
UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: This meeting is now being recorded.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay, the recording is now going.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Desiree. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. Today it's the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance call of the 7th of April, 2016. The time is just five minutes past 14:00 UTC and let's have, as usual, a start with the roll call please, Desiree.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay. In the room we have Claire Rupert, David Maher, Elizabeth, Ganesh Varma, Klaus Stoll, Mark Buell, and we have somebody – they don't have a name here, but their phone number is ending in 4849 – if they could identify themselves in a little bit that would be great. For staff, we have Veni Markovsky, and myself, Desiree Cabrera. And for the Chairs, we have Olivier Crepin-Leblond and Rafik Dammak.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Desiree.

So, would the person on the number ending 4849 please let us know who they are? And also, Elizabeth, I'm not sure your family name or second name, if you wish to share it with us. And of course anybody

Note: The following is the output resulting from transcribing an audio file into a word/text document. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages and grammatical corrections. It is posted as an aid to the original audio file, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

whom we haven't named in the roll call today? Okay. We don't seem to be able to hear you, so never mind. I know there's another person who's just joined us. Could you please introduce yourself? Hello?

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: Hi. It's Elizabeth Thomas-Raynaud from ICC BASIS.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Hello, Elizabeth. Thank you. And is anybody else on the call that we have missed? It doesn't look like it. Okay. So [inaudible] today's call is going to be primarily about policy on this occasion. We're going to have updates on the IGF MAG Consultations, Ministerial Declarations at the OECD and looking at the next steps, an update on the CSTD next steps, ECOSOC Multi-stakeholder Forum on Science, Technology, and Innovation, and also a WSIS Forum workshop update. Is there anything to change on the agenda? Do you wish to change the order of the topics or anything else to add on today's call?

I don't see anyone putting their hands up. No. Okay. So the agenda is adopted as is, and we can move to our action items. And because I'd like to spend as much time as we can on our discussion topics today, let's try and go through those action items quite quickly.

First, there were doodle polls for the WSIS forum. These have been sent by Desiree on our mailing list. Please fill them out. If you are going, even if you're not going, fill them as well so we don't have a question mark as to who else might have not answered or might be turning up and not be there. This is just to help us on two things – first, find out if you are

going to be in the WSIS Forum and we do have a space on the panel that we will have at the WSIS Forum, you might be able to fill in in case we have cancellations and so on, and secondly, also to find out any willingness on your part to spend some time attending the ICANN booth. We'll be speaking about this maybe a bit later, but the booth is something that ICANN has had this year. As you know, it's not like ICANN is going to send 100 people over there, so if you do have time please tick the right boxes and so on. If you don't then never mind. No big deal. Next. Maybe Nigel might think it's a big deal, but it's to try and see if one can help.

The next one is for staff to rework the timeline to be in a printer-friendly format – and check with Marilyn if this is still acceptable for our timeline to go on the wiki. Desiree, have you managed to check with Marilyn? I know that she was at the MAG consultation this week and very busy, but was there any updates on this?

DESIREE CABRERA: No update currently, but I will still go back with her after this call and see if we can get an answer.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you for this. And I do have to actually add to the roll call that Marilyn is traveling today so she sends her apologies and Bill Drake is also traveling today so he also sends his apologies. So please have these recorded for the call.

Now the next action item is the request for the mailing list suggestions on the policy topics for the next call. We have had some suggestions and this is what we have today, so that's also done. And then for Greg Shatan, Marilyn Cade, and Olivier to draft a statement on behalf of the working group Co-Chairs, and that's a statement on the Cross-Community Working Group on Cross-Community Working Groups. The three of us have exchanged ideas. I did meet with Marilyn yesterday also to discuss this and will have a first draft out in a couple of days. It probably will be a good idea to discuss the statement next week. There has been an extension to the public consultation until the 16th or 17th of April, so we still have a bit of time before that statement comes out. So hopefully by the end of the week I'm planning to have something out over this.

Finally – do the poll for time/dates for the next call whether it's the usual standing item. Any questions or comments on the action items? I don't see any hands up, so let's move on then.

Our discussion topics today – first we'll start with the update on the Geneva IGF MAG consultations, and I can certainly provide a short-ish update on my experience there. I attended this week as an observer which meant that on the first day, which was the open consultations, I was allowed to take the mic. On the second and the third day, which were open to observers which is very good, the preference was given to the MAG members, and the new Chair Lynn St. Amour who has assumed responsibility for running the MAG this year and hopefully in future years, too, was very nice to provide the floor in some occasions to people who were not members of the MAG.

