20150501_ccwgIG_ID967133

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Loretta. And thanks, everyone, for attending this call today.

So, we have the draft agenda issues displayed in Adobe Connect and we will try to go through all those items, and so -- particularly to prepare for (inaudible) meeting.

But the first agenda item is really to -- I would say to welcome and introduce the new Co-Chair, Young-eum Lee. So she's the Co-Chair from the ccNSO. Jordan had to resign because he got too busy with the accountability cross-community working group and so we got Young-eum Lee. And maybe she can say some few words. Young-eum?

Renate Dewulf: Young-eum, are you having difficulties? Have you dialed in through the Adigo bridge? We can hear you typing.

Rafik Dammak: So, okay.

Young-eum Lee: Hello?

Renate Dewulf: Yes, we can hear you.

Young-eum Lee: Can you hear me?

Renate Dewulf: Yes, we can hear you.

Young-eum Lee: Oh, great. Great. Okay.

Again, thanks, Rafik. I'm glad to be here. I've been trying to follow what has been going on in this group, but I know Jordan has been doing a lot of work for this group and I know I have a big shoe to try to fill. Thanks.

Renate Dewulf: Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: (Inaudible) Thank you for this. Can you hear me?

Renate Dewulf: Yes, we can hear you.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Can you hear me, Renate, or not?

Renate Dewulf: Yes, we can hear you, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks. Okay. So I think we can move to the next item, which is about preparing -- yes. I was saying that -- let's move to the next agenda item, which is for Buenos Aires meeting

and start to shape the agenda for the public session and also the one for the face-to-face session for the working group.

So, we -- in Singapore meeting we had I think successful public session and I think we have to keep that momentum. So if we can start by comprising some ideas or topics we want to discuss in Buenos Aires and we think that they can be relevant to the community. And then -- for this time, the ICANN meeting at this time, the -- how to say, the working group will come after the public session, so we won't have really time to prepare during ICANN meeting, but we have to do the whole preparation prior.

Okay. So let's start trying to get some topics, ideas here, how -- what do you think we should achieve for Buenos Aires and so on.

Okay. I see that Judith and Lynn in the queue. Yes, Judith, please go ahead.

Renate Dewulf:	Hello, Judith?
Rafik Dammak:	Okay. So while Judith try to fix issue from her side, we can maybe move to Lynn and then we can come back to Judith. Lynn, please?
Lynn St. Amour:	Yes, thank you.
Rafik Dammak:	Can you speak up?
Lynn St. Amour:	I just wanted to say that with the CSTD and the WSIS Forum having concluded shortly before the meeting in Buenos Aires, and with folks looking forward to a number of other meetings, that (inaudible) something to do with (inaudible) for IGF consideration that we've actually (inaudible) of our agenda. But I also think it's really important that we (inaudible) to put some issues in front of--.
Rafik Dammak:	Lynn, sorry. We have really hard time to -- Lynn?
Lynn St. Amour:	Yes.
Rafik Dammak:	Sorry.
Lynn St. Amour:	Okay.
Rafik Dammak:	I'm just -- sorry to interrupt you, but we really have hard time to hear you. Can you please--.
Lynn St. Amour:	(Inaudible--.)
Rafik Dammak:	(Inaudible.)
Lynn St. Amour:	Let me know if this is better and, if not, I'll just type it into the chat. Is it better now?
Rafik Dammak:	Yes, please go ahead.
Lynn St. Amour:	I'm trying to see--.
Rafik Dammak:	Yeah, this is a bit better, yeah.
Lynn St. Amour:	I was simply saying that given the fact that we will have just come through a CSTD meeting and the WSIS Forum shortly ahead of the ICANN Buenos Aires meeting, and

then of course in the second part of the year we'll be looking forward to other WSIS events as well as some sessions on (inaudible) for the IGF, I think there needs to be some substantive issue sessions. But, I actually think we need to have those with the intent of driving across (inaudible) and looking for (inaudible) from the ICANN community; not simply a report out, but a way to get more active engagement on the (inaudible). I'm not sure what those are yet, but--.

Rafik Dammak: Yes, please--.

