20150423_ccwgIG

Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	We've got enough people on the call. Let's try and get this call going please, Renate. So, let's start the recording and start the call.
Renate De Wulf:	Okay. We are starting the recording. For the roll call we have Bill Drake, Greg Shatan, Lynn St. Amour, Judith Hellerstein, Vicky Sheckler, Olivier Crépin-Leblond. And from Staff we have Nigel Hickson, Alexandra Dans, Ariel Lang; and myself, Renate De Wulf.
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Thank you very much, Renate. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And welcome to this Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance Conference Call on the 23rd of April.
	We have, today, some feedback from various events that have taken place recently. The first, the NETMundial Initiative Consultation, which has a deadline of the 1st of May, then we'll have a follow up on the GCTS 2015 that took place in The Hague. And then we'll have a quick update, well, not even an update, as sort of a discussion on the WSIS Forum, CCWG, on Internet Governance contribution.
	So, I think that what we can do is to move directly to agenda item number two, which is the NETMundial Initiative Consultations, and for this -- Actually who is going to take this? I thought it was Marilia that was going to speak about this, but maybe Nigel Hickson can provide us with an intro on this, and what we need to basically work on. Nigel? (Pause) And you might be muted.
Renate De Wulf:	Nigel?
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	I cannot hear Nigel Hickson at the moment. Nigel Hickson might be muted, or unable to speak, it's going to be whatever he says--
Bill Drake:	Olivier, would you like me to say something?
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Yes. Bill Drake, please go ahead.
Bill Drake:	Okay. I can do that if you want. I was involved in writing the document that called for comments to them. Do I understand that you were planning to talk for 20 minutes about this? As I remember just reading the schedule, but--
Olivier Crépin-Leblond:	Bill, if I can just in. It's Olivier speaking. We put an ample amount of time to be able to discuss this, and discuss what we were going to -- whether we wanted to draft something and maybe come up with a number of proposals. Of course the 20 minutes is just a very open time, and it might well be that this call is shorter than full 90 minutes that we have there, but it looks like it's going to be a good time for us to discuss this.
Bill Drake:	Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Over to you, Bill.

Bill Drake: So, we had up to -- for comments until the 1st of May, is a draft Terms of Reference, we are also looking right now, on operating procedures that would complement those, the Terms of Reference that are intended to describe the overall mission and functions of the NMI, and it is posted at Comments.NetMundial.Org, in a way that would allow people to comment on the individual passages. So far, looking at the website right now, I have to say the comments are disappointingly (inaudible) on the ground, which raises the continuing question in my mind, about whether we are going to get the kind of engagement necessary to make this a going concern, but we'll see after the thing is up and running, and in doing some things, whether that will be the case.

But in any event, what is sought here, is not like single, coherent documents, which don't know that you can necessarily have everybody from the CCWG agreeing on anyway; I imagine views will probably be diverse, but he would be helpful if people want to put in their comments, pro-con, whatever format, et cetera, on the individual provisions, so there's a space -- a chapter space next to each paragraph, as I say, and people could individually do that. Of course, sure, if the group wanted to try to that collectively I supposed you could, but it will be kind of awkward, I think, to try to organize that.

And basically what we are trying to do here, is get some feedback on whether the fundamental construct has it as evolved, is something that people could, despite all the strumming down in the boot up stage of this process, get their heads around thinking, or there might be some useful though for a multistakeholder process, that is not a dialogue process, that does not duplicate the IGF, but which would be focused on helping actors, particularly in the developing world, to identify knowledge resources, networks, people that they could go to on particular policy issues that they are confronting, and so on, and also serve as a vehicle for people to share projects of their undertaking on different aspects of Internet Governance probably define not ICANN issues, but the other, by and large, and seek potential partners, et cetera.

So that is, fundamentally, what this is about, and we would like to be able to see whether people can imagine and will go for that. I can put it in historical perspective, if somebody who was involved at the frontend with the IGF when some of us began in 2004, to advocate creating a new multistakeholder body with a broad ambit to pick up any kinds of issues in our governance we got strong opposition from the same groups that have been opposed to NETMundial Initiative, and ultimately people, once the thing was set up, began to see value in it.

And so, to me, ultimately at the end of the day, what's going to have to happen here, you know, is that we get enough feedback from people to have a sense of direction, root something up, get some initial activities up, and see if people find it useful. If they find it useful, then the thing will become sustainable, and if they don't find it's useful, then the thing will become like One Net, and it will drift off. So, I simply encourage people to have a look at the draft Terms of Reference, and provide any kind of feedback that they think would be helpful to us in thinking about that. And I say that as a Member of the Coordination Council. So, I'll stop there, and anything anybody wants to talk about, I will (inaudible/audio skip) --

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Bill. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking, and as you will have noticed, I'm now sharing my screen, and have gone on to the comments at NETMundial.Org website. I don't know if everyone can see it, and if you maximize your screen you'll be able to see it, the full screen. I wonder, do you wish to perhaps go through some of those paragraphs, and sort of ease us into this. The document is only, I believe, four pages long.

