of us and we've all – those of us who work in the group have reinforced over and over. And that is the importance of ensuring that by changing the vehicle, we do not lose the relationship and interaction. I know this is not the intent, but I just want to reinforce this point, particularly because the board working group is here, that we do not lose the interaction and engagement with the – and the formalized interaction and exchange with the board working group on IG, and secondly that we can, with your support, we can help to ensure that there's staff resources to continue the work of the group.

So, that's an overarching concern. It's not about the vehicle change, but just something that I think is always good for us to reinforce about making the change, and then as part of that, that we also do not lose the opportunity to have these face-to-face meetings, and upon occasion to have a public exchange with the full community. So, those are my overarching, making sure those things are included.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Matthew Shears?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Marilyn, I think very good points. I think all along the board working group has been very supportive of the continuation of this CCWG IG and now into the CCEG. I don't see that it would materially affect the way that we have been engaging in the past and the way we've had the dialogue and the meetings, so I'm pretty certain that productive relationship will continue.

Also, on one of your points, Marilyn – and Nigel, could you just comment briefly on the issue of resource?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much. Nigel Hickson, government engagement. Yes. The change of the vehicle, as been said, there's no implications for the support of the government engagement team to the group that will remain the same. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. So, just a short bit of history before I pass the floor over to Tatiana Tropina. The charter itself or what we've sent to the different supporting organizations and advisory committees is pretty much in line with the cross-community working group on Internet governance charter itself. It's got the same component parts, but it has an enhanced more emphasis on reporting. Reporting is one of the things which I

think we can say we have failed in doing and keeping the chartering organizations well-informed about what is going on, what is happening, and especially for a group like this, which has a main mission of being able to get information to flow, that is a recognized shortfall that we've hit. Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA: Thank you very much, Olivier. Well, first of all, thanks to all who contributed to these documents. Thanks to Olivier. Thanks to Rafik who is not here, and Greg Shatan and others who commented and provided responses to the ccNSO questions.

I just wanted to ask this group if there is any chance that we make a kind of timeline we should stick to and follow, because I know the GNSO was going to coordinate with ccNSO about these comments. We are completely swamped with EPDP right now, so to get these through, and I think the sooner we get these through the better it would be for all of us. We can't spend another year just trying to re-charter it.

Shall we maybe just leave it to the group because I am going way soon, just create a timeline, a feasible timeline. Say, for example, with Rafik and me, so we can pass it to GNSO somehow. I am ready to contribute as a participant of this group so we can stick to this timeline. But, at least we know the dates. We know the deadlines for ourselves. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tatiana. Not all the balls are on our court at the moment. So, my understanding at present is that the ccNSO has come back to us with a set of questions. We will be sending replies I would imagine within a week, a week and a half, because we do need to have the full no objections from the group as it stands and we need to give people a couple of days to read this.

Once these are given to the ccNSO, I understand that the ccNSO will discuss things with the GNSo. Young-Eum, correct me if I'm wrong. I do hear from the GNSO Council …

YOUNG-EUM LEE: It was kind of … No. It was in San Juan where we tied what we are going to do to what ccNSO was going to do to coordinate. That was exactly my concern how this is going to go. So, this goes to ccNSO in a week. Then we can probably ping GNSO and ask how the further coordination is going to go because, without this document, my hands are tied anyway.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's correct. Carlos?

CARLOS: Yes. As Heather Forest informed this morning in the ccNSO-GNSO meeting, it will be up to the constituency groups of the GNSO to comment on the document.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. There is a copy of the document that was sent to the SO/AC SGC RALO mailing list. We haven't received any response yet. Perhaps an action item would be to send a reminder once we've had the responses sent to the ccNSO. I don't know whether the GNSO might wish or the constituencies might wish to also have a copy of those responses here because I have seen questions very similar to these being asked informally in corridors. Tatiana?