So the first day, as I mentioned, was really the open consultations, taking stock of what had happened last year at IGF in João Pessoa. As you know there were a lot of statements that were sent in. There is a summary of all of those statements and of the taking stock somewhere on the IGF website. Good luck in finding it. Certainly a few people added more comments. I can't quite remember any statement that stood out of the lot. Certainly a lot of thanks to Janis Karklins for having run last year's MAG in such a fantastic way. A lot of welcoming messages for Lynn St. Amour this year. What else? Not really much else as far as I can remember that was breathtaking in any way.

The second day we had, again, a welcome by UNDESA and also the announcement of the hosts for this year's meeting. So that's going to take place in Guadalajara, in Mexico, and the date will be in early December – I think it's the 3rd to the 6th. It's quite late, actually, compared to previous years. Well, certainly last year but again in line with maybe some of the past Internet Governance Forums that we have had. Lovely location. I think everyone felt that it was really great to go there, and the Mexican government is certainly going to pull all stops out in order to accommodate the large number of people that are expected to go there.

Certainly there was some discussion on the preparations, and bearing in mind the feedback that was received on the open consultations regarding the difficulty in reaching the location, etc. that seems to now be in a much more accessible location. And there were also some – I wouldn't say concerns but certainly some messages and so on – regarding the accessibility, as in accessibility for disabled people, etc. and that will be taken into account.

Again, the MAG this year, I think a third of the MAG has been renewed, so a lot of new members that had to introduce themselves, introduce their background, and it's quite obvious that we have a very wide variety of people that are in the MAG. It will be interesting to see the dynamics of the group and certainly interesting to see the different approaches that each person has to this. As you know, everyone is selected as a part of a stakeholder group, but then once they are sitting on the MAG they are individuals. There was also actually some discussion as to what happens when a MAG member is selected under one type of stakeholder group and then might change stakeholder group due to the changing nature of their employment, and that was seen as not being a problem because next year there would just need to be a readjustment in the balance of the stakeholder groups. But people are not attached to a specific stakeholder group.

With regards to the creation of working groups and the timetable for the Intersessional work, the timetable was presented for the MAG's work and that was seen as being quite a challenge and so the full discussion of this timetable was pushed to the third day of the MAG meeting – the early morning before the official day starts so as to try and see if the timetable can be put together so as to allow for MAG members to also be able to carry out with their usual work outside of their MAG activities.

I have to remind you that MAG members have to make the choice among the hundreds and hundreds – I think it's more than 200 workshop applications – in order to build the program of the Internet Governance Forum, and having to review 200+ workshops and marking them using specific criteria and really doing the work is significantly

time-consuming. And again, the amount of time that – we're already in March I think – so the amount of time to proceed forward with this, things need to move very quickly. Others might wish to comment on this.

And then there were certainly discussions on the shaping the actual structure, the session types, the schedule, how many main sessions there are going to be, what type of main sessions. And then further down – and I think it wasn't on the second day but on the third day – there was a discussion about the dynamic coalitions, about the Best Practice Forum Groups as well, and with some several Best Practice Forums that would be renewed, including the one on IPv6 and that's the one that stuck with me since I was quite involved with that one. A couple of others which – unfortunately I had to run out of the room so I missed a few of these points – but inter-sessional work is going to be ongoing.

And then finally, the overall preparatory calendar of meetings with discussion as to where the next meeting would be, whether it would be in Guadalajara itself or in New York, in Paris, or in Geneva, and that still needs to be worked out. As far as I know – as I've said, I did have to leave the room on a couple of these things – so you can see a lot of preparatory discussions on these things.

As far as the dynamic coalitions are concerned, there was a lunchtime meeting which looked at the way that they were creating a coordination group between themselves and discussions as to whether there could be a liaison between the dynamic coalition and the MAG.

That's what I've seen. And no doubt I've seen several other people in Geneva this week, so no doubt we're going to have some more updates from other members of the team. And the floor is therefore open.

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: Can I take the floor?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Please, Elizabeth. You have the floor.

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: Thanks. I just wanted to share it was my first MAG as a new member, and I thought the meeting went extremely well as you've described much of it. Lynn in the new Chair role I thought did an exceptional job. She had a very tight schedule on the two days of our MAG sessions to advance a lot of work that in the past we had an extra four months to manage our way through. I thought that it was great to see a number of new MAG members participating as well as the usual suspects, caring and encouraging the program forward. So I just wanted to share that positive feedback. We landed with an overarching theme and a call for workshops will be going out, I think, next week, so those people that are getting ready to put together some proposals, you can kick off your work very soon.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks so much, Elizabeth. Because I think I was out of the room when the final theme was decided – do you remember what the overarching theme was going to be?

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: Yes. The final decision was that they weren't going to put Internet Governance as such in the tagline because there would be the Internet Governance in 2016 Guadalajara or however that works. And then the tagline would be "Enabling, inclusive, and sustainable growth."

