

993788

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Let's start the recording please.

Speaker: The recording is started.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Fantastic. Thanks very much. Welcome. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This cross-community working group on internet governance conference call on Wednesday 19 August, 2015. Today on the call we have Cheryl Langdon-Orr, David Maher, Judith Hellerstein, Klaus Stoll, Lynn St. Amour, Mark Buell, Pranesh Prakash, Olivier Crepin-Leblond. We also have Renate De Wolf for staff who will join us in a moment and --

Renate De Wolf: I have just joined, Olivier. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: You have joined. Fantastic. Welcome, Renate. And I'm not sure --

Renate De Wolf: Sorry for the delay.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That's fine. Thank you. Have we missed anybody on the roll call, just anybody on the phone? Okay. It appears we haven't missed anybody in the roll call. So, welcome, everybody. And today we have two main points of discussions. One is to do with the WSIS+10 submission table. And one is to do with the Dublin meeting sessions which we have to prepare for since the forms will be due in shortly.

First, let's have a look at the open action items. We have two links on the agenda and you've got the link to the agenda page in the chat and also on the actually page itself drafted into the agenda PDF. In there you will notice the last call that we had, there was just one action item which was to build a Wiki page for the different WSIS+10 contributions. That was done.

And the second set of action items spans back from our internet governance meeting in Buenos Aires. There were two open action items, one from Rafik to ask Chris Gift to make the CTWG internet governance more visible in ICANN.org and one was for Nigel Hickson to check if ICANN could help with the hubs for the IGF. Unfortunately I think it's a little late for Rafik. I cannot see him on the call. And Nigel Hickson did drop me a note earlier that he was in an area in lovely Scotland which had poor mobile access. So, he may not be able to join the call. If he does join we will ask him for an update on this.

Are there any questions or comments on the action items?

Hearing no one, let's move on to part number three. Number three is our Google doc, our WSIS submission table. Two documents have been created based on the discussion that we had during our last call. The first one is the Google doc working table. I invite you to have a quick browse at it. What it has is to have to the -- I think the first -- what it has is to have the contributions. So, submission thing on the left, stakeholder category, summary of content, and then comments and remarks.

I think that ultimately this would probably be our final table because based on the discussions that we've had, one of the first things we had to look at was the category based upon which we're going to do our analysis. You saw on the mailing list there was going to be some neutral analysis to start with, just clearly enunciating what was in the submission itself. So, what you have in the left column is all of the different submission sources, Egypt, European Union, China, India, et cetera, et cetera. Then the next columns shows what the stakeholder category is and then the third column is one with the summary of content.

Now, we had a discussion on the mailing list as to what our categories were and I thought first to do a little test in the first box to see if we put all of these categories in one box, what would this look like. And it seems to be spanning several pages and not just several pages, these are just questions. There are actually no answers there. It's just the general issues regarding WSIS, the what issue, the who issue, and the how issue.

I think that this came up from the discussions we had online and there was some agreement from many people that these were the categories we should be looking at. Are there any comments regarding this first table and whether the table itself is suitable for our final -- call it document or our final results that we wish to achieve. Judith? You have the floor.

Judith Hellerstein: Hi. Paraguay is missing. They also had a late submission.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you for this, Judith. Renate and Nigel are actively monitoring the latest submissions. Renate, are you adding the submissions on to the table? How is this working?

Renate De Wolf: I'm trying to but I don't always have time to look on the website. I'll try to keep a better eye out for this.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for this, Renate. And thanks for pointing this out, Judith. Yes, there are a number of late submissions that have arrived. These will be added with time. I guess Paraguay is one of them. Any other comments on this table? Are we okay with the final format of this table? Again, are we also in agreement that it would probably be pretty hard to use this as a working table for the work that we're doing here?

Let me then take you to the second thing. For this I'm going to be sharing my screen. I think that's probably the easiest. The second Google sheet is the Google sheet working table, you all should all be able to have access for this. Let me try and therefore share my screen. How does this work? Of course that would work even better if my screen worked properly. I seem to have a technical problem. That doesn't help at all. Here we go. Is that working? Sorry. It's taking a little while for some reason. Here we go. The easiest way is if I share my screen as it is. Are you all able to see this?

