
RECORDED VOICE: This meeting is now being recorded.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hello. Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening everyone. This is the weekly cross community working group on Internet Governance conference call, on Friday the 22nd of April 2016.

We have a small agenda today of various discussion topics relating to internet governance. And as, it's one of these calls... We're now alternating between calls where the working group works its own internals on the one side, and on the other side, we have calls that deal solely with internet governance issues and policy issues.

Today is a policy call. Before we start, let's have a roll call please. Deirdre.

DIERDRE SIDJANSKI: So we have, just from ICANN, Nigel Hickson and Veni Markovski. And then your present, Olivier, with Farzaneh Badii, is that correct?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Farzaneh Badii, yeah. Thanks for the Deirdre. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And do we have anybody else on the call who is not on the Adobe Connect?

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.

DEIRDRE SIDJANSKI: No, I don't see anybody.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: I don't see anyone. Okay, well this is just a very small call, or a small number of attendees today. I guess everyone will be able to listen to this call later on, when they listen to the recording. The agenda today is just discussion about the CSTD update, the WSIS forum, and the IGF MAG, the ITU WTSA. What a whole lot of acronyms, and maybe we can shed some light over the activities of each one of these organizations or working groups.

First is the review of the action items from our last call, and there were none. So that can swiftly be pushed aside for us to go and dig into the discussion topics, and we'll start with the update on the CSTD, the computer science and technology... What's the D for again? Anyway, I'll hand the floor over to, is it Nigel Hickson or Veni who is going to speak about this?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Sorry, I was on mute. Yeah. Yes, good afternoon. Nigel Hickson here. So the CSTD is the commission on science and technology for development. It's a commission, it's a UN commission run by [UNDB?], the United Nations development bureau here in Geneva. The commission meets every year in a plenary session and I'll put the agenda in the chat when I can find it again. I found it earlier and now I've lost it again.

And the meetings look at basically, sort of scientific innovation issues, but including the WSIS process. So on these calls, we've discussed before CSTD meetings, notably in the run up to the WSIS plus 10 review last year. The CSTD were conducting a major review of the 10 years of the WSIS process, and that review formed the basis of a recommendation from CSTD, or a resolution from CSTD, which was formed this time last year in May/June last year, and which was a fairly influential input into the UN General Assembly discussions in New York in December last year.

So the CSTD meets every year in a plenary session, and is meeting this year on the ninth, the 13th of May. The agenda is basically, and I'll put it on the link, is in sort of two parts. One is on science and technology for innovation and science policy in general, which of course is somewhat outside of ICANN' purview. But the other issue is looking at the forward looking process on the WSIS plus 10 outcomes from New York.

The WSIS plus 10 UN General Assembly output document reaffirmed the role of CSTD in terms of forming the annual ICT for development resolution, which goes from CSTD to [echo-sock] in New York. And there will be a discussion in the May plenary on the outcome of the UN General Assembly meeting. And also the task of the CSTD, to establish a working group on enhanced cooperation, which we've already touched on in this group before.

So one of the paragraphs of the resolution coming out in New York, the output document was the instructions to CSTD to establish this working group on enhanced cooperation, or reestablish this working group, because there was a working group previously, a couple of years ago.

So I'll stop there, but happy to answer questions, obviously. Veni will probably have something to add.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Nigel. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And so the floor is open for any questions or comments. I was going to ask you one question on the actual remit of the CSTD. I mean, what does it actually feed into afterwards? Does this feed into the IGF process as well? Does this feed into the WSIS process?

You know, if the CSTD reaches a decision on something, where does it go afterwards?

NIGEL HICKSON: Well, in our area, I mean the CSTD is essentially a commission. So it's not passing resolutions in the sense of making UN resolutions, nothing from the CSTD, if you like, goes to the security council or anything like that. But the commission does form recommendations and policy in terms of science and technology for development.

So for instance, it comes out with recommendations on science policy, which governments then might or might not adopt. And it feeds in our area, in terms of the world's summit on the information society, each year it creates a resolution, a draft UN resolution, which then goes in ICT for development, which includes some references usually to WSIS and to Internet governments.

And that resolution then goes to [echo sock] which is the [inaudible] and social committee of the UN in New York. And then from there, the

resolution is debated and eventually adopted by the UN as an actual resolution. So it's the first stage in a process of having something, have a resolution adopted by the UN.

So I mean, yeah. But it doesn't feed into the IGF. The IGF is a very separate process.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this Nigel. Olivier speaking. And the second question I had, not seeing any hands... Oh, there is a hand actually. Let me just pass the floor over to Farzaneh Badii, who has a question or a comment.

You might be muted. We can't hear you at the moment.