Lynn St. Amour: (Inaudible)--.

Rafik Dammak: During the council--.

Lynn St. Amour: (Inaudible.)

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Lynn St. Amour: I hope you could hear that.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Lynn. I think we have this timeline, so--.

Okay. So we can maybe now move to Bill and then to Judith. Bill, please go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Hi, Rafik, it's Marilyn. Judith and I have been trying to be heard. Can we get in the queue?

Bill Drake: Alright. Should I continue or should I wait? Can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yeah, yeah, please go ahead. Yes. She's in the queue, but she can speak after--.

Bill Drake: Alright, fine. Hi, everybody. I was actually going to say something fairly similar to what I think I heard Lynn said, although I could barely hear her. There will have just been this whole set of activities in Geneva, some of which I think have potentially lasting consequences, I mean in terms of the internet governance agenda of the year and potentially beyond with regards to the CSTD and WSIS follow up and all of that. I think it would be useful to cover that because most people probably in the ICANN community are not following those issues very closely and they are potentially significant. At the same time, the problem is, as Lynn says, it can't be simply a report out. And the challenge is how to get dialogue with an audience in -- on a topic in which they're not closely linked in.

So, that's a challenge. And I think maybe what we could do would be perhaps, in providing an agenda, to list a few bullet points of key issues that are in play and maybe even have links to some materials. I don't know whether anybody would look at them or not. But it would be a pity to not talk about something important because not everybody's following it but, at the same time, we do have to have a baseline for people to engage. So, this is the challenge.

And I know that we have in the past in some of these public IG sessions talked a bit about WSIS-related developments and when it went to Q&A there really was a fairly small group of hardcore insiders who play in both spaces who were commenting. So, that's the challenge, how to get people who are coming from the broader domain name and address community to recognize -- to see what is important and relevant to them and to engage in discussions. But I think we should do it and I think we should also talk a bit about the IGF renewal in that context and what had been decided, at least for the Brazil meeting, at

the recent MAG and so on.

So, that's -- so I'm basically agreeing with Lynn. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Bill. Okay, Judith, can you speak now?

Marilyn Cade: Actually, it's Marilyn. Judith and I are together so I had asked for the floor. Is that okay?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Marilyn, but just have to say Judith was in the queue for a while and she couldn't--

Marilyn Cade: Rafik? Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: She (inaudible)--?

Marilyn Cade: Rafik? Rafik?

Rafik Dammak: Yes.

Marilyn Cade: I'm trying to explain this to you. Judith and I are together. Judith asked for the mic for me.

Rafik Dammak: Okay.

Marilyn Cade: Is it okay with you if I take the mic?

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Yes, okay.

Marilyn Cade: Judith did not ask for the floor for herself. She asked for the floor for me. Are we okay on that?

Rafik Dammak: Oh, okay.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Well, that was not a question then. Okay, yes. Please go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Would you like me to have her send you an e-mail and verify that I was the person who asked for the microphone, Rafik? I'm happy to have her do that.

Rafik Dammak: Honestly not, but just please go ahead, Marilyn. I'm just -- I just was seeing her raising her hand and try to get her in queue. But if it was just you, that's okay. I mean, please go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: Thank you. I support the idea that we should be focusing on a readout and making it relevant for ICANN stakeholders. And I think that if we marry the approach of this is what has happened in the May marathon, which is four weeks of meetings that have implications for ICANN activities and for the renewal of the IGF, but also have implications for how ICANN is viewed in the larger internet governance ecosystem, and then turn our eyes to the road ahead from June through December and again explain to the ICANN stakeholders what the relevance of these meetings are to ICANN stakeholders. Notice that I am using the word ICANN stakeholders, not ICANN staff or ICANN board. ICANN board and staff, CEO, etc., should be working with the stakeholders. But, I do think it's our job as the CCWG IG to provide that interpretation.

So to Bill's point, and I think to Lynn's, we're not just reading out, we're also clarifying

and providing information about how stakeholders may be able to get engaged. And I'm going to give a specific for instance. During -- on July 1 and again in October, there will be stakeholder consultations held in New York organized by the President of the General Assembly and the two co-facilitators, so it's a rough date. There's likely to be an online consultation. So, providing a heads-up to ICANN stakeholders that these events are being thought about and will be announced shortly after June would be something that we could do that would be helpful.