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Wow. Excellent. It sounds very catchy. I'm glad that was chosen. Good.

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: I think the aim was that they were trying not to – there were lots of things going back and forth – but in the end I think they decided on something that could be concise but broad enough that all of the other subtopics that would evolve and would want to be covered would be able to be covered that it could make a liaison to the... or [referring] sort of inferred reference to the sustainable development goals of inclusiveness and the idea of considering the new future to the climate change taglines and all of those kind of things, but in the end rather than being a long list of different words and ideas, they wanted to go with the shorter tagline and then have an explanatory paragraph that could capture more of the diversity of topics that could come under that.

Then I think, if I understood correctly, and Nigel or somebody else who was in the meeting can elaborate – but the feeling was that for the call for workshops, they didn't want to pin down very tightly a bunch of subthemes that people felt contained in and so they would give some opportunity for tags for people to see different themes that have a history and a relationship and that they could also expand or add new themes or new ideas.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this, Elizabeth. So if I understand correctly then the final decision was to therefore not have everyone having to review all of the workshops.

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: No, that decision we haven't actually addressed that question. That's a different... this issue was of the subthemes. So in the past I think typically what they've done is they've chosen an overarching theme and then they've had a list of subthemes that have gone out with the call for workshop proposals. And then when the workshop proposals came in, they would be categorized as coming under cybersecurity or openness or human rights or... They would have these subthemes that were subcategorized. This year they felt that in order to better facilitate a bottom-up to actually open up and be a little bit more relaxed in letting people decide what their key themes and topics and issues were and not feel constrained or dictating that that they wouldn't actually contain the process with subthemes already decided, that they would leave it open. Nigel, do you have a better way of saying it?

NIGEL HICKSON: Good afternoon. I don't. Good afternoon. Nigel Hickson, staff. No I agree with Elizabeth. I think there'll be some flexibility. There was a lot of very constructive discussion on what the theme should be, and I think it's... I would have thought that people are going to in terms of their workshop proposals obviously try and think in relation to the theme but not necessarily be dictated to by the MAG in a top-down way exactly what sort of workshops should be stipulated. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Nigel. So are there any questions by anyone on the call?

NIGEL HICKSON: Perhaps I could just mention one thing. You'd alluded to it a bit. There was a discussion during the... and of course all of this is screened so none of this is confidential because it's all very good screening and remote participation, we should mention quite a few MAG members could only take part remotely because of the short timeframes and that, and they did that and it was excellent. No, the issue I was just going to mention was in terms of nominations for the MAG as I think we've discussed on the previous call the nominations come through the various Stakeholder Groups, the technical community, the Internet Collaboration Group, and for business it's the ICC BASIS, and in the Internet Collaboration Group it was felt that as only two of our six nominations had been taken up, that perhaps there was additional criteria that UNDESA was applying which we hadn't been aware of. And

so there was a discussion on this and UNDESA said they would be more inclusive in the future, more transparent, and also that they would be willing to actually publish the nominations that were made. So I think it was a fairly constructive discussion on that. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Nigel. Some of the feedback that I've received from some of the old timers – people that have been to many Internet Governance Forum/MAG consultations – were indeed that the consultations went very well and Lynn did a fantastic job in being able to go through very tight agenda indeed. There was a little... it's not a concern but disappointment I guess that the MAG didn't have enough time perhaps to think a bit more constructively into how the workshops could be selected maybe using a different method or something that was a bit more bottom-up or maybe working in an entirely different way. So I guess that this was really my explanation or my understanding was that there was so little time I don't think this is probably the year where the MAG could redesign its working methods in any way or in any significant way, but I did hear from a couple of people that they had hoped that there would have been more of a discussion from scratch as to how the workshop selections might take place or perhaps look at things in an entirely different way on the how to build the program. It's always this, isn't it? You have those people that want to move on and get on with things and you have others who want to redesign things from scratch at any opportunity as such.

The floor is still open. Are there any questions or...? Rafik is asking, "Is there any timeline for workshop submissions?" Actually, yes. There is a

proposed schedule that was published. If you look at the input documents of the Internet Governance Forum website there is a – you see, that schedule is not correct now and that’s changed and so on. Where was it? I think it was somewhere in those documents there was a draft schedule for when the workshops would be proposed. Maybe others have taken note of this during the meeting. I hadn’t. I know some people had taken a picture of the screen and we were told by Lynn that the workshop was there. Ah, here we go. “Proposed Schedule.” Thank you very much for this, Elizabeth. Is that the updated one?