Okay, she will be back. She has a technical problem at the moment. Okay, no worries. In the mean time I was going to ask you, so currently, Nigel, Peter Major is the current chair of CSTD. I understand that there are elections that are coming up. Is this...? It's a yearly thing, isn't it? Is it a yearly post and then are there other elections coming up for a follow up chair, or is there no move in that department?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you Olivier. And I should have had the complete facts at my fingertips here. So essentially, it is an election but not in the normal sense of an election in that people can put up their hands and nominate each other. There is a process involved in terms of who is a vice chair, and the chairman is... The chairs are rotating in terms of regions, although I'm not sure it is completely strict.

So we would expect... I mean, Peter Major is obviously representing Hungary, so we would expect a non-European country to assume the chair next. And I think it's from Asia, and no doubt we could probably work out who it was, but I haven't got it right in front of me.

But yes, Peter Major was appointed chair last year, so last May, May 2015 and he steps down during this meeting and the new chair will be appointed. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thanks for this Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. Are there also...? Are the vice-chairs also rotating as well on a yearly basis?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. I mean, I think vice-chairs can be reappointed, but certainly they're up for election, yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so then comes my question and it's as follows. How is their continuance in the work of the CSTD if the leadership changes every year? I mean is there a process by which continuance assured? Or really the chair and the vice chairs, are they actually supporting the work and directing the work in the way that it's going?

Or do they just make sure the trains run on time?

NIGEL HICKSON: This is Switzerland so the trains always run on time. So I mean, essentially there is a secretariat to CSTD, and the secretariat obviously maintain the process, and there are some items which are continuous, if you like. Items that appear on one agenda and then appear on the next agenda because development has taken place in the meantime.

Whereas I think the chairs also have an input into the agenda. So for instance, in the intercessional meeting we had in January in Budapest, there was a discussion on sustainable development for cities, and intelligent cities. And I think that was the wish of the chair or the vice chairs.

So the agenda is to an extent made up of items that the chairs might determine, but also because of the progress of the committee in determining [science?] policy.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. And last question on the topic, what is ICANN's interest specifically in CSTD?

NIGEL HICKSON: And others will have a view here. I mean, given that CSTD has an input into the WSIS process, because the WSIS process covers internet governance at large, so to speak, and includes obviously the WSIS document in the Tunis agenda, include references to the way that critical internet resources are managed and the multistakeholder process.

So we have an input in... We have a very keen interest in the WSIS process, of course, hence our involvement in the run up and in the actual discussions that the UN GA last year on the WSIS plus 10 review. And we also have a general interest in ICT development because some of those aspects include references to the domain name system, or the use of domain names in one respect or another.

Obviously some of the debates on CSTD on science and technology and innovation are not germane to ICANN.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks for this Nigel. Olivier speaking. So the floor is still open. Any other questions? Farzaneh, have you been able to change your browser?

FARZANEH BADI: Yes, I can speak now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic. You have the floor Farzaneh.

FARZANEH BADI: Okay great. Thank you. I will be asking my question. I wanted to know what source of interest ICANN has in this process. My impression is that, and Nigel can correct me, is that ICANN would like the UN to hold down to these multistakeholder principles for internet governance, and that why it keeps contributing and [inaudible].

I want to know how effective ICANN is in contributing to the process?
Are they observers or like active participants?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you. Nigel Hickson here. A very good question. It's a shame that Marilyn Cade is not on the call, in that should would be able to give a sort of fairly lucid explanation of the history of the participation of different stakeholders at CSTD. I think it's fair to say that when the Commission for Science and Technology Development took on this issues like the responsibility for looking at the WSIS process, and I think that was, perhaps, six, seven, eight, or nine years ago.

But when they first took it on, there were not any stakeholders at all, the Commission for Science and Technology for Development was just the member states. And the member states rotate on an annual basis. And although stakeholders were sometimes called in to give talks or whatever, there was no stakeholder engagement at the table.

But pressure from the likes of Marilyn Cade and others resulted in observers being allowed into the CSTD process, and now there is a formal recognition that the technical community, and civil society, and business at the table. And you know, we have our place so to speak. It's true to say that the UN process is dictated to an extent that we talk after the member states, but what we do have a place at the table and we are able to talk during the debates.

I mean, perhaps at the end but we are able to contribute. So I think on particular issues like the WSIS process, I mean, ICANN has been reasonably influential in the process, not just ICANN but members of

the wider technical community or civil society, etc. in upholding, as you say, the sort of the multistakeholder process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Nigel. Any other questions? Okay. So no further questions. I think we can move on. The next topic is the WSIS forum, which is taking place in Geneva in May. So again, it's going to be... I think it takes place just before the CSTD meets. And what we have for the WSIS Forum 2016 is pretty much what we had last year, as in... Well there are a couple of sessions.