Bill Drake: Astonishingly so, given the amount of time we spent on it, but it was a process of elimination, whittling things down, and taking out things, till we got to the point of what people could really agree on begin rather than other things that were debatable.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. It's Olivier speaking. Are there any specifics that you'd like to take us through? You can't see on your screen at the moment, I believe, the introduction and context, there are three paragraphs there, I note on the right-hand side, all of the comments that have already been made by a number of people. Is there any -- I mean, these are just definitions, aren't they, the introductions and things? I guess that you've got that, then you've got the mission statement is just one paragraph. I'm sure you've worked a lot on that one. I know what mission statements are like to write. And then there is part III, rationale and commitment, that's three paragraphs. Is there anything specific here? Can you just take us through the rationale and commitment?

Bill Drake: I don't think the first three are really all that imperative to dwell on. I mean, they are sort of setup type stuff. I mean, again, it's simply emphasizing that this whole initiative is emanating from the NETMundial Meeting, and the NETMundial statement that was adopted, as well as other lines of thinking including the other Panel reports, and other work that's gone on over the years, outlining the possible need for some additional means of performing some specific functions, and so really what matters most at the end of the day, is the front page, the scope of activities, which describes exactly what we are saying the thing would do.

And so that's where, I mean, you could debate all the earlier stuff about, you know, precisely why this word and not that word, and whatever, but that's not so interesting or helpful to the initiative, what would be helpful, I think, in particular is here on the front page where we say, this is the kind of activity we plan to undertake, and we'd like to know. So those seem to be all like useful things to do. If you are still on the previous page, let's go up --

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I believe I'm on the fourth page.

Bill Drake: Yeah. Yeah. Now you are on the fourth page. Sorry.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. It takes a little while to -- it's been on the fourth page for at least 20 seconds, so it takes me a while to populate.

Bill Drake: Okay. So, the document stuff up, I'm emphasizing yet again, that it is not intended in any way, shape or form to compete with the IGF in any matter. The people know that the NETMundial Initiative are people who are involved in the IGF, and have no desire to, in any way, challenge the IGF's role, or do anything else. In fact, indeed, I advocated the IGF doing these kinds of things 10 years ago, but that wasn't allowed, so that's why we are doing something separate.

But in any event, and it makes clear that the initiative is not a policy-setting body. I know that there was, at various points in time, some loose talk that emanated from certain unnamed sources, that led people to believe that it would somehow be a policy-setting body, and that would pick out solutions and so on, and that this could somehow be viewed as a privatizing of a policy process and moving into the closed doors of the West, and the this and that, and that's not what it is. So we make very clear, that's not what it is.

So what it is? Is (a) to serve as neutral clearinghouse, for sharing information issues, solutions and expertise between suppliers on said things, and demanders who are looking for information, connections, and so on, on particular types of activities, and I can give examples of that, and providing a platform on which actors can solicit project partners. So, this is something that has not really done in the (inaudible) just now, and which could help to reduce friction and information costs on the part of participants in the ecosystem.

Secondly, enabling open inclusive, collaborative communities to share knowledge and expertise leading to best practices, suggestions, and innovation. So again, it's suggesting things. In other words, if you look at some of the projects that are already up there now, they are trying the (inaudible) Project is one of the projects he puts forward. He suggests work on jurisdiction, so his project might find partners who want to support that activity, and it would generate certain types of outputs, suggestions and recommendations which have no legal standing by nobody, to

anybody visibly part of the discussion, and then they are out there, and then they are listed on the website in a kind of focused way, where people can look at it in relation to other projects, outputs and so on.

Facilitating, participation in legal system, basically by supporting multistakeholder processes at the national and regional level, based on, essentially, trying to avoid a situation where, when governments want to think about establishing a multistakeholder process they don't have to fly to Brazil and talk to CGI.Br, and say, how do you do it? There are some -- through a stock of shared experiences, best practices, model laws, other things that people have developed, have been put together in an organized place, where people can look at it, and draw on it.

Promote the application implementation of the NETMundial principles, and encourage community reporting on same. So, in other words, if somebody, an NGO, a Think Tank, an International Organization, or some collaboration thereof, wanted to, on an annual, semi-annual, or whatever else basis, take stock of what is the status of the implementation of the NETMundial principles and substance and procedure, one could put out a report saying, here is the current state of play, here is what's evolved since the NETMundial Meeting, and here is what has not progressed, et cetera. So, this will be a way of sharing information. Not doing anything actively, but so much as just taking stock of implementation.