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: Yes it is. There were two. That’s the one we adopted.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That’s fantastic. That’s great. Okay. So yes, the workshop proposals are going to start on the 15th of April and the last date for submitting the proposals is June 6th. Originally, the timeline, the duration was shorter, so they managed to lengthen it by one more week and also the MAG evaluation was also lengthened. Originally, if I remember correctly it was 10 days. It has been moved up to three weeks. That schedule took a lot of time to put together, but as you can see, it’s very, very, tight.

Any other comments or questions? If there are none, then we’ve spent some significant amount of time on this, so thanks for this. I guess we can move to the next discussion topic. It’s a bit too early to talk about workshop proposals for the IGF if the working group was interested in doing so. But as you can see, April 15th is when the workshop proposal period opens. I suggest that we might wish to discuss this as part of our

next call next week which will be a working group call instead of a policy call and we'll be able to discuss whether we want to submit a proposal for a workshop in Mexico City in Guadalajara.

Let's move on then. The next thing on our agenda, the next slide is the Ministerial Declaration at OECD. Nigel Hickson last week provided us with a very quick update during the very last minutes of the call as part of "any other business" and so perhaps Nigel could let us know a little bit more about this Ministerial Declaration and what the next steps are.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, sorry for the delay. Yes, I think this can be fairly brief. We're still waiting for final documentation from the OECD Secretariat. So essentially what happened last week – and I get my weeks confused. Yes, what happened last week in Paris, it was the final meeting of the CDP Committee that's putting the Ministerial Program together and agreeing all the documentation and, as I mentioned before, we're part of that in that there's a place at the table for the technical community and ISOC and ourselves tend to do that along with RIPE NCC.

At the meeting last week the Ministerial Declaration was agreed largely as drafted in the draft I put around about 10 days ago – very, very, minor changes in grammar. There were a lot of suggestions to open the Ministerial Declaration up during the meeting last week. We thought in the technical community it could be stronger in certain areas in terms of the open Internet. It's fairly strong on declaring an open and a single Internet is good for inclusive and economic growth, but we thought it perhaps could go a bit further. It also extols the multi-stakeholder

approach to Internet governance. So it's a good declaration but the problem was that opening it up would probably make it more difficult because different [member states] have slightly different views on things like intellectual property and that.

So the Declaration – and I'll circulate the final one when we get it – is joined by a number of policy statements for the various sessions. There's six sessions on things like skills, on innovation, on entrepreneurship, on the open Internet, on the Internet of things. And on each session which will have a Ministerial panel there is a policy document and those we spent many hours agreeing the detail of those. I'll be in a position to circulate those hopefully.

So that's the policy background. So I think in terms of policy there wouldn't be too many surprises. The OECD of course is predominately a northern institution but it primarily extols the open Internet and market-based solutions to Internet public policy. The actual Ministerial itself in June starting on the 22nd to the 23rd, preceded on the 21st by the Stakeholder Day and they're going to have a more detailed program to outline. The Stakeholder Day will consist of presentations from the technical community and BIAC which is the business community, and CSAC which is the Civil Society community of the OECD – a very active and positive community, and the Trade Union Congress, as well, and then the Ministerial discussions on the Tuesday on the Wednesday. In terms of ICANN just for interest, Göran Marby, our new Chief Executive who will be officially in place by June, he'll be speaking in one of the Ministerial sessions on the Tuesday.

So I think I'll stop there, but happy to answer any questions or whatever.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. The floor is open for questions and comments. Whilst everyone else gathers their thoughts, I have a question for this. What's the significance of both the Declaration and the work at the OECD in the wider sense of Internet governance? What I mean in that way is when we look back at 2012 with the World Conference on International Telecommunications and the possibility of a declaration to be signed by member states and this to potentially affect the Internet in a very direct way. How close are we here when it comes down to Ministerial Declarations and this type of process for it to have a direct impact on the Internet and also I guess a direct impact on ICANN?

NIGEL HICKSON: Olivier, as always you ask a key question. I think this is always a question in relation to principles and other documents adopted by the OECD. In fact, the OECD does have some legal connotations in the finance area, but certainly not in Internet issues. So it agrees is what the membership wants it to agree and the membership of course is reasonably diverse- 30 odd countries now – and because of the high quality of the work that the OECD does, generally speaking, the output of the Ministerial is quite influential. If we look back to NETmundial, for example, the OECD Internet Governance Principles were a key input into the NETmundial Internet Governance Principle. So I think what the OECD does in this