I'll speak to you about the session that this working group is putting together, and that's one on the CCWG accountability process. And to some extent, the actual proposal itself of the CCWG accountability. I'll put a link in the chat for a Wiki page that we have created, that has a list of all of the panelists, a provisional list.

There are a couple of people that still to be confirmed, Matthew Shears has definitely confirmed for being the person in charge of moderation for this session. And a small... Well, emails are now being exchanged, and so we're working through the session flow itself. We have material that was sent by staff, support staff, for the CCWG accountability.

So we just have to cut down, I think it's like 80 slides or 90 slides. We'll pick seven or eight of them to explain the process, and then leave it to the moderator and to the different participants or panelists to be able to fill the 75 minutes that we have at the WSIS Forum.

I believe that there will be a pre-meeting meeting or call, possibly next week for the call or pre-meeting meeting that will take place on site, on the very morning of that session. But it's one of these sessions where Matthew Shears isn't too concerned. He's got a pretty good idea of where we want to go on this, and I think that, all the other panelists or such stellar performers that this hopefully will draw the crowds, should draw enough people for the session.

Last year we had a full house, so let's see how we do this year. And I'm not sure regarding the actually printing of the glossary and so on, but I gather that Nigel has got that well in hand. That's the update on my side. Nigel, do you have anything else to add?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yeah, thank you very much Olivier. Nigel Hickson here. Yes, I mean the WSIS Forum is nearly upon us, [inaudible] I suppose. So it involves quite a lot of different sessions for ICANN, but for this cross community working group, as you say, the session on accountability and the slide deck came from the IANA transition team, and we will do a glossary of terms as well for the session.

In addition to this cross community working group on accountability session which is on the Thursday, we have a session on gTLDs, the reviews being undertaken in preparation for a perspective next round, and that is, that session takes place on the Monday, that's a workshop being organized by GDD with community members as well.

There is also a session that's being sponsored by the NCUC, and on civil society engagement based on sort of geographic factors. And we're

helping facilitate that where we can as staff. That takes place, I think, on the Thursday as well. And there is another session that Bill Drake is sponsoring as well on the IANA process.

So there is a number of other sessions which involve sort of ICANN community, which is of course, you know, very positive. In addition to that, Akram Atallah, the acting CEO will be there for the high level track. At the high level track, he'll be speaking on the Tuesday morning. And we'll have a booth, as we discussed on this call, for presentation of literature and other materials. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. And you mentioned Bill Drake's session being about IANA. Was it not actually not about internet fragmentation? I thought that was the... Bill Drake is having a session on Monday, Monday afternoon on internet fragmentation. Was that what you were referring to or was that another session?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, I am sorry. Not IANA... Too many sessions. Yes, internet fragmentation. And it, yes, I think it clashes with the other session on gTLDs. But yes, I think in all of those sort of four sessions or four workshops which involve community people or being organized by community people, by staff, or whatever. So quite a lot of people will be there.

In addition to that, apologies. I should mention that the civil society engagement staff at ICANN are organizing a lunch time briefing session on ICANN and civil society engagement, which is taking place on the Wednesday lunch time at [inaudible], just across the road from the ITU, and that's, no doubt there will be some further information about that in [inaudible]. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much for this Nigel. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I believe, yeah, the [Geneva?] internet platform. Next steps in enhancing ICANN accountability is the topic of discussion on the 4th, Wednesday the 4th. I must correct you on one thing you had said earlier, that Bill Drake session clashes with the ICANN new gTLD program reviews and lessons learned.

Actually that's not the case. They both are on Monday. The new gTLD program reviews and lessons learned is from 14:30 until 16:15, and then afterwards, internet fragmentation is from 16:30 until 18:15. So they are not clashing. You can go to both sessions.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you. Thank you Olivier. Sorry about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks. Any questions? I see Farzaneh having her hand up. So Farzaneh, you have the floor.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you Olivier. Farzaneh Badi speaking. So I'm looking at the list of speakers, and I know that the process you've had for selecting the speakers was kind of like in a small group. I just wanted to focus that on this page, you say how you came up with this list. And also the other thing I wanted, because kind of like people who are new to this really don't understand how things work or how things are organized.

And I think we should also put emphasis on what is ICANN, like the corporation sessions, and like what sort of sessions are done by the ICANN community, which is NCUC or ALAC or At-Large? And that was it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks very much for this Farzaneh. It's Olivier speaking. So on the, your first question, how the people were selected. In previous times, having to select people for the public meeting that we had in Marrakech there was an enormous amount of email that went to the overall public mailing list, this working group's mailing list, and a number of people complained that discussing potential panelists and so on was not something to be done out of respect...

Not something to be done so publically as such. So what we did ask was for a small working group to be created. I think the... Well, I know the request actually went... First on one of the calls, we asked if there were any volunteers, but we also made a request on the mailing list, and we should have probably repeated the request on the mailing list if anybody was interested in joining that small working group.