And finally, assisting developing countries, governments, developing country communities, governments, and understand -- serve stakeholders by enabling capacity building efforts to help to address gaps. So that, for example -- and I will stop believe me -- system reflectors defense, so that if you have a Minister in a developing country or least-developed country that has a problem with spam or security, or whatever else, and so, gee, there's no international organization that has specific responsibility for this, and I don't know how to go about constructing a policy approach, et cetera, the platform could serve as a means of connecting them to people, resources, ideas, et cetera.

And if you look at the draft tools, that stuff at the warehouse and the people from Gov Lab (ph) have set up, it tries for different issue clusters to do that, to kind of show the range of different actors, issues, reports, and so on, around different issues. So these are all, basically, facilitating-type activities, sharing knowledge, information, promoting connections between actors. No decision-making, no dialogue space, nothing that is duplicative of any other existing body. Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: That's good. Thank you very much, Bill. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I already see a question in the chat from Lynn St. Amour, regarding item number 2, "Starting as a neutral clearinghouse. Why not just be, an open platform then?"

Bill Drake: I'm not sure I understand Lynn's question.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Perhaps, Lynn, if you have voice capability? I'm not sure if Lynn St. Amour is able to --

Bill Drake: A neutral clearinghouse -- Lynn does not have voice, she's typing. "I will say, a neutral clearinghouse is an open platform, in my mind. It is a place where information, supply and demand meet." I think also an example clearing -- I did a thing at the IGF in Istanbul, on institutionalizing the clearinghouse function, which is something that can be performed in different ways, by lots of different actors. And among the kinds of initiatives we made mention of was, for example, the European Commission, the GIPO, which has just been launched today formally, which provides the database and a frontend, where, somebody will give you some information about X, and can go and enter the terms, and so on, and access certain resources. That's an example of a clearinghouse type activity, and you can call that an open platform too, and I don't really see the difference, other than what we are saying, by clearinghouses that it's focus in particular on sharing information and knowledge. We tended to use the platform thing more in terms of the projects, but there is -- they are both tied in.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: All right. Thanks for this, Bill. Olivier speaking. I don't know if Lynn has made it on the call yet, but let's open the floor for everyone to ask questions, and of course the question I ask now at this point, is there anything in here that stands out as requiring a comment from our community? And if that's the case, you will note that the way that commenting is enabled, it's you click on the little bubble on the right-hand side, so each one of those paragraphs, one has the ability to comment on the paragraph itself. I guess the way really is to try and get everyone to -- well how do you do this? I guess try and get everyone to -- yeah, to basically, let us know what we should write on those things. I don't know if anybody has got an actual link to the page. I've put a page -- I've put that link on the chat now. So if you were not able to shift through the document by yourself, now you will be able to do so. And I don't see any hands up at the moment.

Lynn St. Amour: Olivier, can you hear me now?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yes. Now we can hear you. Lynn, welcome.

Lynn St. Amour: Excellent.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: You have the floor, Lynn St. Amour.

Lynn St. Amour: I have to figure out how to use Adobe, but I don't need the camera and everything else on, so I'm calling (inaudible). So, Bill, my question just was, that that bullet seems to make a distinction between a neutral clearinghouse because it was circulated to provide a platform, and the clearinghouse actually implies, I think at least to me, I'm sure everybody is reading this, possibly too carefully given its history, but here is where we are, and the clearinghouse, you know, implies that somebody is going to judge the material that's appropriate for perhaps to be much more active than, you know, an open platform will actually allow.

And I think those are some of the questions I have as you actually read through the document, so there's a similar question on, I think it was, yeah, item three, which is to enable participation as opposed to, you know, I don't know, supporting activity to empower or something. You know, it implies that there's an active management role, at least to me, maybe more than just, you know, a global open platform for participation and sharing of ideas. As I said, maybe I'm, you know, reading too much into some of the text there.

Bill Drake: That's possible. Thank you, for the question, Lynn. The mission statements are clearly, I think that the mission is to provide a platform, and the clearinghouse concept is just one element of the platform, and it's pertaining to sharing of information. Now there are different kinds of ways you can implement the clearinghouse type of activity, and one, certainly, could be that if you had some dedicated staff that was actively filtering, selecting, choosing, pointing people to, and so on, then that would be speaking to the thing that you are expressing concern about.

I don't think that that is envisioned at this point, and I don't imagine that it will be just -- first of all, because of resources, and secondly because there are multiple kinds of clearinghouse initiatives of things that can be viewed as performing that kind of function out there. And so what we would probably be doing instead is serving as the front end to a number of different types of clearinghouse mechanisms that people could look at. But, you know, it it's true that I guess you could say at some level, somebody has to design something, right. I mean, it doesn't just exist.