TATIANA TROPINA: I know that in terms of deadlines it's not up to us to set the deadline for constituencies to reply, but maybe at least once we send in these documents we can ask what would be the feasible date of for you to provide us feedback. So, at least if feedback is not provided until that date, we can send a reminder and ask if there is no feedback, do you agree or do you want more time? So, at least to have some timelines, because otherwise, it's getting swamped under all the work.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Young-Eum Lee? Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: I'm just going to make an offer because some of the CSG constituencies, the Commercial Stakeholder Group, are still having our meetings. I had planned to update on that. So, I will also ask the question at the CSG level. We do not comment about the policy council's timeline. We comment about our own governance. So, I will ask at the CSG level for these three constituencies – IP, ISP, and BC – to consider having the ability to get back in what's a reasonable timeline. I can make that commitment without saying what the answer will be.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Marilyn. Perhaps, can we record this as an action item if that's okay Yeah. That would be great. Young-Eum?

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Yes. Thanks, Olivier. I would just like to point out that these questions, although were stated by the GNSO, that they are very much interested in the answer to these questions. These are ccNSO-specific questions. To summarize the main question points, one was the fact that the ccNSO was worried that any

statement or any action as a result of the activities of this group may have an influence on the ccNSO stuff.

And whether the board group, the staff, and the cross-community group, whether there's a possibility that these various efforts could be consolidated as one formal group within ICANN. The answer to both is that, of course, no. There is a specific prohibition that states that the scope of this group is very limited and this group is mainly involved in informing groups outside ICANN about the activities that are being conducted within ICANN, the SOs and the ACs. So, the possibility of the actions of this group influencing back the SOs and ACs is almost none, unless they specifically state that they would like something done.

As for the consolidation into one group, I don't think that's a good idea because it is this very multi-stakeholder nature of this group that allows this group to be flexible and responsive to the many unexpected and sudden events that may occur outside of ICANN. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Young-Eum. I know that Greg Shatan had indicated earlier he wished to speak, so I'll just take Greg and then we'll close this topic as time is of the essence. Greg?

EN

GREG SHATAN: Just briefly, and it's too bad Tatiana had to leave. I was going to applaud her efforts at what I'll call project management and timeline management. It's something that ICANN-wide is a more honored [inaudible] if it's honored at all. Some of us actually may do project management for a living. I'm not one of them. But I think we do this particular set of issues really needs to be managed in terms of timeline and contacts because every time we don't, it slows down and then you get vacuums that form and get filled with misinformation. Just whatever Tatiana said, we should not just double down on it. We should quadruple down on driving the process, almost put together a project management time line or a [Barry Cobb brand ant chart], something there.

But, we really need to, in terms of process, we're the only ones running this process. Everyone else is kind of letting us, giving us enough rope to hang ourselves. So, let's instead, us that rope to … I have no analogy for that. I'll stop there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Greg. So, in order to start with the end, because I think usually you can start something by reading the end of the book and then finding out what's in between, let's emit a wish. We cannot actually set the timelines for the

ICANN 62
POLICY FORUM
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

chartering organizations and the stakeholder groups, but we could emit a wish that we wrap this up by Barcelona. Is that something that would be doable? Do we have any thoughts on the table about this? Because I'm also concerned, of course, about the number of cycles this is taking. In each one of our meetings, we're spending valuable time on process time that we don't have. Matthew Shears?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Olivier. I think trying to wrap this up by Barcelona would be a great ambition. One thing that I think that would be useful would be perhaps if there's a possibility of moving away a little bit from the process-related elements of this charter and actually thinking about how we could already perhaps start to look at some of the Internet governance substantive approaches that are being proposed as part of the charter, because obviously there are a number of issues, a number of spaces, that are going to get very busy in the upcoming months. The ITU Plenipot being one of them. I think it would be useful for us to almost shift gears, if we can, out of the process work and shift into a more substantive policy approach, given the limited time before important Internet governance events. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Matthew. I do remind everyone that the CCWG is still in operation, so it's still operating under its older charter to start with.

Okay. Let's move on, then, please to the next agenda item and that's our interaction with the board working group on Internet governance. Matthew Shears is with us, so I hand the floor over to him.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Olivier. It's always a pleasure to be here, and really to Marilyn's point, I think it's really important that we continue to be very much partners in the issue of Internet governance at ICANN.

So, a couple of things. I have to admit that the board working group on Internet governance work has been a bit superseded by work related to GDPR among other things. So, we have not been as active over the past couple of months as we might have wanted.