It is the small working group that made the selections of the panel. And in fact, many of the panelists that are here are panelists that we managed to get because they were already coming to the WSIS forum, one of the problems being that not everyone is coming there and if it's just to appear on one panel, in Geneva, we had a lot of people saying no, I'm sorry, can't make it.

So, as far as the geographical balance is concerned, it's not that great. It doesn't do that well, but we've tried our best balancing geographical and gender balance. And unfortunately, some of our choices to have a better geographical balance were crushed in that the person was not travelling to Geneva and was not planning to attend.

We gave up on the idea of having remote panelists. Last year we did have one remote panelist, but the system worked so badly that in fact, she never had a chance to say anything, which was really a shame. But on this occasion, we thought let's not even try so that we don't disappoint the person who is there, following remotely.

On the second point that you've made regarding having sessions marked as being either community sourced or staff sourced, that's obviously something that we can do. I don't quite know whether it's understood outside of ICANN though, and the way that were filed, these sessions were applied for, it was ICANN staff that applied for both this session, WSIS Forum, the one on IANA accountability, sorry, ICANN accountability and the one from the GDD.

They filed both requests. I don't know if there is a way to make a difference between the two. We can certainly put it in the explanation and the agenda of the topic itself.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Olivier, Nigel here. Just on that, on the... When one applies for a session, one has to put down who is applying. So for the cross community working group session on IANA accountability, I mean it's clearly the cross community working group. My name appears because I filed the application, but it's in on the behest on the cross community working group, whereas the one on the NCUC is on behalf of the NCUC.

That's made clear as well. There is the one for generic top level domains that is on behalf of ICANN's global domains division. I think it's clear on the agenda, although obviously there still can be confusion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. I note on the chat that Marilyn Cade mention or explain how the submission process works. Marilyn, can you say a few words?

MARILYN CADE:

Sure, thanks for this. And thanks for the question, Farzaneh. But also, Nigel, thank you for making the submission. So there is a fairly complex but open process to participate. It opens several months before, with an open session. I typically, if I mention that you attend those open sessions, you can participate remotely, and perhaps you might just add

to our calendar of events, a follow up on planning ahead for WSIS Forum 2017, taking into account how the process works.

So there is an open call, and then people can submit ideas or workshops. The WSIS Forum population is very different from the ICANN ecosystem population, and I think we need to take that into account. We're influencing and contributing a much larger and more development. Anyone can apply for a workshop, but the workshops have been allocated based on how they fit into themes that have been identified through the public call for comments.

So on the other hand, intergovernmental organizations and international organizations do get some priority, just as they do at the ITF, in being able to ask for a workshop. So, you'll see, or a session. So you'll see, for instance, and I'm not going to bore you guys with this, but you'll see for instance on the full agenda of the WSIS forum, this year's priority is effecting how the action [inaudible] and the SGGs come together.

So when requests were received, they were evaluated against whether or not they contribute to the achievement of the SGG I-20 30. This particular submission was explained, and I want to compliment Nigel and others who worked on this, Olivier, myself of course, but Farzaneh and others, that we created this in a way to talk about how multistakeholder is contributing to the larger internet governance ecosystem.

And I think that's a really important point. The other thing I'll just say, and I can live with this forum for other reasons. I will in fact be co-

facilitator of the high level sessions this year, but if, you know, perhaps we should digest the WSIS Forum agenda when we, after this WSIS Forum since it is informative, and think about whether we should be proposing a different approach for participation in the WSIS Forum for the CCWG IG next year.

Which might be more inclusive of even trying to provide travel funding, because really, I worked very hard, so did Olivier, to try to find speakers from other countries, from all of the different groups, and since there was no funding, it was a real challenge.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Marilyn. That's very helpful and a very good rundown on how things work at WSIS Forum. Good suggestion for this, and we'll doubt have a long discussion post-WSIS Forum 2016. Farzaneh Badii, you have the floor.

FARZANEH BADI: Hi. Yes, Farzaneh Badii. Thank you for that Marilyn. And as you've covered what I wanted to just, a point I wanted to make, is that... So this crowd is not familiar with ICANN, how it works. And if they don't, if they think that ICANN is a corporation [inaudible] come to talk about its own accountability, they might be surprised.

So I think, I just wanted to reiterate that you should be able to tell the crowd how the process works, and it was not like ICANN as a corporation to come up with accountability in ICANN. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Farzaneh. It's Olivier speaking. And I think that certainly the moderator of the session will, in his introductory comments, needs to explain where we are and how we got there, and certainly need to explain and emphasize the fact that this whole process was community driven, and that this workshop itself is community driven as well.