In theory here you should be able to see the actually document.

Judith Hellerstein: We can see it now.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for that, Judith. Thanks, everyone. Sorry for this. My machine is a little slow in doing these things. Probably the connectivity. On the left we have the alliance of small states, Argentina, Australia, Canada, all of the different countries. This -- I've done this very hastily, by the way. So, the links are probably not working correctly but we'll fix that. The next column is the stakeholder category. Then we have the summary of contents and underneath that -- let me move this away. There we go. Summary of contents. And then underneath that we've got general issues regarding recent -- and we've got the two subcategories under that. These were taken from Yung's suggestions on the mailing list. Of course we can change those and work on those.

At the moment I just want to show you the format of what we could work with and start filling out. You've got the what issues with priorities, does the contribution specifically mention internet governance as opposed to discussing solely human rights? Concerns about what remains to be done, key focal issues, access, capacity, building content, gender use, freedom of expression, et cetera, et cetera. Then we've got the who issue. ICANN related content is somehow support critical and you see underneath is where we can start filling in the blanks effectively. Transition of INF function mentioned, I guess it's a yes or no question here, maybe with a comment. Calls for extension of IGS, APS, under what condition? Is the role of IT mentioned when discussing internet governance? Call for new mechanisms or changing role of existing mechanisms.

Then you've got the how issue, is the concept of multi stakeholders recognized as important versus multi -- we can rephrase this a little bit but that's the sort of idea. And here under the how issue there are four boxes and as you see the system scrolls so that you still keep the submission organization still frozen so that it doesn't scroll along with everything else and similarly speaking it can scroll down the list with the top being frozen as well.

That I think was what I made up of the discussions on the mailing list and now of course I open the floor for questions and comments. Very much open it. You're all taking this in at the moment? Is this the way we want to go with this document? Are you feeling okay with it? If we're okay with this as a format of our working document and I know having a multiple number of columns is a real pain. But we're just working with it. It's obviously completely unprintable. Then what we'll have to do once we've got this document filled in, it can all be put back together into the other document which is -- this one -- what is that? This one and then it will fit on a page and maybe we'll have to put it, instead of having it as a portrait -- I think that's actually in landscape mode. We'll have it in landscape mode and we'll be able to have it in a printable format of some sort.

Right, I see Pranesh has put his hand up. Pranesh, you have the floor.

Renate De Wolf: Olivier, he seems to have dropped off the call in the meantime. He will have to get back in.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Technical issues. Yes. I forgot about those. Thank you, Renate. We'll get back to Pranesh when he's back on the call. In the meantime, if you can let me know when he's back, Renate, that would be helpful. In the meantime --

Renate De Wolf: He seems to be on but his microphone doesn't seem to work. I will try to sort this out between him and Adigo.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you. Thank you very much. I know others are saying it's okay, format's okay, basically looks okay. Young, if I could call upon you because you brought the suggestions and you kind of synthesized the discussions we had with Marilyn and with others on the list in the last call the different columns, the contents of the different columns. Any thoughts on this? Any improvements to what we have at the moment? Young will try to speak. I believe.

Renate De Wolf: Actually she's --

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Adobe Connect?

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

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes.

Lynn St. Amour: I think she's not actually able to speak. She's -- she can join the previous comments she would actually -- for chat --

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks for that, Lynn. I thought it was the auto-spell that was -- that changed speak to park. Sometimes it does things like that. Okay. That's great. Thank you. So, I think that we have a number of people on the Adobe Connect that doesn't seem to be working too well but we -- everyone's typing and saying they're pretty much okay with this. Where did you -- where did we get the list of the countries and did we get those from -- ? Yes. We did. Renate took the list of the contributions that were made and basically added them into the table. They should link. Unfortunately it doesn't at the moment. That will be worked out. It should link to the actual contribution itself. Renate?

Renate De Wolf: Yes. Two people have raised their hands, Young Eum and Lynn St. Amour.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Renate. I have to swap between the little -- the tiny little window I have here. Let's start with Young Eum, please?