Now we're, of course, coming into -- our meeting is probably right the week before the stakeholder consultation, but it still, I think, would be important for us to overview what the rest of the process will be, including the fact that there will be outreach provided to other fora by the two co-facilitators where, again, ICANN is part of the discussion, but not all of the discussion. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. So, any comment on this? Okay. So if I try to summarize what I have got here from the different comments, is we try to kind of maybe report and update in BA about the CSTD, (inaudible) from the MAG and WSIS Forum activities and trying to -- how to say, to frame that to ICANN community which many -- which may include many parts who are not aware about those activities. And if I understand correctly, Marilyn, she was also talking about preparing for December and in general assembly, too.

Okay. I hope I didn't miss any comments. But to Bill, be helpful if you want to add something or you think that we can start with this and work on for the next weeks.

(Inaudible?) Okay. Yes, that's a good start. This is for the public session. We can -- I think we have that plan, but what about the working group face-to-face session itself? I mean what do you think we should cover as topics? I mean it will be after the public session, so it cannot be really to -- we use it for preparation, but what do you think it should be, the main topic for that session?

Yes, Bill?

Bill Drake: I suggested in Singapore, and I think Marilyn didn't agree with me, so we could return to that perhaps. I think that if the working -- if this is going to be a working group rather than a working party and we're going to have some agenda of actions that we're going to try and engage in, trying to make at least some baseline statement as an input to the stakeholder consultations of the WSIS review might not be a bad thing to do. We did succeed in saying something for the NetMundial meeting. And as long as we are sticking to the basic procedural aspects of support for multi-stakeholder participation and so on rather than trying to get into specific substantive issues where we might disagree, it could be useful to consider developing some sort of statement.

And if we will have just talked about the CSTD and WSIS, plus in the public session having a working face-to-face session building on that, try to sit down and establish a process for saying something might be a useful activity. Otherwise, if we have no work agenda of even a basic level of saying we support the multi-stakeholder process and think it's effective and blah, blah, blah, blah, then one begins to wonder what all we are seeking to do as a group aside from periodic updates about developments in other fora, which we can do in the public session. So if we're going to have two sessions, I'd like to think one of them could maybe be working in some manner. And if we can move in that direction somehow, that would be really good from my standpoint. Thanks.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Bill. Yeah. I mean we need some (inaudible). Okay. So just maybe to be clear. Which -- I mean if we should draft or make statements, for which fora?

Bill Drake: I'm sorry, are you asking me which forum?

Rafik Dammak: Yes. I'm asking (inaudible)--.

Bill Drake: Well, Marilyn was just saying, I mean there is supposed to be a stakeholder consultation process leading up to the UN General Assembly discussions and they've never been terribly -- I'm reading Marilyn's comments at the same time. No, you -- Marilyn, you didn't have to agree with the strategic advice at ICANN. What I suggested, that we might say something as an input to the WSIS Forum in Singapore, you scowled at me rather publicly.

But anyway, I think that that would be a process. And for those who are following it closely, whether it's Marilyn or Vinny (ph) or Nigel and (inaudible), whoever is on top of the procedural aspects of how the UN GA process will be ramped up, they could provide us with guidance as to what kind of input, inserted at what point, would be viable. But, certainly I would think that we could start by taking some of the things that we've said for the (inaudible) initiative, the base like document, and think about whether there's not stuff that we already agreed on that we couldn't boil down to a page statement that would capture current sentiment, etc., and feed that into the process to whatever mechanism the UN is providing.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks for the clarification, Bill. I think that's a good plan, but let's hear what others think. And I believe that Marilyn was raising her hand before.

Marilyn, you want to speak? Okay. Meantime, I think Young-eum wanted to intervene. Yes, Young-eum.

Young-eum Lee: Thanks, Rafik. I think what Bill -- I agree in general with what Marilyn has said and what Bill said, said about trying to follow the UN session. But I just was -- I'm just curious. I was trying to follow the sessions. But even making those statements, I mean do we have a general agreement or a consensus as to what the base sort of standpoint of this group is? For example, are we going to refer to the NetMundial outcomes document or whatever and any -- okay. So that's my question.