It's a good point that you're making, of course, from outside, ICANN looks just like the corporation, and there is no differentiation between the community and ICANN Board or ICANN staff. Any other comments on this?

NIGEL HICKSON: Just... Nigel here. Just to note that indeed, from Farzaneh's is a useful distinction. We did a briefing in, just as an aside, we did a briefing in Geneva last night to missions and IGOs on the IANA process including accountability recommendations. Theresa Swineheart is here in Geneva this week.

And that was a question that was raised, which I suppose we sometimes, we just talk about the ICANN accountability process, and you know, one of the missions asked why would ICANN be interested in enhanced accountability? Which was a good question, and it was made clear that it wasn't ICANN staff or ICANN Board, not to say that we're against the process, but it was a community driven process because of certain reasons, and I think that's the important point to be made.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this additional information Nigel. And let's then, seeing the clock move forward, let's move on to then to the IGF MAG consultations. And the news this week is that there has been a call for proposals, putting this in the chat, a link to the call for proposals.

And for this, I guess, shall I just hand the floor to, is it Nigel Hickson again on this? Or who wishes to speak about this?

I know that Marilyn, you're already, you're also on the MAG so perhaps you wish to say a few words on this.

MARILYN CADE: Sure. And then let me speak as a MAG member, and then invite Nigel and you, Olivier, who actually attended the meeting to also comment. The IGF held its first consultation, which is a full day open consultation followed by two days of the MAG meeting, which are also open. Transcripts are available.

We made a number of decisions, and I want to highlight two that are particularly, I think, well actually three that I think are particularly interesting for the CCWG IG. One, the call for workshop proposals, and the fact that we will be, the call is open. We're trying to get bottom up ideas, but we are suggesting some general framework, so that we will be able to categorize workshops.

We're all working with the... The MAG and the secretariat are also working with the host country. The event this year will be held in a [unes-co] [inaudible] site, which is very unique. And that means that it's a build out site. So there is much more opportunity for unique settings

for special sessions in the village, but the workshops will have probably more limitations. There are many, many rooms for workshops, and many, many rooms for large sessions.

The MAG is working right now on fine tuning the criteria for workshops so that even though there is a call out for workshop proposals, there will be structure and ideas provided so workshop submitters have some sense that they're not wasting their time. They're submitting something into a process where they have a likelihood of being approved. There is also a discussion about doing a kind of a special approach, which I'm going to go pop up, but that's not the right term.

There is a better term for it, but having different places in the abilities where 30 minute presentations could be scheduled according to many criteria, so not the kind of full workshop criteria, but many criteria might be a corner for use, might be a corner for entrepreneurs, [inaudible]. And that would help to provide more opportunities for participation, but limit the demands on the workshop.

The MAG agreed to continue the limitation on MAG members not to submit workshops since they evaluate workshops, and to call for MAG members to participate in no more than three events in their capacity and to focus on bringing in new voices from the community.

The next MAG consultation is scheduled for the week of July 11th through the 15th. The location is still being debated based on a Doodle poll. The options are Mexico, and Geneva, and New York. My latest insight looks like Geneva, due to travel costs and time costs, and the possibility of the third consultation being in Mexico is probably pretty

high. And the host country wants to organize the high level event in a special way to focus on innovation, and to ensure that ministers attend but that it is also open to participation more broadly than it has perhaps been in the past.

So I think I'm out of time.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Marilyn. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. And I heard you speak about the size of the location and the number of rooms that are available for both workshops and plenaries. Is there going to be a reduction in the number of parallel tracks compared to what we had in previous years, or is the number going to be the same, or maybe increased?

MARILYN CADE: So the MAG discussed the fact that in the main sessions in Brazil, there was very low attendance while in the main sessions, and the rooms looked empty, but in Indonesia, the main session rooms were only held 500 people, and they were filled. So the MAG is talking about different approaches, including limiting the number... Right now there are something like 12 to 14 proposals, the main sessions, but the MAG is trying to whittle those down.

The one thing I wanted to mention for CCWG IG is that there was an agreement to give a main session this year to the national and regional IGF initiatives. Now shorthand called the NRIs, and they are organizing their own sessions, so for anyone on the CCWG IG, and I'll post that

later. If I might Olivier, [inaudible] went on the CCWG IG, you know, we don't want to do the work here, we want to send people off to the other list. But I think that's a really interesting idea, as well as the fact that connecting the next billion phase two was accepted as a priority for intersessional work, along with continuing work on dynamic coalitions and the best practice forums.

And there is a lot of people on this list that are not on this call today, but a lot of people on this list that I think would find that announcement useful. So perhaps we should think about how we draft something and post.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. Please just feel free to post it and forward it onto the mailing list, and the participants can read it and can take part in this. Or at least they can act on it if they wish to. Farzaneh, you have the floor. Farzaneh Badii.