So if you'll look, for example, at the thing that the Gov Lab did, which is -- leaped off the front page of the NETMundial Initiative Solutions Map, which I don't particularly like that framing; obviously, Steven (ph) and his grad students spent a bunch of time categorizing issues and then identifying resources that were relevant to the issue. So a human was involved in doing that. That's one implementation, and that's fine. The GIPO implementation is different, what the European Commission is doing, is very much a database, big data searching kind of thing, but no real human selecting or interacting. So there are different ways of implementing that, this initiative

is not replacing those, or doing the same thing as either of those, what it would do, instead, is perhaps provide an aggregation of access to different resources like that.

Do you see what I mean? So, in other words, it would be like a portal (ph) to information-sharing type activities. But I don't see how it would do more than that, just because of the people that would be required, the resources that would be required, the political buy-in that would be required, and so on. I suspect that we would not have that.

Lynn St. Amour: That was helpful, and I'll read it again, but again, when I look through, you know, the service of the neutral clearinghouse: (3) enable something, (4) facilitate the decision; (5) promote. If this was meant to be an outcome of having a platform that would be one thing, but when it's a scope of activities it, I think, implies that there are going to be some management structure doing those activities, and I think for some and, again, I'm only speaking for myself, I'm not speaking for anybody else, or any other organizations, past or present. But you know if -- we've all said this is -- it's about distributive, and open, and participation, and those sorts of things, and to support something which seem to imply (inaudible) again. I said, we may all be reading this much too carefully, it seems to imply that there's actually an organization, a structure, and I think that's what gives a lot of people pause. Again, speaking for myself, because--

Bill Drake: No. I heard that, and I understand the point. There is no organization, there is no plan to build an organization, there is no staff for an organization, and there is nothing in the operating procedures that we are writing right now that envisions an organization, but I think that, you know, what would be useful, Lynn, is if you could enter those comments, if you've got the time, on to the comment bit on here, and then when the CC, steps back and looks at the comments received, we would have something serious to chew on about exactly how do we make sure that we do this in a way that people won't interpret it as being something other than what it is.

Lynn St. Amour: Okay, and I have --

Bill Drake: I think you are asking a really important point, and I think that if you could provide that to us as input that would be very helpful.

Lynn St. Amour: Okay, I will take a look at doing that, and give a whole bunch of ideas, and I have views on that sort of thing as well. But your comments were helpful, and I appreciate it as well. I'd be getting the operating terms, and perhaps making some of these points clear, and that will be helpful as well.

Bill Drake: Okay.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Lynn; sort of the set of questions, actually. And thanks for the responses, Bill. It's Olivier speaking. I'm somehow puzzled by the term clearinghouse, because somehow it implies a vetting function. It implies some kind of filtering or evaluation of those issues, whilst I would have thought an open platform is basically, absolutely open and everyone can put the issues forward, and then I guess they are self-evaluated by their peers. Which one of the two are we looking at here? Are we looking at a clearinghouse which is evaluated by, I suppose, a NETMundial committee? Or, are we looking at an open platform where everyone evaluates everyone else's proposals?

Bill Drake: Again, you are reading the word clearinghouse in a way that I think is not necessarily entailed by the term. The notion of the clearinghouse is simply a place where, again, supply and demand meet, and transactions can be conducted, exactly how that is done, and whether that requires any humans to be actively connecting and shaping, or making decisions, or instead, you have something that's a more automated kind of activity, varies. There are different ways of implementing a clearinghouse function, and I gave examples of the warehouse model on the one hand, and GIPO on the other hand, as being two quite different ones in that regard.

So, the idea here is simply that this is a place where people can come searching for information, in fact, it will be -- if anything a clearinghouse of clearing houses, it will be a meta (ph), it will be a collection of pointers to other clearinghouse type functions. But, again, I do not see the desire among the group to build some organization where some set of people will sit around deciding that for spam, these 15 resources are worth mentioning, and those 10 are not, that's not the intention, we never had any discussion that gave any indication that anybody has any interest in anything like that. So, I just don't see -- I just don't see that as being implied by what we've said.

Unidentified Participant: Excuse me?

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks very much for this. It's Olivier speaking. And that's clear. It might be that this term itself might have to be looked at, and suggestions for an alternative term since it's -- Certainly, I also note in the chat a question about this specifically, or a comment about this specifically. Okay, let's have a look -- I don't see anyone else having put their hand up.

The question now is, do we as a group wish to be contributing to this? I must say I've had just a browse over this, it's not a large document as such. I personally don't see anything that really sends out an enquiry, perhaps apart from this question mark about clearinghouse, but not that much else that kinds of sends out as to what we wish to be saying as the ICANN community. Of course, you know, the floor is open for anyone else on the call to say otherwise, or make suggestions, and I don't know whether ICANN, as an organization itself, will be making comments or not. And I turn to Nigel Hickson on this. Was there a plan for a specific comment from ICANN on this? And if that was the case would it be interesting to have a look at the kind of comment that ICANN might make?