Marilyn Cade: And Rafik, if I can be heard? I'll just make my comment very quickly. It's Marilyn.

Rafik Dammak: Okay, Marilyn, but it sounds that you have some echo. But anyway, please go ahead.

Marilyn Cade: I was nominated to the CCWG by the business constituency. I'm not a free agent. And I need to consult with the business constituency. I think probably all of us need to consult with the parties that send us. Making a statement to an external body is different. The terms of reference that I understood we signed on to was providing advice to ICANN. If we're going to be providing statements to external bodies, I think we just need to have a process for understanding what that statement is. Is it a collection of individuals who are going to sign their individual names? ICANN staff participate in the CCWG. Of course they are there to support us.

But, deciding we're going to be issuing external public statements I think really changes -- and I'm not saying we can't do it at all. I'm not objecting to the idea we're going to do it, but I think we just have to think through what our process is. And if we're saying we're a collection of individuals working on the CCWG on IG and that's our point of view or we're actually doing what we did on our NetMundial advice to the board and the staff, and that was to hold a town hall and to seek consensus; but we again were advising ICANN. We were not -- and if you remember, we didn't have time to do a public consultation. We did a kind of a shortened approach to it. So, if we decide as a group

we're going to issue something that says that it is supported by the full ICANN community, it would have to go out for public comment.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks. Thanks for Marilyn and Bill for sharing I think the charter.

Okay. Yes, Marilia.

Marilia Maciel: Thanks, Rafik. This is Marilia speaking. I was just wondering, because now there's movement by some civil society organizations to make some provisions on some topics that I think are important. I understand it's the modality for the (inaudible) to have the members (inaudible) that the consultations and the voice of governmental actors can actually be heard during the process through December.

And the other point is related to the focus and substance of what we will see in the documents after December. I mean what are the new goals and the scope and the vision of a post-2015 information society? I don't know if there's a deadline for contributions or to try to influence the process somehow. Maybe Marilyn or Bill have more clarity about that. But, I think that the concrete thing to discuss in Buenos Aires maybe is a contribution that will try to influence this process, both in terms of participation and in terms of vision, something that would be concrete and that the community would -- could gather and rally around and have a direction, at least in terms of long-term goals in order to participate in the meetings.

Because sometimes, I feel that this group here is either all the time trying to make sure that ICANN and staff and the board is accountable and transparent with what they are doing, but it's not all that we should be doing. We should be proposing things that are more positive and concrete. And maybe this will give an agenda to the community that will help them to make some sense in the several meetings that are going to take place from here until December.

So, if we can produce a document that sets the long-term vision, that sets a goal, that sets a spirit of that this community believes that the world after 2015, that the internet system should look like, or the priorities or the goals, I think that that should be something important. And we would kind of not have the feeling that we are being so reactive and preparing from one meeting to the other. When the meeting's around the corner, then we react. When the consultation is around the corner, then we send a couple of e-mails and people don't have opportunities to respond.

So, what I feel like here in this group, and maybe this here is an opportunity to do that, is this vision of long-term goals and where we are going and what we want to achieve. And I think that this community has a lot to contribute with this post-2015 vision. So, maybe this is something that we can sit and discuss and align during Buenos Aires.

Thank you, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Marilia. I know I have say, I think, there are several interpretations that (inaudible) should be our charter and what is said about what we can do or what we cannot. And at the end, even if we make statement, it has to be -- how say, approved by the charting organization. So I'm just -- how to say, to really also understand this internal and external thing. I mean we are trying to -- well, at least not just to guide the ICANN staff and the board here only, I think, but also to help the community itself to make -- to take -- to maybe make a position and to work towards that since we have representation from the (inaudible) group. But anyway, I think this is up to you guys and I think we -- maybe probably we have to continue the discussion (inaudible) still.

Okay. Any further comment here? Okay. Since I see nobody want to intervene, I think there is a topic for discussion (inaudible) so we can get more people commenting here; commenting there.