FARZANEH BADI: Hi, Farzaneh Badii. Thank you Olivier. Thank you Marilyn. I was wondering if CCWG IG wants to stop [inaudible] proposal? Is it within, does CCWG IG do that as well? For...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Farzaneh. It's Olivier speaking. So last year, the CCWG and IG submitted a proposal which was to explain the IANA stewardship process, and it was, I wouldn't say a copy, but another version of the workshop that the working group had put together for the WSIS Forum.

This year, I guess the big question is whether we want to, again, have a session on this, and whether we want to touch on, I guess what could be on the table, is the CCWG accountability process, and that might be something of interest to people in the IGF as well, but I don't know.

We're so few people on this call, I don't think it's for us to decide, but we can certainly on the working group on our mailing list if there is interest in doing something like this. That's the obvious topic that I would have suggested, the one that might be of interest to people at the IGF. Farzaneh?

FARZANEH BADI:

Yeah. Farzaneh Badii. So I was just asking if there is a possibility to [inaudible]. So if CCWG does that, then I think we can add, put this on the mailing list. Just to things, on accountability we submitted a workshop last year, and it got rejected, and one of the comments by a MAG member, oh, what does that have to do with internet governance?

Which is quite interesting. So that's one thing. So when we start asking if anything is accountable, we have to be very clear. The other thing is that there is a dynamic coalition on accountability of internet governance organizations in general, that we have started and we need to kind of activate it.

So if anyone, I can also provide information on CCWG, I don't think it's a good, I don't know if it's a good idea or not, but...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Farzaneh. It's Olivier speaking. So it might be worth, if we are to pursue the potential topic of accountability, first to of course, format the workshop proposal in a way that it makes it very clear that this is all about internet governance in a very level way of bringing accountability to organizations that have a very significant part in the way the internet works.

But secondly, to also look in the direction of the dynamic coalition on accountability for any speakers perhaps that can be taking part in any panel that we might put together. And I guess we're not at this level yet, and probably the next step for this is to ask our mailing list if there is interest in having a workshop at IGF.

Nigel, you haven't said much on this. Is ICANN going to submit workshops at IGF as well? [CROSSTALK] as in, you know, obviously ICANN... Marilyn mentions the public forum, open forums sorry, that's there, that ICANN gets. So yeah, over to you.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you. Nigel Hickson. It's not for me to sort of give an opinion on what the CCWG should do, although I think it was a successful exercise last year at the IGF that we held such a session, and I'm sure that in general, people would welcome the CCWG holding, or at least applying for another session. As Marilyn said, it's obviously up to approval from the MAG.

I mean, ICANN itself, yes, has this open forum which is in the last couple of years has been a very sort of [inaudible] in the sense that there hasn't been a specific them. It has been an opportunity where the chair and

CEO can sort of listen to the wider internet community and their views on ICANN issues. But we haven't discussed that yet as ICANN staff, although I'm pretty confident that we'll probably ask, or we will go for an open theme again.

In terms of other workshops or, that we might want to propose, we haven't discussed those yet. It is just worth noting of course, well of course the IGF is not until December, but there will be no internet governance public session at the next ICANN meeting in Finland, although there can perhaps be one at the following one in October. So whether that is relevant or not, I'm not sure. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thanks for this Nigel. Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking. What I would suggest is we send this or forward this call to workshop proposals to the cross community working group on internet governance mailing list, and from there we start discussing on whether this working group wants to move forward with this. [Inaudible] mentions that there will be no public session of CCWG IG in Helsinki.

The meeting in Helsinki is a short meeting, so there are no opportunities to have a public session. Although from what I understood, and apparently the schedules are still changing, most afternoons we'll see discussions on specific topics in a plenary style way with all of the ICANN communities together.

But it's another, the whole preparation for Helsinki is probably a topic of a call that we'll have to have in the next call that we'll have next week. So that's what we have on IGF MAG consultations. The closing date for

submission of a workshop proposal is the 6th of June. So we still have time to discuss this, as I said. So an action item is to send that call for workshop proposals to the, to our mailing list.

Next... Any other comments on this?

MARILYN CADE: Yes, I apologize I missed the CSTD update, and can we come back to that after you do the WTSA?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, we'll do the WTSA and then we'll give you the floor for CSTD update. And in fact, Nigel Hickson mentioned you and said it was a pity Marilyn isn't there. So [inaudible], we'll move back to you afterwards. Let's just go into ITU WTSA. That's another of these lesser known forums. The World Telecommunications Standardization Assembly. It's held every four years.

It's back in action this year, and so for this, I guess I can hand the floor... Is it Nigel or Veni who will speak about this?

NIGEL HICKSON: I'm happy to say a few words very briefly. Actually given the time, we can always go back to this on another occasion. But I think it's worth flagging that this is the World Telecommunications Standardization Assembly, this is one of main ITU conference in addition to the [inaudible] the [inaudible] conference and the development conference every four years, each of them.