Nigel Hickson: Good evening. I hope you can hear me now, and apologies for not being on earlier.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah. We can hear you Nigel. Welcome.

Nigel Hickson: Thanks, Olivier, I'm apologizing for this (inaudible). I'm pretty sure that the (inaudible) response as such, because we are part of a -- as you know, there are three, sort of, parts of the Secretariat, and we are one of the parts, and I think you'll see where we are sort of facilitating the process, as well as Fadi Chehadé, and he will come on to this later. In his talks with various countries and member states last week in The Hague, is trying to encourage people to respond to the consultation on the site. And I think, you know, Bill got it exactly right. I mean if people don't respond then, you know, clearly the Council will take a view of, you know, people's relative enthusiasm and what projects they are putting forward, but I don't think ICANN will respond itself, not that that means that people don't have individual views. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Nigel. Any other questions or comments on this? Seeing no hands up, I think maybe we can take an action item on that, which is just to share that document. It's not such a large one, so share the link comments at NETMundial.Org, scope and activity -- well, the whole thing, basically, one, two, three, four; and ask for any comments on the list, and then move on basically with our call today.

Okay? I see no one having put their hand up. So let's move on then to the next part of our agenda. I've stopped sharing my screen, and we are now going to look at the follow up from GCCS 2015, the conference that took place -- Was it last week, or the week before? I'm losing track of time? Recently, in The Hague, and it was last week, yes; in The Hague, that's a global conference on Cyber Space 2015.

A number of people from this Working Group were in The Hague for this conference, and what we are going to have now is just an update on what went on over there, and so this, I believe, and specifically the name is not next to it, but I believe that's -- Is it Nigel Hickson who is going to provide us with the details? I'm not sure, actually who else on the call was there, so if you were at the conference, and you attended the conference, so you actually followed a significant amount of

the conference, remotely, and you'd like to contribute as to what sessions you thought were of importance, please put your hand up, that would be very helpful. So, in the meantime --

Nigel Hickson: And yes, thank you--

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Nigel Hickson, you have the floor.

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Thank you, Olivier. Good evening. I'll be very brief because I think there's a lot of, you know, documentation out there, so people can form their own judgments. So this was the so-called Global Cyberspace Conference, it followed the so-called London Process, so this was the fourth conference following the London Cyberspace Conference at the back end of 2011. And there is no institutionalization of these conferences; it's something that's caught up quite a bit in various groups in that. The first one in London was organized by the U.K. Government, and it was organized, really as a one-off, but it then became clear that subsequent dialogue was required.

The original intention was to come out with some sort of global agreement on so-called norms of behavior, you know, behavior in cyberspace, so how people should behave in cyberspace for the public good. But of course it's morphed into a wider dialogue as we saw last week in The Hague, where roughly about 1,800, 1,900 people gathered. A lot of governments, obviously that was the original focus of the conference, but also business, and this time a really fantastic representation from civil society as well. So a much more diverse audience than I think we've had before, although geographically, perhaps, not all that diverse in that a lot of Europeans, obviously quite a few people from Asia, very few people from Latin America but, you know, of course distance and that. And the one in 2017, sorry for going out of sequence, it's going to be in Mexico, and Mexico has offered to host the next one in 2017, so hopefully that balance would be addressed.

In terms of the output, there was the Chairman's statement which I circulated to the Group. The Chairman's statement was the document that we were shown about a week before, first time, at one of these conferences where we actually had shown the Chairman's statement. It was a useful document, nothing particularly outlandish, I don't think, but it reinforced the messages about the multistakeholder approach, the importance of the WSIS, and the continuation of the IGF, so I think that was useful. And various parts of the sort of community that attended as the technical community to the statement; and civil society also put something together.

So I think that that was the -- sort of the institution side of it. Fadi Chehadé spoke in the opening session along with quite a few others, and he also took a part in the Panel on Internet Governance on the second day. And we took advantage of lots of different ministers, mainly foreign ministers -- not necessarily foreign ministers, so foreign-office ministers, you know, from the foreign department rather than the communication departments. So a different group of ministers from -- than often you see at Internet conferences. And we had meetings with China, India, Brazil, Indonesia, Egypt, the UAE, and I think these and other countries which I forget. They also met with the Secretary General of the Council of Europe, and the representative from the OSCDs in Europe, and the Chief Executive of the CGM (ph), so we had a fairly busy agenda.