Young Eum Lee: Thanks, Olivier. Can you hear me?

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Yes. We can hear you now.

Young Eum Lee: I think the table looks fine. I don't -- I mean, this is what I'd proposed before basically. I think the staff did a fine job coming up with formats.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. That's great. Thanks for this, Young Eum. Are there any improvements you would suggest or do you just want to mull over it for a few days and follow up by email?

Young Eum Lee: I think I'd like to follow up by email because I wasn't able to actually look at the table in detail yet.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks, Young Eum. Next is Lynn St. Amour.

Lynn St. Amour: Thanks, Olivier. And thanks to Young Eum for all the excellent suggestions earlier. I thought it might actually be helpful to add one miscellaneous or catch-all column in case there was anything else of note that wasn't specifically called out by the earlier questions. But otherwise I think the table looks good. I think it looks fine.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Like a comment thing here? I'm doing it as --

Lynn St. Amour: And maybe other items of note. We don't want it to catch everything but if there's something we're actually seeing worthy of additional attention or specific call out those are the things that would be captured there.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That probably would be the right one. Okay. Thank you. That's the last column here. Is that what you were envisioning, Lynn?

Lynn St. Amour: Require attention assumes something that might be more active than we want. I'm not sure. I can think about some words. Maybe just other items of note or noteworthy items or something.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: We think alike, I was typing as you were saying it. I think that pretty much is the column we had earlier about comments. We had comments and remarks right here. We can do comments and remarks. Okay. That's good. So, what I'll do, not seeing anyone else put their hand up. Here's a suggestion from Pranesh, add a column on funding, impacting ICANN, IGF or additional countries, the digital solidarity fund has been a topic of discussion too. Funding. Impacting ICANN. Where would you put this?

Pranesh, you have the ability to edit this table, by the way, if you have the link to it. Do you wish to add the column where you want to add it? I think everyone with the link is able to edit the table. Perhaps you can add this in the right location? I can see there's

support, funding -- yes. You cannot edit. You only have view capabilities? That's strange. I'll have to work this out on the sheet as we do this. Spreadsheets are things -- never mind. Work this out with me afterwards. I'm not an expert in this one. View for everyone. I'll have to share another link. I think it's another link that allows for the actual editing of it.

Seeing that we have spent quite some time on this now and there seems to be agreement on the general direction that we're moving into on this, I think that the next stage is to share this with the rest of the -- with everyone on the mailing list and get some feedback over the week on this and get to work on filling this up. So, the next question is how to change -- how to fill this up. I noted that some are concerned that we have to have resources for this. Is staff going to fill this or are we going to fill this? My understanding was that we as the members of this working group were going to spontaneously volunteer to fill some of these.

Of course this would entice the way it would be different people reviewing different contributions. So, it might well be that we have different ways of analyzing things or evaluating things. But I can't imagine any other way. I can't see ICANN staff having the resources to fill that full table. It would be helpful to have Nigel with us to let us know a little bit of his feedback on this so far. I don't think everyone can edit this yet. As I've said, I've created this quite quickly. Anyone with a link can view. Let's try this then. I don't know if that changes anything.

Judith Hellerstein: Olivier, you need to go back to that page and say anyone can edit.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: I've done that now.

Judith Hellerstein: Then save it.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. That's saved and I'm going to put the link in our -- there we go. There's a link here. I don't know if that's changeable or not?

Judith Hellerstein: Olivier, I think -- yes. We can now edit. But I think you may need to sign in.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Excellent. I'm signed in. Others might have to sign in. I don't know. Let's not take too much time on this. I can see that people are now able to change things and edit here. That's fine. So, let's share this with the mailing list and ask them for feedback until the end of the week and then we have to start filling those boxes. What I was suggesting is that we end up filling the boxes. But let's continue the discussion on the mailing list and check with Nigel too before we proceed forward. We as in the whole group.