So and this, WTSA takes place at the end of October early November. It actually clashes with the current dates of the ICANN meeting, which is somewhat of a shame. It has been hosted in Tunisia, and it's, the assembly looks at the work program for the telecommunications sector.

The telecommunications sector covers internet related issues in terms of issues like addressing and naming, and the internet of things, and the assembly looks at the work program to the various study groups should carry out. It looks at what the study groups should be doing, and looks at any rationalization for the study group, and also can pass sort of resolutions on things, on issues that could possibly be relevant to ICANN, such as naming or addressing or IPv6.

So it is relevant. There are regional preparations underway. We have a European one next week in Switzerland, but there are a number of other regional preparations that are already taking place to ascertain what the regional positions are on different aspects. And later we can brief the working group further as it becomes clearer on what the main issues are going to be, at the meeting itself. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. Are the resolutions of WTSA binding in any way?

MARILYN CADE: Actually, Nigel if I might, let me comment on that. It isn't that... It's Marilyn. It isn't that the resolutions are binding, but the problem is that from the TSA, from the T sector perspective, the governments take

them forward and make them binding at a national level. So resolutions are not considered binding, but, particularly from the developing countries, they implement them.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Marilyn. It's an interesting response of how the work of WTSA is used by national governments to make them binding. A similar to question to Nigel, and the question that we asked regarding CSTD, in what way does ICANN engage in WTSA?

Is it as a specific type of organization? Why kind of say does it have in there?

NIGEL HICKSON: Just to note, I mean, ICANN takes these seven days quite serious, in a serious way. So our regional global stakeholder engagement teams, where it's appropriate and possible, attend the regional preparation meetings. As I say, we have one in Europe next week, which I'll attend. We had our African team attending one recently, I think in, I'm not sure where it was, but somewhere.

And they look at what, may contribute to the discussion on the operation of resolutions. And as Marilyn said, these resolutions are important because they, because most countries do something with the resolutions, if... Certainly in the UK if the UK signs up to a resolution, then generally some action is taken as a result of the content of that resolution.

And also, some of the resolutions aren't aimed at member states. You know, they're not saying countries should paint telephone boxes red, or yellow, or whatever. They're aimed at the ITU itself, and the ITU should work on this particular issue, or the ITU should look further another issue.

And what comes out on these resolutions is sometimes taken forward in the plenipotentiary, where resolutions are passed at the plenipotentiary. So it influences the content and the debate at the plenipotentiary.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks Nigel. Olivier speaking. And is this all just purely governments in general?

NIGEL HICKSON: Well no. So the Standardization Assembly is an assembly made up of all of the ITU members, so that's the member states, the governments plus the sector members, which are businesses, academic members, and some other institutions. I mean, ICANN is not a sector member, so we, but we work through other sector members, or sometimes we're invited as observers to take place in these discussions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: All right. We'll thanks very much Nigel. And it's Olivier speaking. And no doubt on the next call, or in two weeks' time, you will be able to loop back to us on the discussions that have taken place in [inaudible], I believe, in Switzerland, at the end of the next week.

We are looping back then to the CSTD update with Marilyn Cade, as time is of the essence. Marilyn, you have the floor.

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you. My apologies for being delayed. I'm just going to beg your indulgence as a mother fox with three kittens has moved into my backyard and 30 feet from back door, I now live with [inaudible], and that means, that's very scary. So thank you for your indulgence.

And it is quite [inaudible]. CSTD on the other hand, is Commission of Science and Technology Development, I don't know what you briefed on before, so I'll just cover a couple of important facts.

CSTD is the commission under [inaudible], and I know we need to decode all of our acronyms, under the United Nations overall committee that, agency that has responsibility for trade and development, that the CSTD, the Commission for Science and Technology Develop sits in that overall UN agency.

It is the expert agency invited by the United Nations to be the advisor on science and technology for development in 2006, through some useful engagement, which I was involved in as well as many, many others. We moved the oversight of WSIS follow-up to CSTD, which meant that at each CSTD meeting, there will be resolutions developed that affect the future of WSIS follow-up, but also the IGF, and also a separate resolution on science and technology for development.

This meeting will be chaired by Peter Major who will be the, from Hungary, who is the outgoing chair. There will be an election of a new

chair, during the meeting. Although we all remember that at the end of the year last year, there was an outcome document from the United Nations establishing a 10 year extension of the IGF, and notably not referencing a call for action on what ICANN does.

You need to understand that every year, through the CSTD process, the governments get another bite at the apple. They could, via a resolution, which would, we go by the resolution. Elements in the resolution could include calls for action to evaluate something related to the IANA transition, or to questioning the tenure extension that then goes to [inaudible], and then goes to the UN General Assembly.