That said, one of the things that we have been doing – and I'll come to the session that we had over the weekend in a minute. One of the things that we are doing is we are bringing a lot of the discussions that we have about Internet governance and Internet policy more broadly into the strategic planning process

ICANN
POLICY FORUM 62
PANAMA CITY
25–28 June 2018

that we're undertaking. So, you have probably been a part of the trend assessment work that's been going on and the board has gone through that same exercise.

Beyond that, we're also looking at doing – we have done, I should say, SWOT analyses on a number of different areas and a large component of those as you might imagine are policy and Internet governance related.

So, there has been some thinking probably more in the future sense in terms of the trends analysis as to what the Internet governance space might look like as it evolves in the future.

That said, there are obviously a couple of issues that are important for us to look at in the immediate term, and as I said, one of them is the ITU.

In terms of what we covered over the weekend, the weekend session, for those of you who weren't on it, was actually a good opportunity for Tarek's team and for Theresa's team to update us in terms of where they have been engaging and what they've been accomplishing over the past year and then looking forward through the remainder of the year. That's largely how we structured that presentation. In other words, looking back, then considering the trends. The trends working policy that Theresa has undertaken. Then looking forward to how we would engage

and what are the big issues going forward through to Barcelona and a little bit beyond.

You have I think – Olivier, you circulated the deck, so you'll see what some of those trends are and the relative importance of some versus others and how we're thinking about it. This was really an opportunity for us, as I said, to be updated. So, our discussion then really was about engagement and engaging in the upcoming activities.

Obviously, one of the perennial issues that we have to address and the board is going to take this on is how does the board engage? How can the board be supportive of the organization when, for example, Tarek's team is out in the field, so to speak? How and where should the board resources be deployed in an appropriate and responsible manner? That will be a focus of the working group in the immediate term, given that we've got a number of events coming up like the ITU and like the IGF, for example, so that we can have a proportionate board presence at those events. So, that's going to be one of the priorities.

Another one is getting back into the mode. You'll recall the last time that we met that I said that what we were trying to do is to bring a more forward-thinking approach to Internet governance. So, we will be getting back into that mode, even though we've been doing it in the strategic planning. We'll be getting back into

that mode with Theresa and Tarek's team in the upcoming months, simply because we have to be more aware of what's happening on a number of different Internet governance fronts.

So, two things came out of the … Let me talk about two things. One of them, Marilyn has already raised. Two things came out of the meeting that we had over the weekend, one of which was a reference to whether or not or how or if, I should say, ICANN should consider some closer relationship with the ITU.

I'm going to ask Tarek just to comment on this briefly, but before I do so, I must put it in context. It's when we have these discussions on the board and we often have wide-ranging Internet governance discussions, the issue of how we engage in different fora is often one of the points of discussion.

Obviously, ICANN's relationship with the ITU has evolved. Goran and the board have met with the senior management of the ITU. So, there's I think a more comfortable relationship there. I just wanted to put that in context. I think it's important to understand that we have these discussions about how we engage in different spaces on an ongoing basis.

And let me pause there and maybe just ask Tarek if he wants to add anything on this particular issue, and I'll come back to another one.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Tarek Kamel?

TAREK KAMEL: Thank you very much, Olivier, and Matthew. Good afternoon, everybody. Indeed, as Matthew has said, we had a quite successful engagement with the board where we have been granted the opportunity to update the board as a org teams [inaudible] or the GSE team about our engagements since the last updates that we made to the board in Abu Dhabi, as well as the plan so far until the end of the year, given the different events and challenges that we have.

On the trends Theresa has been providing within the process of the strategic planning that engages the community and the different SOs and ACs, the trends that are related to the geo-political trends as well as the trends related to Internet governance.

Our engagement definitely was a different fora, takes a different shape. In the case of the IGF we all definitely know and participate in the different processes as well as ICANN funding the trust fund as well as the different activities of the national and regional IGFs through our participation at the IGF. So, that's an example, as such.

We have also being applying to the ECOSOC accreditation as such. It's a process that takes a year. Many of us are very familiar with this process, as such. It provides us with facilitation, definitely, to access to [inaudible] and facilities and following up, specifically for the government engagement team that are doing the direct engagement.