So I'll stop there. And so I just want to apologize again, as I did on the list, I should have circulated the Chairman's statement to the Group when we saw it about a week before the conference, and I apologize for not doing that. It wasn't any deliberate act, just simply got dealing in lots and lots of things, and it slipped my mind. So, I do apologize.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you very much for this, Nigel. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And of course I open the floor for questions. I had a question actually, that was specific to the statement was released, and a copy of which was sent to the mailing list. In fact, I think we had a discussion on this as well. The global forum on cyber expertise, the creation of -- it's an initiative by the Dutch Government to create a global forum on cyber expertise. I mean, was there just a wish to start something like this, expressed in the room, or within a proposal that the Dutch Government just came up with? Or was

it a consensus decision? And how much do we know about this at this very moment in time? Nigel Hickson?

Nigel Hickson: Well, it's just -- whoever questions there, and other people might have more knowledge that I. Certainly I knew nothing about it until a few days of so ago, well until I got the agenda, and so that -- it was sort of a significant part of the agenda. The launch of this -- the launch of this global forum, and I had look at it, and consulted some people, and indeed ICANN has since approached Jean-Jacques Sahel, who is the European Vice President, and indeed would coordinate in ICANN's input into this conference that was in The Hague. And I think they've been approached by the Dutch Government and other actors to, sort of, endorse this platform, and to take a look at it, you know, rather than endorse it straight away.

Various actors have endorsed it, so they were able to announce various partners, so-called, for this platform, but essentially it's a platform that's -- it's an initiative that's been backed the Dutch Government that put money behind it, and it's not entirely clear exactly what it will do, how it will -- sort of insights with other platforms, such as GIPO that Bill Drake mentioned earlier, and of course the NETMundial Initiative, and various other open sort of sources of information there is. This is particularly aimed at the countries, in terms of trying to make out expertise on various issues. So, I mean, certainly we can, you know, in the coming weeks, and if there's an interest in the group, we can try and find out more about it, and provide a more comprehensive and intelligent briefing than I just gave. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks, Nigel. We have Bill Drake in the queue.

Bill Drake: Thanks. You know, I just wanted to say, I mean, this is further to the question that was asked. I found the discussion of this initiative to be quite puzzling, as did a number of my friends that I was on Skype with at the time. Given that there are many existing capacity-building initiatives out there already, there are the various summer schools that have been running now for a decade, and other related kinds of activities, DIPO, et cetera, et cetera, and here we had, it seemed a group of governments saying, oh, let's do capacity building, and there was, as far as we can tell, no real civil society or academic participation in forming the group, so we were quite puzzled.

I mean, we talked to them about the question of something redundant. This seems a lot like something that is already going on, and if governments come in with big money wanting to do the same things that other actors are doing -- are already doing -- then you introduced some dynamics that I think are, potentially, complicated. So, I hope that over time, they do find a way to make this a more transparent and participatory process, and define a niche in the capacity development, we don't say building anymore, capacity development world that is not going to be stepping on what everybody else is already doing. And that's not clear to me whether these issues are really on the agenda for the folks starting this. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Bill. Olivier speaking. And I don't see anyone else with their hand up, but certainly what you mention here is absolutely correct. I wonder, so far, what's the relationship -- or is there any relationship between this new initiative, I guess, another one, and the iStar organizations? I mean, are the iStar organizations involved in any way? And that would be a question for Nigel, of course.

Nigel Hickson: Well I've been -- I was (inaudible) -- I think the answer is no. We did have a discussion with ISOC and certainly, I think, APNIC, and the INTT (ph) on this before the conference, we had a sort of a technical collaboration called the week before The Hague conference, and it's -- well I think that's the first time I've really heard about it. And the INTT (ph) had been brief by the Dutch Government, which was over in Amsterdam, and the government came along and talked to them about it, but that was about all, and certainly, you know, I don't think there's any collective involvement as such. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks, Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. And unfortunately, the time, I know that this was announced during one of the sessions, I'm not sure whether there was any feedback from people on the ground to ask this very type of question. Or was it just an enthusiastic audience saying, yes, another initiative, please. Let's have more efforts duplicating -- duplication of efforts rather than strengthening of the efforts that are already in place. Of course, I'm only expressing my own -- and it might not even be my own views that I'm expressing here. I'm just expressing views that might have been expressed by people. Any thoughts on the way to go on this? Should we just wait and see, and perhaps have more details on that in the future? And while the -- soliciting comments from Nigel, perhaps, or anyone here. Bill Drake?

Bill Drake: I will be perfectly happy to see Nigel, on our behalf, ask for clarification as to what kind of community engagement in this initiative is envisioned, because, again, if it's sort of government guys going off and thinking, we'll build the thing, they should at least be aware of what's already there. And they should probably consider whether taking a multistakeholder approach here would be as advantageous.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Bill. So, we'll leave the issue as is for the time being. Nigel, I gather you've taken note of this, and as you are tracking the future of that, I don't know whether there will be any ability when the initiatives picks up, and a website is created, et cetera, whether there will be any ability to give feedback, provide feedback in the time, that it might be something to definitely keep within our radar, and as soon as there is the approach will be for inputs, whether formal or informal. And I know that you are also in touch with your iStar colleagues. It might be worth trying to find out where -- you know, where this is going, and certainly letting them know that they are already letting the Dutch Government know that there's already a lot going on, and how does this fold with everything else.