And I do think we should -- I mean time-wise, we should move to the next item. But anyway, before that, Young-eum, you want to try talking?

Young-eum Lee: (Inaudible) make sense of what was just said. So in terms of this group trying to contribute to the (inaudible) process, my understanding is that -- Marilyn kind of made sure that we are correctly representing the groups that we are supposed to be representing so that -- and that means that when we go back to our constituencies and we consult our constituencies and come back with are the standpoints that our constituencies can support, but then we can -- we should discuss that basically during the Buenos Aires meeting as Marilia suggested and then we can move forward with whatever happens until together. Is that kind of generally a proper summary of what was being said?

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Young-eum.

So, if we're moving to the next agenda item, any further comment here?

Nigel Hickson: Rafik, it's Nigel Hickson. Can you hear me?

Rafik Dammak: Yes, Nigel, can hear you.

Nigel Hickson: Yes. Good afternoon and good morning. Sorry, I was in a rather noisy place earlier.

I just wanted to make two very brief points on the public IG session. As Marilyn said, it's a busy week and -- sorry, a busy month in Geneva. One thing we could mention in the public session, I would have thought, and get some dialogue is on the IGF itself. I know -- there's a lot of noise -- but I know the mandate was mentioned and of course the mandate will be discussed as part of the WSIS process, but I was just wondering if the IGF itself ought to be mentioned in some way. And I acknowledge this, that we don't want to just give information on these things but, on the other hand, the next ICANN meeting is not until the middle of October and by then, people's travel commitments will be solidified. So, it's just a question of whether we might want to just say something on the IGF that could be useful.

And just the other thing is the -- although this could come out in discussion, the ITU in the ITU Council next month, or sorry, later this month, will be debating -- will be deciding on what sort of open public consultation there will be for the ITU Council (inaudible). So, that might be worth mentioning as well. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Nigel, for (inaudible). Okay.

So, let's move to the next item, which is about the CCWG input for the WSIS Forum workshop, and also maybe have some discussion on how to participate more effectively in different process. If we just come some learning about the NetMundial Initiative consultation. But let's start with the WSIS Forum workshop. Maybe, Nigel, you can explain, just give an update about the summation and the topic and so on.

Nigel Hickson: Well, I think others are probably more qualified than I am, Rafik, but just to mention that after the discussion we had at the last meeting and after the dialogue on the e-mailing list, promoted by Olivier primarily and Bill Drake, we put in a workshop proposal for the WSIS Forum. This is the Thursday afternoon slot at 16:45. I circulated to the list the outline. And essentially, the topic is the sort of -- the IANA stewardship transition;

discussing that not so much in substance, but again, as we're doing for the IGF, or as is proposed for the IGF, in terms of what it means for the multi-stakeholder process, as an example of a multi-stakeholder process. And we probably need to do a bit more fleshing out on that, but the proposal's gone in and it's been accepted by the ITU, so we can obviously discuss exactly what we do. It's on the 28th of May so we have a little time. But obviously, completely in your hands. But yes, as Lynn said on the tract, it's not the substance of the transition, it's the process itself. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Nigel. So maybe we can take comments here about this summation and how I think -- what we can learn from this and how we can maybe improve the process so if in future how the CCWG can -- I mean work on a kind of commission and what we should do.

Okay. I see no discussion in the chat, that nobody want to intervene. So anyway, maybe for now we had two summation and we try to improve in terms that we work, we got more time to work on them and to maybe try to participate in other fora here.

Also, just one -- I think we wanted to cover about the NetMundial Initiative consultations; not about to support or not, but there was opportunity to make comments and that since Peter shared with us on the mailing list his own comments. But the question here is how we can in the future participate in such process; what's the best way and what we need to do.

Well, if there is no comment or question, then I can only go and move to the next agenda item. So in the sense I was trying to read your commentaries and -- which are a little bit hard, but okay.

So the next agenda item, it's about the CSTD Plenary (inaudible) resolution and content and your review. I think that was proposed by Nigel. Maybe you can explain for this part.