area is seen to be important. If Ministers from the OECD countries sign up to something then that's an indication of their positions, so if they go into a UN discussion or into a ITU discussion as they will do in a few year's time in the [inaudible] century when these issues might get discussed again then that is their position. So I think it does have significance, although not in a [matter of] legal sense. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Nigel. And I note that Rafik Dammak has put in the chat a link to the Internet Technical Advisory Committee, ITAC, which is the Internet community's partnership with the OECD. Can we share a couple of words about this please? And I realize I should have asked whom. Nigel, would you be able to... That is related, isn't it?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. I do apologize. I thought you were asking Rafik. ITAC is the technical community. Yes, so ITAC is the grouping facilitated by ISOC to ICANN and various other technical community members come under. And ISOC were instrumental in 2008. I wasn't doing this portfolio then – well, not directly – but in 2008, ISOC were influential in persuading the OECD Economic Committee to allow this sort of stakeholder representation [down] the table. And it's extremely effective. We sit there with member states, the Chairman allows us to speak even sometimes before member states have spoken. It's just so, so much better than we have in many other institutions in Geneva. It really is. The Trade Union representative can speak at the table and not have to wait until the end of the discussion. It's very good.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Great to hear that. Thank you very much for this, Nigel. Let's then seeing no hands in the room, let's then move on. Just one more note, one more thing from Rafik. He says, "The OECD outputs tend to influence policy making in its state members." So yes, it seems to be something very much upstream and very much at the forefront of giving us a view ahead of what the next discussions are going to be about.

Let's move on to the CSTD – the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology for Developments. As you know, the CSTD has a new Chair, Peter Major, who was also in Geneva for the MAG consultations as well. I unfortunately don't know the update on what the CSTD has been up to, so I'll have to ask... I'm not sure, is it Veni who'll provide those details or Nigel?

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: I can help you if it's useful.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Elizabeth, you have the floor.

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: So just to let you know, the last intersessional meeting of the CSTD was held in Budapest in January, and they're looking at the topics of Smart Cities and the futuristic technology with Technology Futures, sort of anticipating where technology is going and the impact of that on society. They had speakers on that and then they prepared the

documents that will then be presented at the 19th session which is the week *after* the WSIS Forum in Geneva. That's great, Nigel's just posted some links and details about that.

I heard from Peter that they've actually got... I can't remember exactly her name, but she's the head of a Science and Technology institute based in Paris, but she's also [co-chairing]... I think it's Heidi. I'll find it and I'll put it up on the chat after. But she's also the Co-Chair for the new Science and Technology Forum that was created through the Technology Facilitation Mechanism. This is something that's come out of the Addis Agenda – the Financing for Development Agenda in the UN, which is something that's not very clear and the linkage to other existing multi-stakeholder forums on related topics is unclear and it's taking shape in sort of a separate place. So what's great in having her speak at this event is that we'll hear more about that work, and then also get a chance to show what the CSTD does.

In addition to its work on studying and exploring these different topics that relate to science/technology for development, CSTD was also given the mandate by the General Assembly to report to ECOSOC each year on the WSIS review. And so last year they did that which was the 10 year review but then they also do an annual review each year. Nigel probably has lots more to say on that, but that's what I can share.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: That's great, Elizabeth. Thank you for this. Nigel, is there anything else to fill in from this fantastic update?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you, Olivier, and thank you, Elizabeth. Yes, so the meeting in Budapest which I think we've reported on was what's called an intersessional meeting, so not a full plenary so it doesn't make any decisions, but we had a good discussion post WSIS on a number of issues including Internet of things and smart cities as Elizabeth mentioned. The agenda, I think, is in the second post that I've done for the meeting on the 9th to the 13th of May. This is the annual plenary which is always held, I think, in Geneva. Stakeholders – shame Marilyn is not on the call because she would tell us how she and others pioneered the introduction of stakeholders into the CSTD meetings. But ICANN is an observer and will be there along with ISOC and a number of other observers during that week. There's a discussion on the WSIS framework on the Tuesday, post WSIS framework, and as Elizabeth said, discussions on other issues. It's great to hear that someone that knows about the technology facilitation mechanism is going to be there, and there'll be a discussion on science and technology and innovation in and science policy at that meeting, as well. And coming out of that meeting is a draft of the resolution, the annual ICT for development resolution which goes then from the CSTD to ECOSOC in New York and then to the second committee of the UNGA for adoption later in the year.

Peter Major, as you mentioned, is the Chair. He was going to Chair at the last CSTD meeting, so last May and he'll step down this May and the Chairmanship will go to someone else. Sorry, I'm not sure who that is, but it's a pattern of rotating Chairs for this. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. Thank you for also putting the link to the meeting details – it will be on the 9th through the 13th of May. I don't believe that remote participation or streaming is possible in those meetings, is it?

NIGEL HICKSON: That's a good question. I don't think so, but we'll find out. I don't think it is available.