Nigel Hickson: Thanks, Olivier. Nigel Hickson. Yes, will certainly do that. We'll track it, and if anything comes from (inaudible) or when it's in a position where it's ineligible (ph), we'll forward something to the group, whether a paragraph or just explaining where it's at. One thing I will also mention, it's linked to an initiative by the Oxford Internet Institute, which is something that Olivier may well know about, so this is the school where the government that formed this college at Oxford, but they have a -- the Internet Institute has been in Oxford for some time, and they have created a set of Web-based capacity platform, as they call it, in the prelude to the Netherland's (ph) Initiative. Thanks.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Nigel. And yes, the OII that used to be run with -- Bill Dutton, I think, was the previous Chair on this. I'm not sure who is in charge now, but it's in St. Giles. Okay. Let's move on to the last 10 minutes of our call, and we have a long-standing question mark on our desk which doesn't appear to have been erased and replaced with X, and that's the CCWG and IG contribution to the workshop for the WSIS Forum. And so I'm not seeing a link in the agenda itself, I'm not quite sure, I haven't seen any text as such, proposed text, so perhaps I should leave it to Nigel to let us know what's exactly at stake here, and see whether we can help with something that will go as a contribution. And Nigel Hickson, you have the floor.

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Thank you very much, Olivier. I'll be very brief. So, essentially, we touched on this at the end of the last call, so this is a -- we have a workshop scheduled in the WSIS Forum, and it's taking place in the week of the 25th of May. And our workshop is at (inaudible) -- our workshop is at 4:30 on the Thursday, yeah, 4:30 to -- sorry, 4:45 till 8:15 (SIC), so it's a 90-minute slot, and the title that we have at the moment is, ICANN's Contribution to the Implementation of WSIS Action Lines. And then it has, including the introduction of international domain names. So that's the placeholder, and this is the time lead discussion because we have until midnight tomorrow to submit further details on this workshop. The IG are looking for, you know, a bit more substance on each of these workshops.

   I mean actually, our one has got more text than a lot of others have got, but we need to fill it out with a bit of a better description, and also with some proposed, sort of, speakers, so this is timely if

-- And we can change the title slightly, you know, we can give other examples of how ICANN, in general, has contributed to WSIS. We can also say what ICANN, or community or, you know, whatever, wants to see in the future; I think, in your hands, I mean -- you know, or you might say, you don't want to know, you know, really up to you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thanks very much for this, Nigel. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. I open the floor for comments. I know that, Nigel, you have -- I think -- have you shared some text? I'm just trying to see that right now, whether you have shared some text with the community. I mean, you've shared, certainly, the report with the -- I don't even know how much there is in there.

Nigel Hickson: Yes.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: I'll let the floor open, and then you can comment on that. But I don't think that there's been any actual proposed text from you that's been shared with the list, is there?

Nigel Hickson: No. Just to clarify, Olivier. Nigel Hickson. No. I mean, we shared on the last call, was that we've had some sort of, you know, null exchange about this, and I don't know if you did, but the title (inaudible), is the title that's down for the workshop at the moment. So, as I've said, we can either changed that, we can add to it, and we can propose speakers and (inaudible) confirm, yeah. So, I think that these (inaudible/skip)--

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: And the title is, ICANN, Contribution to Implementation of WSIS Action Lines including the introduction of international domain names. Thank you for this, Bill. We have Judith Hellerstein first, and then Bill Drake afterwards. Judith, you have the floor.

Judith Hellerstein: Yes. This is Judith Hellerstein. I don't know whether this is a good time to discuss the schedule for the -- there's been talk on the list about the open meeting (inaudible), public meeting, and I just was wondering if you can discuss that, because I noticed the public meeting is on Monday, before we would have our working group and that it will -- and I don't think that structure works that well, and so I want you to discuss that.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Thank you for this, Judith. Do you mean the public meeting in Buenos Aires?

Judith Hellerstein: Correct.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Yeah. We'll have, in future calls, I believe next week or the week after, we will be discussing this, and we'll be discussing the top end, and I know the forms are due in by the 1st of May, so I think we can discuss this next week. Bill Drake?

Judith Hellerstein: Okay.

Bill Drake: All right. Now, Nigel, I mean, what I personally think would be useful given the context, and I don't know if you agree, but bearing in mind that we are talking about a meeting being held in an ITU-based concept, where a lot of the participants are not engaged -- most are not engaged in ICANN, and where there is certain kinds of deeply-embedded understandings about ICANN, which may not be ones that we share, would sometimes circulate around Geneva here, and the conditions and so on.