Nigel Hickson: Well, thank you, Rafik. Nigel Hickson. I mean I'm happy to defer to our members working, really. I mean Marilyn is going to go and others are just as okay with this issue than I am, but I mean just to mention the CSTD Plenary kicks off on Monday. And as has been I think noted in the discussion earlier, the main task of the plenary is to agree a resolution on the WSIS 10-year review and the resolution would go to SSOC and the United Nations General Assembly. So, it's a -- I think as Marilyn has mentioned and others, it's an important -- it's quite important. And of course ICANN are an observer there, but I mean obviously there's many other people that participate and will be making input. I recently -- I circulated earlier today just some brief remarks that I'm happy to take comments on those, but no doubt other people will want to talk. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Nigel, for sharing the draft comments. So we would expect members to send their comments and to help in adding maybe some, how can I say -- yes, to edit that draft.

Do we have -- I don't recall, but do we have a deadline for this?

Nigel Hickson: Sorry, Rafik. Nigel here. Well, the discussion in WSIS sort of starts on Monday, but I guess the main session is on Tuesday. And I'm not -- I mean I perhaps will make an intervention for ICANN as an observer, but I'm not saying that I have a monopoly on this. Lots of other people will be there and more qualified than I am to speak. So it was just -- if anyone's got any comments on that draft, I'd be obviously willing to take them. Other people, other staff might have comments as well. So, I'm not trying to make this a formal process, but it's in your hands, obviously. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Okay. Thanks, Nigel.

Okay. Any comments here? Well, I assume that (inaudible) a lot of you expressed your opinion already in the chat. Okay. So I hope that there will be some coordination in the CSTD meeting and, yes, please offer your comments to the draft sent by Nigel.

Well, as there is no intervention, then I think that then we will have to cover quickly the last agenda item, which is more about the process. So we discussed a few weeks ago about making an amendment to the charter and we send that to the charting organization. My understanding that the CNSO and ALAC approved them. GNSO will discuss that in the next GNSO Council call to be I think on the 21st of May.

But, maybe just if we can decide quickly while we're waiting for the approval from GNSO if we can start accepting open membership and participation. So (inaudible) only -- what do you call, I think representatives and members can participate in the mailing list. Should we open -- make it open membership as we try to amend in the charter or should we wait until the GNSO send its approval?

Okay, I see many yes. If it's -- I didn't hear any objection. Again, assume that we can accept open membership. Okay.

Well, Bart, you think that we should wait?

Bart Boswinkel: This is Bart. So as you -- it is -- so it is a twofold purpose, say, in no objection of the charting organizations. First of all, it's normalizing the current membership of the working group. As you know, according to the charter you will have members and observers. You could allow people in as observers. But once say the GNSO has expressed its no objection, then everybody can participate in a way as working in the CCWG accountability. So, even as of that moment you can even open a call for participants if you want. So, it's a bit on the brink of do you want to preempt the council decision, yes or no, but that's your call.

Rafik Dammak: Yes. Thanks, Bart. What's (inaudible) here is that we have several individuals in the list and they are trying to participate in the discussion, but we have now a moderation and so that's got quite a work for the staff. And people are trying to be included here. I don't see -- I don't think there will be objection from the GNSO Council, but we are trying here to get the feedback from those in the call. But, well, if we can wait maybe for more three weeks and while we can try to speed up the posting, but -- I mean trying to get the feedback from the group. I didn't see any objection, so--. I would assume for now that we can open, but we can just confirm in the mailing list and give time to express any objection. Okay. Yes (inaudible). I'm not making decision, merely just trying to have issue.

Okay. So we may end -- finish before the time, but any other business or topic that you want to raise or comment you want to add here?

Yes, Marilia?

Marilia Maciel: Thanks, Rafik. I am not sure if people are interested, but since we have still a few minutes, maybe this would be a good opportunity to talk about the latest developments regarding the NetMundial Initiative, but I am not sure there is interest on that.

Okay. I think that there is some support. So taking into account these few minutes that we have, maybe you can complement. As you know, we had the first working meeting of the coordinating council of the NetMundial Initiative in Frankfurt about a month ago. It

was a very good and productive meeting. It was devoted to developing the terms of reference for the initiative. We conducted a period of public consultation before that and, based on the contributions that people had and on the views of members of the council, I think that we have managed to put together a good first draft of the TOR (ph) that tries to lay ground for the work of the initiative.