All right. I think that's enough for this. Let's move back to where we were before. I've stopped sharing. And if we go back over to our agenda, then we can see that the next part of our agenda is the Dublin meeting. First, before closing off this part of the agenda, the submission table, are there any comments from anyone? Are we going in the right direction on this? Is that the way you envisioned it? I note from Young Eum who has said in the chat, yes, I'm willing to work on this. I think we need more than one person for this purpose. I agree with you, Young Eum, it would certainly be important to have more than one person reviewing each submission because you take away that bias from whoever is reviewing things and it helps. I'm using the word bias not in a negative way. Obviously we're all biased one way or another depending on how we do our analysis.

So, having a neutral analysis is always better when you have a second eye or a fourth, a third or fourth eye looking at this, another pair. We could indeed do a Google call and ask people to sign up. Lynn, that's a good suggestion. I wonder whether it's better to leave it very spontaneous and get people to start work on this spontaneously or whether we should have a full sign up sheet on that. Or maybe can put their initials in the column that they would be interested in reviewing because I know it does take -- for some of those

contribution, it might take a little while to review. That's probably the easiest way to do it rather than having another doodle.

Would we be okay with people just putting their initials in the column as they start their review? Agreement from Cheryl Langdon-Orr. And much typing in the chat. Yes. There's an agree. Yes from Pranesh. Yes from Young Eum. If the Google is correct that should work. I think we can move forward. We've pretty much got our next step here. Let's see what we get back from the mailing list until Sunday and if we've got positive replies then from Sunday onwards we can start working on this and typing our analysis in there.

Let's move to agenda item number four. That's the discussion of the Dublin meeting session. We have two sessions that are tabled for Dublin as they were for Buenos Aires. There is the internet governance public session which is a high interest session that usually takes place either in the main room or in the second largest room. It's a large public session with everyone -- the one we had in Buenos Aires was jointly moderated by Peter Dengate Thrush and Bill Drake.

I think that was a pretty good success. Lots of people that were present and the face to face session we had in Buenos Aires was somehow less well attended, probably because it did clash with a number of other high interest sessions at the time. That was I believe on the Wednesday afternoon. So, we had somehow a smaller number of people attending than we thought and therefore not very much progress made.

That was actually a contrast from the session that we had in Singapore, the face to face session in Singapore where the working group had a large number of people attending. It could just be circumstantial or it could be that at the moment the flavor, the hot issues are just not matters of internet governance or there are other hot issues that have pulled people away from the internet governance side of thing.

The question here is do we want to have those two sessions in the same order, with the public session first and then the face to face session second? Or should these be swapped over? We have those two examples. The face to face session in Singapore took place before the public session. In Los Angeles -- sorry, in Buenos Aires the public session took place before the face to face session.

There was a bit of a timing issue in Buenos Aires. That's correct. The calendar as it is at the moment is pretty open. It's up to us where we would prefer to have those sessions. The suggestion is to continue having the internet governance public session on the Monday, I believe probably the Monday afternoon. And having the face to face session of the working group some time on Wednesday or Thursday morning. I'm going to have to ask Renate since she probably knows a lot better than I do. What's open at the moment for us?

Renate De Wolf: I'm sorry, for the moment I have no view. I will have a view in a week or maybe two weeks.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thanks, Renate. We're a little early then I guess.

Renate De Wolf: Yes. It's starting earlier than usual at the moment.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: It is starting earlier. How long do we have to make our choice? Will it be a case of on Monday you'll have more view and then on Thursday you'll need to have an answer from us?

Renate De Wolf: There is a call on Friday. I hope to have a better idea and I will let you know by email.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Fantastic. Thank you, Renate. We'll follow up by email. There's some background noise at the moment. Okay. That's the next thing, any questions or comments on the Dublin

meeting sessions? Are there any suggestions you'd like to make on this? A note from Pranesh, Pranesh believes that having face to face first works better if it's possible. Okay. We'll take that into account. That would mean having our public session on Wednesday then and having our face to face session on Monday afternoon. It mostly is all down to room bookings and unfortunately I haven't got any idea of the size of the venue we're going to. I know it is rather large but it really depends on the room bookings.