For the ITU [sector] membership, I want to say specifically the following. We have presented an issue to the board that we have as an engagement [inaudible] as such. I'm repeating it here. It is not a secret. ICANN is not a startup anymore. Maybe ten years ago. Things have been different. ICANN today is independent, reputable organization that has its weight and doing its work, respectful work.

We have started in the last couple of years to hear clearly from different delegations, not that much from the ITU secretariat even, but from different delegations. When during our engagement, which is becoming more and more with the ITU in attending different global fora, whether it's a plenipot or it's sometimes a council or if there is something related to the Internet that is being discussed in the Internet council working group or it is the development conference, [WGDC] or the WSIS. We have been going under different government delegations, without mentioning names, as such with personal relations, personal initiatives of specific stuff, as staff members being

there. Or, sometimes ISOC takes us with them and if nobody from ISOC is not in the room, I am not allowed to talk or the [inaudible].

This is becoming a lot for the staff and also increasing comments and critiques from different member states because they respect ICANN, they know the individuals, they respect the views that we are representing on behalf of the community as well as an org if they need to talk and intervene.

And if someone is standing behind a governance plaque or whatever other organization, it starts awkward. And even we are receiving jokes. Who are you today? Are you Bulgaria or Macedonia or are you ISOC? Yeah. That's what we are hearing now in the last couple of years and it's increasing.

So, it's putting pressure on the staff. It's putting pressure on those who are hosting us. It is not sustainable, because individuals are here today and they are not here tomorrow with these relations. Honestly, not all technical organizations always have the same views that we necessarily want to say. So, sometimes they say do not say this statement while you are on our name or our delegation. We don't share views, these views.

So, the question becomes more and more Internet-related issues are being discussed at the ITU. More and more we feel we need our presence, the more [inaudible] Nigel and the other

team members are doing a lot of effort. But, I am also putting the issue on the table such because it is causing definitely an overload to us and to the staff. We appreciate the support from community members when we are there. They help and support as such. But, it happens very often that there meetings in Geneva and not necessarily any of the active community members is in town as such, so we need to go as staff members alone.

So, I just wanted to mention that and put it on the table. That's what's being discussed. There hasn't been resolutions or solutions, but this is the issue. Thank you very much, Olivier and Matthew.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tarek. Matthew Shears?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Yes. Thank you, Tarek. I think, obviously, from the board working group's perspective, how and where and when ICANN engages is obviously something that has to be measured in many different ways and it has to be a judicious engagement as well as one that is clearly relevant and to the mission, etc.

But, there is certainly an important other element, which is the visibility factor and engaging in processes to ensure that ICANN

is seeing, that ICANN has a voice, and that ICANN is not seen as not playing the role that it should be playing in that particular space or another space.

So, I think it's a fine balance, and as Tarek said, this issue is under discussion at the moment, as is the level of engagement in other spaces as well. Thanks.

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

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I really appreciate the explanation, Tarek. I have already posted to the CCWG IG on some of my views, but I'm going to just take a couple of minutes to say something.

Look, in my long years of engagement, have worked in the number of the UN organizations. Let me say that different. Worked with a number of the UN organizations. And in some cases, I've certainly encountered the issue as well, and [inaudible] Tarek, because as you know, the only way that I could get in the [CSTD] because of the rules was if I was accredited by a large association. It was only when the rules were changed and I could be appointed as an SME that I could wear my own hat.

I also, in order to attend the council at the ITU, which I had done many, many times, I had to go on the US delegation and I had to sign a contract. It's not just that I'm told I can't, but I have to sign an agreement that I will adhere at all times to the official position, including in conversations in the ladies' room and in the hall. So, I really appreciate the problem. I, too, have been asked, even when I worked for a very major corporation, "What hat are you wearing today?" I really appreciate the issue.

I think the issue, though, is the important thing to talk about and I think the issue is broader slightly, if you don't mind my saying that. There are other UN bodies that today are taking up Internet policy issues and Internet governance that are just as important and critical to ICANN as certain parts of the ITU and that includes the work going on at UNESCO and IDNs and other issues.