I can't help wondering whether doing something that is (a) explaining again, in a little bit more detail, and setting up the notion of multistakeholder and how it's useful, not in the raw, raw sense, but in an operational sense. And then (b) looking at the transition and accountability processes in order to spread the understanding of what's going on, because I think probably a lot of actors don't really know how much work has been done through multistakeholder setting -- in a multistakeholder setting, to try to transition the U.S. role, and make ICANN fully independent and able to stand on its own feet and function as truly, more globalized body.

I think those are things that are worth talking about in this context, personally, as opposed to -- I mean, you could talk about New gTLDs, but that's -- I think that this is going to be -- I think it's more sort of an environment where you might want to speak to the broader geopolitical aspects without getting into the knotty details of who said what, or favored what, you typically describe, this is what's being done, this is how it works and so on. I would think that that's value adding based on my very long time here, I don't know if that comports with what you are thinking.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks for this, Bill. It's Olivier speaking. I'm desperately trying to find page 141 on this, and I'm scrolling to that. Sorry for the flickering in your screen. Let me just hand the floor to Nigel Hickson, while I try and look for this. Nigel?

Nigel Hickson: Thank you, Olivier. I just wasn't sure what you were looking for, but you're looking through the document that you have on screen, that's the document for CSTD that we circulated the other day. So it's not on the WSIS Forum but, you know, that will--

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: The wrong thing. Sorry about that.

Nigel Hickson: No. No. No. I thought you were coming on to it. No, I mean this is -- you are the Chair. So, I mean, Bill, thanks for those comments. Yeah. I mean we could certainly propose that. I know that -- I mean to some internal sensitivities, I think that's just being honest about how much is openly on -- well obviously there's quite a lot of open discussion on accountability, and the mailing proposal, but how much is down in other forums. But I mean, as far as I'm concerned you are absolutely right, this is an audience which is potentially important just to highlight what is going on, because they are an audience that might well, you know, have influence in terms of the governments represented on the GAC, and perhaps in other ways as well. So I think we could take that opportunity, but as I said, I'll have to go back and discuss it with the team, but I know it's not just -- I'm not trying to say -- it's not just staff, I'm just saying, you know, I would need to sort of discuss it.

Bill Drake: Do you need to turn something in tomorrow, did you say?

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Yes. I can see the deadline for putting in the details on this session, we had an email today. I might be -- I could ask to see if we can get an extension till Monday, or something like that, or I could certainly do that. I can't see there's any absolute criticality that -- that's what they are saying but, you know, if it's -- Yeah, perhaps other people have views as well.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thank you for this, Nigel, and it looks like we are already running out of time. Time just flies at such a speed on this call, but is it possible to maybe make another attempt, one last-ditch attempt on the mailing list to try and see if we do have inputs from those people who have not been able to make it on this call? I know that this is being sandwiched between two calls of the CWG Accountability as well. It's been a lot of work for the other groups, so we, unfortunately, haven't got such a lot of people on the call here. So, Nigel, would you just be able to fire off one last email on the mailing list, and try to see if we can get maybe some further input?

Nigel Hickson: Yes. I can, Oliver. Nigel Hickson. Yes, of course we can do that. Yes, and see if we can get more input indeed, and any other ideas, but yes. Thank you.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks very much for this, Nigel. And now we just go over to any other business. And I've noticed a note from Greg Shatan who had to run to the CCWG Accountability Call, and introducing Vicky Sheckler, who is going to somehow take his space, I guess, in order to be a participant in this Working Group.

Vicky, are you able to speak and just briefly introduce yourself?

I see, maybe the technical things haven't been worked out yet, totally. So, let's keep it for the next call then, perhaps, and when the technical will work, and we will have not run out of time, then at

least we'll be able to have some time to discuss it. Welcome into the Working Group, and I gather -- and maybe, Renate, you could check this, that Vicky has been subscribed to the mailing list, the Working Group's mailing list.

Renate De Wulf: I will add her now.

Olivier Crépin-Leblond: Fantastic. Thanks very much. And with this, unfortunately we've run out of time already. I hope this has been a helpful call for all of you. It's been a little short. We are usually used to having our 90 minutes, and they think a little more than that. I certainly have learnt much about what's been happening these past two weeks, and let's follow up on the mailing list, and certainly follow up with Nigel on this contribution which needs to be out and, you know, we have a deadline but as you've heard, it might be just a matter of hours rather than days for the WSIS Forum.

So, I'd like to thank all of you for being on the call, and it's now adjourned. Goodbye.

And, Renate, it's Olivier still here. Are you still on the call? I'm not sure if Renate has come off the call already. Just to let you know, the Doodle of course for next week, the same thing as this week, but we'll follow up on Skype.