Okay. Let's follow this up by email as well. With this we can move to our next item on the agenda. That's the sharing of information on upcoming meetings, upcoming summits from September onwards. As you know, there's a large number of deadlines that are being associated with it, with some very short commenting periods that are being slotted into the timeline. We had a bit of a problem with being able to respond fast enough to the previous cycle. Of course we work hand in hand with ICANN staff and staff had to take some time to draft the first draft of a response and sharing it with the working group and being able to perhaps make some amendments and then send in their final response or input into the process. How can we better do this? How can we improve on this. It's another very open question and unfortunately Nigel is not able to make it today it appears. So, I'm not quite sure how we can take this question and what we can make of it. Are there any suggestions? Very open questions today on the call. What would you like to do today? Young Eum Lee, you have the floor.

Young Eum Lee: Thanks, Olivier. I think that this is a very open question and there may be things going on that other people are not aware of. I think one of the things I'd like to suggest is just for everyone to post anything that they've heard of or they think that anyone should make note of in to the list and kind of inform us. So, that's just one small suggestion. Thank you.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Thank you very much, Young Eum. That's one good way forward. We also have a calendar of event and a web page for the WSIS+10 as well. At the moment we've got a WSIS+10 review page. Let me share this with you if I can find the right location. Yes. So, Renate has put a link to the events calendar. That's another page we've got here which has got a whole list of the events that have taken place and that are coming up. I think that's the one that was established with the help of Marilyn. Is that correct, Renate?

Renate De Wolf: That is correct.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: That's wonderful. So, that's one that is showing all the different events that are taking place and obviously right now we'd be looking at the next summit being the summit in South Africa and then there's the UN MBG summit which is in New York on the 24 through 27 of September. That's the Millennium goals, particularly important. And then we have ICANN 54. I guess we could add to this right next to the ICANN 54, the next meeting of WSIS+10 because we've just learned this is going to take place during the -- I think it's the Monday of the ICANN meeting. Renate, are you updating this document? Who is updating this?

Renate De Wolf: I believe it was Marilyn with Alexandra.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. So, perhaps we could -- can we ask Alex to keep track on this or is she not working on this anymore?

Renate De Wolf: I don't know. I'd need to check with her. She's been very busy with the IGS if Brazil.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Okay. Thanks for this, Renate. We'll have to work on that then. That's certainly our master calendar as we could call it. I note Klaus Stoll mentioned that -- will be at the Africa summit and Klaus himself will be at the New York events if he is able to do so. That would be great. We'll have someone on the ground that can report back to the group in addition to some ICANN staff who I'm sure will be attending as well and it might be that other members of the working group will also be attending this. So, thanks for this.

As I said earlier we have various links on a wiki page which I put there with reviews because the review timeline and roadmap, we have the WSIS+10 webpage, ICANN submission to the WSIS+10 review and the WSIS+10 submission page as well. I guess we can start building on this and Renate will be building on the links there as we continue the work and continue monitoring WSIS+10 as it advances over time.

Are there any suggestions of other links we should put on this page perhaps? None at the moment. That's all fine. I'm not quite sure what else we can work on at this very moment. I was hoping we would get Nigel but we'll obviously have an update by email by then. Let's see -- I think we can move to any other business. I'm not going to keep you on for the full hour if we have nothing else to discuss at this very moment. I'm pleased we've moved forward with the WSIS+10 submission table. And really the next process is to get agreement from the rest of the group or no objection from the rest of the group and then start going and start doing this analysis. As you know, time is of the essence so we need to get moving fast.

So, we're now into any other business. Seeing no hands up I'd like to thank you all for this call. We just need to have one action item for our next call. The last call we had was two weeks ago. Would you think it's better to have a call in two weeks time or should we have a call next week. That's the last question of the day.

Cheryl Langdon-Orr: Two weeks should do.

Olivier Crepin-Leblond: Let's do it in two weeks time then. Cheryl suggested this. Let's do it in two weeks time, our next call. In the meantime I ask you to follow up by email. Hopefully by the time we have our next call we will have a much fuller table with all of the information there and we'll be able to discuss maybe some of the points and come to some resolve as to what this committee message is going to be overall.

So, I'd like to thank you all for attending this call and this call is now adjourned.
Goodbye.