So, my suggestion is that we look at the problem as opposed to looking at the short-term solution. We look at the problem very, very quickly with more dialogue with people who are perhaps extremely experienced, like Tony Holmes, myself, and others who engaging in these settings and think about whether there are a range of approaches that can help ICANN in certain other settings to make sure that ICANN is sitting under its own flag in as many of the … Its own name badge. Sorry. Shouldn't use the word flag. We haven't made you a sovereign country yet. In as

many of the UN entities as possible. I fully support pursuing the ECOSOC accreditation.

I would just ask you, as a quick example, several people actually misunderstood what ECOSOC was and thought we had a new acronym at ICANN. I think if we could park the idea very quickly and then come back to more dialogue, but treat it as there is a problem on the table that the community must understand and should contribute to some ideas more broadly on the solutions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Marilyn. I think that you've mentioned a number of people to be involved perhaps in follow-up work to discuss this. What is the timeline for a decision to be made on this, Matthew?

MATTHEW SHEARS: I'll have to defer to Tarek on that, but I don't think there is a particular timeline.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So, ASAP? Okay. Well, as a follow-up, we can get a group of people. I'm looking at Jim Prendergast also who had mentioned some things on the mailing list. So, a small group of people to

sort of weigh in the positives, the negatives, and maybe drop a list of what Marilyn said. Matthew Shears?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Can I propose that we consider having a call within some reasonable period of time where we could have a follow-up discussion as you suggest, Marilyn, about how we engage with different UN agencies and what the various merits of engagement is?

MARILYN CADE: If I could just quickly … I would say yes, but I would also establish some criteria for the call. I'm getting tired of opinion-based discussions as opposed to fact-based discussions on the calls. So, can we plan it in a way that at least some of the people establish the fact they have some experience as opposed to, hey, I watch mailing lists and hey I write reports. There has to be some people on the call who actually have real experience in working in these various entities to help deepen the understanding, if we could make sure of that. As well as anyone else, of course, who wants to attend. But if that would be okay.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. Back to you, Matthew, for the rest of your report.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Well, I know we've got very little time, but I just thought it might be useful for Nigel just to walk through, given that we're talking about the ITU, and maybe to close on that. So, Nigel just to walk through very quickly this slide because this is one of the slides from the deck and it will give you a slightly fuller sense as to what the organization's priorities are at the ITU.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Matthew, if I could actually jump in, I think the next agenda item talks about looking forward for CCWG, so that can also cover this simultaneously. Two agenda items at once. Over to you, Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thanks very much, Olivier. Thank you, Matthew. The first point I think is that the presentation to the board working group – sorry, the presentation of the board working group to the board on Saturday. This deck, of course, covers more than just the ITU and I think address's one of Marilyn's points in that we are engaging indeed at UNESCO, at WIPO, in terms of geographical names at the WTO and various other bodies in UN configurations.

On the ITU and the plenipotentiary, if we could just briefly go back to that slide perhaps. What we've tried to set out in these four very short bullets was looking forward to the plenipotentiary in Dubai at the end of October and beginning of November. We do see, I think, along with our colleagues in the technical community, etc., that the ITU have opportunities at this meeting to establish a firm mandate in the areas that they have expertise on.

Indeed, we are looking for this linkage in the ITU strategic direction, looking forward to better regulation, linked with sustainable development goals, linked with [inaudible] missions work on access.

We do have concerns, however, on proposals that might come forward and these concerns are, if you like, in the general Internet governance arena and specifically in relation to ICANN. So, in terms of proposals for an ITU cybersecurity treaty, which we've seen draft proposals on and will be discussed in terms of further work on ITRs in the WICT vehicle which we think is potentially unnecessary and draws the oxygen out of other discussions.

Closer to home in terms of the work of ICANN, in proposals to discuss issues like geographical country code names or country code names themselves or IDNs or other types of gTLDs in some

of the working groups and study groups of the ITU. So, this again are some of the proposals that we're looking at in the preparation process, which we're part of and of course at the actual conferences. So, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. Are there any specific action points which the working group might be asked to contribute to over the summer months as we're planning our work?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. Yes, indeed. It is difficult, as we've experienced before, to get a complete picture of what's going to be before the plenipotentiary until possibly five or ten days before the actual meeting.