I think that there are some positive and useful roles that the initiative could play. It would be gathered around an online platform that would basically -- and this is explained in a good manner in the TOR to try to facilitate projects and new ideas that the community may have that they could place in the platform. The platform would be a hub to try to find partners, other interested parties and donors that could fund these projects and initiatives.

The NetMundial Initiative would also be closely linked and the main reference to it would be the document that has been produced by the NetMundial meeting one year ago. So that document not only sets the vision for the NetMundial Initiative, but one of the roles of the NetMundial Initiative would be to serve as a platform to follow up and to understand how this document has been implemented, especially when it comes to principles, the principles section of the document. So, we expect that NetMundial Initiative would be able to produce some reports regarding the implementation of these principles to be discussed in spaces with the communities such as the IGF regions. It will also be a space to commission studies, to try to produce documents that would enhance the understanding about internet governance.

So, it's really a platform where actors and the community can gather together and try to foster collaboration and communication between different actors and to embody and facilitate and enhance the strength of summative (ph) model of internet governance that we have.

I think that some concerns that the community has shared have been addressed by council members such as the need for this initiative to be complementary and to enhance and to strengthen the IGF and work in cooperation with or at the existing organizations, which is something that I think that finally has been made clear in the terms of reference.

The next step after the Stanford meeting has been to put the terms of reference in public consultation. So this public consultation closes today, actually. So if you can go through the document, it's a four-page document, it's not very long, and you can still make your comments and the council is going to take those comments into consideration and improve the document.

What we are doing right now in terms of work is to work in parallel, in three working groups that have been created during the Stanford meeting. One of them is devoted to develop the operational -- the rules for the NetMundial Initiative, to create a document that would guide the functioning of the coordinating council of the secretariat, what are our roles and responsibilities. And we are working on that and I think that the document will be finalized by next week.

Another group is devoted to outreach activities and produce enough information regarding the NetMundial Initiative. And the third group is devoted to developing a criteria and to put together (inaudible) for the platform in (inaudible) a way that we can (inaudible) receive projects (inaudible) these projects from the platform so they can be (inaudible) that has been developed by Stefaan Verhulst from the New York University. It has been showcased as well in the recent JACO call that happened this week. So they have explained this project and I think that it is a very good project, to try to make some sense and to classify and make accessible a lot of information that has been produced

about internet governance issues; policy documents, academic papers, the network or actors. So, it's a very interesting platform. And if you go to the NetMundial Initiative website you can see a demo of this project that has been developed by Stefaan Verhulst and his team.

So, I think that's it for now. I don't know if Bill has something to add. We are probably going to have another -- actually, the first official meeting of the coordinating council. It will happen probably after Buenos Aires. Details are still being sorted out, but probably it will be right after Buenos Aires in South America and taking into account that people will already be there for ICANN.

So, I think that's what I have regarding news to share. Don't know if you can complement something. Thank you, Rafik.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Marilia. Thanks for this (inaudible).

Okay. Any question or comment to Marilia? Yes, Bill.

Bill Drake: Marilia summarized a lot very concisely and very quickly so I think that that was great. I would just point out for those who might be interested that I think the NetMundial Initiative will be sponsoring a reception for attendees at the IGF open consultation in Geneva on June 20th where we will have an opportunity I hope informally for people who are interested in both efforts to chat, recognizing that in many cases those are the same humans.

Yes, May 20th, Jim. When -- did I say June? May 20th.

So in any event, the people who are involved in the NetMundial Initiative were very involved in the structure of the IGF, too, and certainly see those are entirely complementary. So, that's that and we're out of time. Thank you.

Rafik Dammak: Thanks, Bill. Yes, we are out of time. Okay. Any comment, question, suggestion? Okay. We got a quiet group today. Quiet -- but, yes.

Okay, I think it's time to adjourn the call and I want to thank everybody for attending. We still have more work to do in the mailing list and to content discussion. So, thanks again and see you soon. Bye-bye.