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: I'm quite sure there's never been remote participation set up for those meetings.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Elizabeth. Yes. Participational streaming of course, participation probably not due to the way that this is all set up and through the hierarchies and so on. But with remote streaming, as you know, some of the United Nation conferences are available on the UN channel, and I just wondered whether there was...in fact, guess what? No. Yes. I thought that there might be. I did see here “[inaudible] online meeting registration” but it's not registering for online streaming, it's registering for the meeting. So, okay.

Any questions or comments? Elizabeth, you have the floor.

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: I was just going to say one other thing about the CSTD that is surely of interest to this group, and I had to step out of the call for just a few minutes earlier so if it did get raised – the Enhanced Cooperation Working Group? That hasn't been touched on yet? That's my question.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well, yes. Go ahead maybe you have something you want to add.

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: All I was going to say is that there was the call for different stakeholder nominations as well as the government under the different regional groupings of the UN. The call for nominations was put out by the Chair and then the different groups were designated as focal points. I did hear Nigel speaking about the technical community focal point and their work, and so ISOC facilitated that through this group that gathers names for *them*. So I'm sure ICANN was part of that process. ICC BASIS that did it for the business community and there's the Civil Society Coordination Group that gathered names. And so each of those stakeholder communities were given five people to nominate and from each of the different regions the UN breaks it out into the western Europe and other group, the eastern European group, there's an Asian group that includes some of the Middle East, there's an Africa group, and Latin America. So each of us put in nominees for that.

What I understood from Peter Major is that the governments are still duking it out a little bit for the four spots in some of the regions, and so he hasn't been able to publish the final list yet. But this is a working group. There was a previous working group that looked at this question. I'm sure it's been discussed in this group in the past, and in the WSIS +

10 review that finished in December, the decision was to refer that question back to a new working group of the CSTD and so Peter Major has agreed to Chair that and move that forward. So his hope is once he has this group appointed, to have at least two face-to-face meetings to figure out the scoping and the terms of reference and start their work.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this additional information, Elizabeth. That's very helpful indeed. I don't see any hands up for questions or further comments, and I realize time is going. I note that Mary Uduma mentions in the chat that we should receive updates and summaries from attendees in the group. I guess we can. I mean, the discussions in those groups on the CSTD are not confidential, are they? One is able to share what's going on inside the room.

NIGEL HICKSON: Just very quickly, the actual CSTD sessions are closed and yet [the] reporting of them I don't think is particularly sensitive as long as one observes the sort of Chatham House rule, so to speak. But it's always a slightly contentious issue.

Just on the Enhanced Cooperation Working group – we have discussed this I think on previous calls before – Veni has noted that it was a fairly important part of the outcome of the WSIS + 10 review in [Geneva] in [GA] and Peter has said that – notwithstanding what Elizabeth said about the government sorting their positions out – but hopefully the membership of this committee will be announced in the next couple of weeks. It then has to be ratified at this CSTD meeting in May, and then

that ratification has to be approved by the ECOSOC in July in New York, and so the first meeting of the Enhanced Cooperation Working Group is not slated to take place until September.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Nigel. So another pipeline of work coming up. Let's move on. Let's go now to the ECOSOC Multi-stakeholder Forum on Science, Technology, and Innovation, and I think that Veni Markovsky mentioned this to us during the last call – or was it Nigel? I think it was Veni.

VENI MARKOVSKY: I neither confirm nor deny.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so you've been accused by Nigel of having provided us with details on this, so you have the floor, Veni.

VENI MARKOVSKY: I have to talk to my lawyer first. Now the Forum, so this is an interesting event. I just went to the URL and some of you may have noticed that if they haven't seen the link a month or two ago that it was called ECOSOC Multistakeholder Forum, now it's only First Annual Multi-stakeholder Forum so they moved it away from the affiliation to ECOSOC for political reasons. But it will be at the ECOSOC [chamber] in New York. And the link basically describes it. I'm not going to repeat what's in the link. We started talking whether there is a need for a [five] event. The deadline

for this is April 22nd so there is still no quite yet decision because the questions that they have put for the Forum – and these are five questions you guys can see them on the screen – are very broad. And I'm trying to find out from the UN whether ICANN at least has some place into this whole discussion, because you may see that this is actually related to the [SDGs] and it's like how technology is helping achieving the [SDGs] and stuff like that so we are still into a research forum. [inaudible] to say we're at research phase to see what exactly this will be with regards to the Internet. I understand that there is also interest from other Internet organizations about this event, but they're facing the same questions we do.

So if you guys hear anything in the meantime, in the next couple of weeks about this conference, please do let us know in the mailing list or e-mail me separately and I'll be happy to take it from there.

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: Olivier, I have something to share on this if it's useful.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You absolutely have floor, Elizabeth.