But, as we did with the WTSA, and some colleagues might recall, we did socialize the proposals at the WTSA for work for ITU on geographical names and country code names. This was the African Union proposal.

We are likely to see a version of that again, and if we do [inaudible], then this will be certainly an example of where the experience of the community would be very important in terms of inputting to that debate. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. I'll open the floor to short comments or questions. Christopher Wilkinson?

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Good morning, good afternoon. Thank you, Olivier. I think from the discussion that we are going in the direction of becoming a [inaudible] member. But, I would just like to point to a certain risk, particularly regarding the relationship between GAC members and ITU Council members.

It looks rather odd to have a sector member which has in and of itself an advisory body comprised by the government. I think it's almost a unique situation. So, I would just strongly advise that leadership, whether it's Olivier or the board, leadership could take [inaudible] in the GAC to make sure they understand the direction in which we are going.

Particularly for the developing country members who are already quite strapped for time and resources, I would not like to find that ministries in small countries would in fact have to decide whether or not they go to the ITU or whether they go to the GAC. It's just a thought. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Christopher. That's a very good point. Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: I really appreciate you bringing that up, Christopher, and that's one of the things I'd like us to talk about more on the call. It is a very serious problem. One of the ways we've been able to get some of the governments here, Matthew, which is before your time and even before Tarek's time here, when I first met with during the WSIS Phase 1, when I first met with the ICT advisor to the prime minister in Shri Lanka and convinced him to come to the GAC, it took me six months to get him here because, at that time, ICANN did not issue invitation letters. Yet, he was one of the most productive and positive contributors, even becoming a vice president of the GAC and heavily influencing.

So, the procedural thing, the fact that some governments are so strapped for resources that this is the first GAC meeting Bosnia has ever had official representation at.

So, I think we should talk about this because if they feel that there is a choice and the ITU Council members are particularly committed to the sanctity of their leadership and visibility.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marilyn. That would be something to take into account with a follow-up. Any other things that we need to plan

for until the next meeting, the next face-to-face meeting in Barcelona on non-ITU, perhaps any other processes, G7? Was it G8, G7, G6 now, G5 maybe.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you, Olivier. As we identified in the slide deck, there other vehicles in which Internet governance issues are being discussed. The G20 this year has a wider agenda, looking at other aspects of ICT in terms of innovation and skills. Although we are closely following that particular agenda, there might well be some issues there of interest.

As I highlighted before, there is an ongoing discussion at WIPO and this was referred to this week in the GAC and elsewhere on geographical names and that is something that at some point we might have a discussion on.

There's an ongoing discussion derived from the W20 minister over the last year where a group of I think 47 or 52 countries are meeting to discuss e-commerce issues in particular, touching on potential DNS type issues. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel. Again, second question. Will any of these require direct input from ICANN and from the community?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. We'll try and socialize when those specific proposals to socialize. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much. Christopher, I'm afraid we've run out of time. We are five minutes beyond the official end of this, but please follow-up on the mailing list if that's okay. Or is that to do with something else? Well, the ITU discussions will be continuing and we're going to have a group that will discuss those, so perhaps we'll do it on the mailing list.

CHRISTOPHER WILKINSON: Just to emphasize the point I've made and that has been repeated. In Barcelona, I understand GAC is organizing a high-level meeting. So, what I've had to say, I certainly perceive might come, materialize with [inaudible] in Barcelona because it will be the same people at a high enough level who are concerned with the ITU Council and with the high-level meeting in the GAC.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Christopher. This is bringing us to the end of this meeting. I'd like to thank Nigel Hickson and our staff support for having managed to get us a room for only 45 minutes, but at

least we have had a room. We'll be working together to try and get a room – well, we will definitely be working together to get rooms in Barcelona, and hopefully a little more time than this. Thanks, of course. Young-Eum, any other words you wanted to share with us or can we close? Okay. So, thanks to all of you. 45 minutes goes really fast when the conversation is interesting and I hope it was. Thank you and this is adjourned. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]