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: All right. ICC engages beyond this topic on lots of different topics with the UN on investment trading, banking, intellectual property, etc. so our colleagues in New York have been working closely to stay in touch and to work on business inputs into the [SDG] process more broadly, and the other day I received some information from our colleagues updating

us on this and then we recently received an invitation which is a call for innovations for the [STI] Forum. I'm not sure what is the criteria or the lists they've grabbed for this call for submissions, but I can find out if it's something we can spread widely and if so, I'd be happy to share that with people on the list.

The call is to submit contributions, for these to be highlighted on the platform and the contributions deadline is the 30th of April. You're supposed to submit innovative ideas so the world funders, collaborators, and potential customers can see it. It's also to encourage innovators to submit innovations, and if they're development experts, to provide feedback and insights on the innovators.

Let me find out how public this call is. I don't know. Veni, maybe you have also an easy way to find this. This came through the Sustainable Development Department at UNCTAD.

VENI MARKOVSKY: If you can e-mail me something so that I can....

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: Sure, fine.

VENI MARKOVSKY: I don't know if you're done.

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: Sorry?

VENI MARKOVSKY: Elizabeth, are you done?

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: The only other thing I was going to mention is that there is also a webinar that's happening tomorrow on this topic. It's actually more on the TFM – the Technology Facilitation Mechanism – and it's a stakeholder online discussion that's taking place Friday, April 8th at 11:00 New York time. I noted that the participation was closed – online registration was closed – as of Wednesday the 6th but again, if you'd like I can e-mail you the contact person from the Division of Sustainable Development at DESA who is inviting people to this.

VENI MARKOVSKY: Sure. And by the way guys, for everyone, when you pop up into something, some information about things happening in New York, feel free to e-mail, I guess directly to me not to bother the whole group, because we don't want unnecessary traffic. Just because there are so many things happening and that's one of the things I wanted to just share is that there are parallel many things happening at the UN in New York and I'm sure similar numbers of events are taking place in Geneva, Paris, Vienna, wherever there are UN agencies, [that] we have to keep each other informed and my big appeal to you is to let me know in New York and let Nigel know about events in Geneva, because we may miss something and it may be important or we may avoid something which we may decide is not important and otherwise we would participate. One thing which in particular is happening is that the multi-stakeholder forum is a preparation for a high-level meeting which will be in July and

that means that whatever we submit if we submit something over this [space] it may be later used by the Ministers who'll be coming in July in New York.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this update, Veni. And thanks for this also, Elizabeth. I note that you've also put in the chat the link to the global online discussion that's taking place in this yet [other] UN department, the Department of Economic and Social Affairs – DESA – and as Veni said, it seems to be a multiplication of discussions that take place in parallel. I wonder whether one day we're going to have to map this somehow using a mind map of some sort, because it's just getting more and more complex and certainly a lot more work for those people that have to follow all those things. But it's very good to coordinate here and so, yes, please share this with Veni but also please I'd like to ask you to share it with the group as well. This is what this working group is for – the flow of information.

I note that we are one minute past the top of the hour. We should have stopped a minute ago. Since we started five minutes late, let's just extend by another five minutes to close on the last topic that we have on our agenda. Just last questions on the ECOSOC Multi-stakeholder Forum?

Okay, so thanks for these updates, Veni. And let's move on to the WSIS Forum Workshop update, and that's going to be quite quick because what's happened is the ITU has contacted Nigel Hickson this week, as we were kind of expecting, but maybe not with such a short deadline.

The ITU asked who were going to be the list of names we had agreed to send to the workshops that we have preparation for the WSIS Forum. As a quick reminder, the workshop was decided to be one on the Accountability process at ICANN, both the process that was used – the overall multi-stakeholder input process that was used to build the proposal and also with a few points of the proposal just touching on a few points of the proposal itself. The type of workshop was very much like what we presented last year at the WSIS Forum where we concentrated on the CWG IANA Stewardship Transition and there we actually focused just on the process.

So ITU came over and said, “Well, we need to have the list of people,” which was somehow not confirmed and we have been working in a crisis – I wouldn’t say crisis, let’s call it emergency mode in the past. Well, since yesterday I guess, I know that some people were traveling out of the small group of people that had come together to put this line-up together, so we managed to end up with a small line-up starting with – and I’m just going to read through them and whether they’re confirmed or not.

So Matthew Shear has proposed as the moderator and he is confirmed subject to funding. Thomas Rickard has confirmed that he will be coming, so Thomas Rickard is one of the Co-Chairs of the Cross-Community Working Group on Accountability. [Lee Spur] has also confirmed that she’s able to be on the panel. She is one of the Cross-Community Working Group Co-Chairs on the IANA Stewardship Transition and so it’ll be interesting to bring her input into how it all fits together. We have a conditional yes from Chris Buckridge – well it’s not even a conditional yes, he doesn’t know yet. We were going to have

someone from other regional Internet registries, we were going to have Izumi Okutani. Unfortunately, she couldn't make it. She suggested a couple of other people and these people suggested Chris Buckridge for the RIR community. Marilyn Cade will be at the WSIS Forum if nobody else from Business is identified as being able to take part in this discussion then she can certainly stand in. I can certainly stand in.

ELIZABETH THOMAS-RAYNAUD: I am going to be there as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You will. Oh, excellent, Elizabeth. Super. That's great. Okay, then well we can follow up afterwards then with Marilyn and you. I wasn't aware that you were going to be able to make it there. So that's great. I'll be able to be in just to provide the sort of basic ABCDE of what the whole process was to put together this accountability proposal. Theresa Swinehart for ICANN staff has confirmed. At the end of the day, this is all about ICANN Accountability, and Theresa is the Senior Vice President for the Strategic Initiatives, so she's confirmed as well. And we've also got Tatiana Tropina who is confirmed. She was involved in the Accountability Working Group and is one of the new faces in there. And we still haven't got a confirmation from a GAC representative yet. Nigel, I know that you've followed up. I don't know whether there's been any response. I know that Thomas Schneider has said that he is taking his annual three-day holiday. Thomas, yes he does take holidays from time to time, so he won't be able to make it. And so we have either Elise

Lindenberg or Jorge Cancio there, but I don't know then will move forward on this. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, we're still awaiting a response from the GAC Chair on who we should approach, but we'll follow up over the weekend and hopefully have something soon I'm sure. Jorge from Switzerland was quite willing to do it, so I'm sure we'll end up with someone.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thanks for this, Nigel. So it is quite a line-up – eight panelists and a moderator. As you know, we've got 75 minutes. The session will be mostly informational. There will be some time for questions. We had nine panelists last year as well and it went quite well. So as long as everyone sticks to their allocated timings, then that's fine and I guess that's what Nigel needs to send out to the ITU ASAP, that list. Is that correct?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes indeed. Too many moving parts. But yes I've requested an extension until Saturday because physically there's not enough hours in the day. But yes, hopefully – well, we will put the names in and a paragraph describing what the session is about as I understand it. I'll put down something to effect that we'll be looking at the process that led up to the Accountability recommendations going to NTIA, we'll be looking at the broad outline of what those recommendations are and what process will be going forward both in terms of the actual process itself

and also the wider aspects of ICANN and Accountability looking forward to WS2 as well, I think. But I'll share something with you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. I note that Mary Uduma mentions that we have to be careful about geographical balance on the panel. Absolutely. We were trying to get a good geographical balance and also good gender balance. Unfortunately we ended up with one small problem which is that we did ask a lot of people that were located outside of Europe and not many were attending the WSIS Forum. In fact, of all the people we asked outside, I think only Matthew Shears who actually is based in Europe said that he was able to come. So we do have a bit of a problem on this. Very good point regarding [inaudible] being based in Geneva. That's a good, good, point. Let's follow up after this call. He's been very, very, much involved with the Accountability mechanisms and so I think yes, that's a good suggestion. Regarding other people, it was very hard, as I said, they just said, "Sorry, I can't make it to Geneva just for this."

I note that we are 10 minutes past the top of the hour so let's follow up on the mailing list. We have another 48 hours until Nigel has to send those names over.

And let's go into any other business. I don't see any hands up, so we are going to have just a doodle for the call next week. Are there any dates that we need to avoid by all costs? I know that this week we had to avoid today because some people were traveling, but unfortunately I wasn't available, I'm on a conference tomorrow. So I wasn't able to deal with both things. I don't think there is anything... Is there anything

next week that will be using a significant number of people? Yes, I would avoid the 14th and let's try and do a doodle...

I have a problem in that I'm flying off to Madrid for an ISOC European chapters meeting on the 14th and I'm actually traveling both on the 13th and 15th. But we'll find something. Let's do a doodle for these three days.

Will there be a face-to-face meeting at ICANN 56? We will discuss this in our next meeting next week, I guess. Apparently it is a short meeting, so it will be a bit difficult, but we'll see. Anyway, with this I don't see anyone putting their hand up for any further business. So next week we'll be looking specifically at working group processes, we'll be looking at whether we need a face-to-face meeting at ICANN 56, we will be discussing the preparation of a statement for the consultation on the Cross-Community Working Groups, and we will also be looking at any additional preparations for the WSIS forum workshop. If you have any other topics for working group processes please send them on the mailing list and we will be including them in the agenda.

With this I'd like to thank you all for attending this call. I hope it was helpful and I look forward to following up on the mailing lists and to see you next week again. Have a very good day and a very good end of the week. This call is now adjourned. Goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]