Normally, we will also launch at this CSTD, we will re-launch the working group on enhanced cooperation. And that working group is very much a creation of the dissatisfaction of certain governments that stakeholders are allowed to have a role. The good news, I hope the good news is that at least on the business side, I will be one of the five representatives. And I believe from the technical side, Nigel will be one of the five representatives, but it was a complicated process driven by the stakeholders themselves to come up with their five nominations.

The group will not meet in May, but it will be proposed or created in May, and then [inaudible] will have to approve its creation. It's going to be really important for us going forward, and looking forward, I would say that when the group meets, it would be helpful to, since you need to have a flow of information back and forth to the CCWG IG.

Normally, this group reaches the science and technology for development ministers. There are a new category, and a very useful

category, and I will just mention that there are some governments that attend the ICANN MAG that bridge this, including Thailand and a couple of other countries where because they've been involved in CSTD, and they're involved now in ICANN, and they're involved in the IGF, they're creating a more horizontal look and feel.

It's a small group, but it would be good to grow it. I agree with you Nigel there is no official announcements. I was just commenting on what has been submitted to the chair. It is up to the chair to decide, and I understand we're being hauled up by the fact that the [inaudible] countries have five applicants for four roles, so we're still waiting.

So that will probably actually not be resolved until the CSTD meeting itself. I will be at the CSTD meeting, I'm sure Nigel will. And I don't know, Olivier, if you might be, but we could perhaps do a Doodle asking for who will be there and who might be following remotely.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this Marilyn. That's a good idea. Let's have an action item then, to send a Doodle to the mailing list asking about CSTD. Who will be there and who will follow remotely, with remote participation. And I guess this can just be two boxes. [Inaudible], so I'm not sure how to do it, but we'll work it out with Desiree on this.

Okay. Any other points or comments? So thanks for this update Marilyn. It has been great, it completes the update from Nigel on this. We have reached the end of this call, we've reached the end of the allocated time as well. Is there any other business to discuss?

I see Farzaneh has put her hand up. Farzaneh Badii, you have the floor.

FARZANEH BADI:

Thank you Olivier. I'm sorry, I just wanted to... I didn't... Sorry if I missed that, but if we can kind of be clear on what we are going to do at Helsinki with CCWG IG with the mailing list, and that's what we're going to do. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yeah, thanks for this Farzaneh. It's Olivier speaking. So, the call next week will be all about internal discussions on preparations and so on. And so will be obviously the preparations for Helsinki. It looks like we will have a face to face meeting, but not a public meeting at the moment. We'll work it out on next week's call.

Of course, we'll also have a call for topics to be discussed on next week's call. So if anybody has any suggestions on this call, then please say so before I close the call.

Okay, no other topics then. So at the moment, we've got preparation for Helsinki as being one of the topics to be discussed.

MARILYN CADE:

Wait, wait, wait. I have a topic.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Marilyn Cade, you have the floor.

MARILYN CADE: I understand that the incoming CEO has met with staff about internet governance. Perhaps it would be really good for him to come and meet with the CCWG, not for us to argue our differences, but ask to advance the importance of ICANN continuing to be engaged in the internet governance ecosystem.

We have different views on some things that the past CEO did, I don't want to go into those. I, in fact, want to ensure that this CEO understands that ICANN's engagement in the external events, so [inaudible] supporting staff, but supporting the community through funding, such as fellowships, you know, travel for the IGF itself, that those are very important.

I understand the Board just basically travels and submits its travel. I would prefer if we had a tighter approach, which supported the community. But my point is just, the [inaudible] on internet governance resides in the CCWG IG. And I don't want to lose that. I don't want it to be briefed only by the staff as interesting [inaudible]...

Just saw that [Nora?] has done something with Stanford University, which was kind of, you know, okay, but that had no visibility to us. And at least the CCWG should have a visibility of all of the activities that are relative to internet governance. Not oversight, but insight.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. So what I suggest is we have this on our next call, we have this topic for discussion on our next

call. As to having the new ICANN CEO on one of our calls, we can certainly do that, but I would say though that perhaps we need to wait for him to settle in his seat. I'm not sure that he's not even started yet.

When is he starting? I don't even have this off the top of my head, but I think it's sometime in May.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, it's...

MARILYN CADE: That's right. I said, I need to be clear. I meant a meet and greet during Helsinki. I didn't mean a previous discussion.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so in Helsinki, okay. Yeah.

MARILYN CADE: Just a meet and greet. Here is who we are. We come from, we go around the room, we do 30 seconds. Hi, I'm engaged in internet governance, blah, blah, blah... And we just meet and greet to start out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Great topic for our face to face meeting. I think that would be perfect to have at our face to face meeting in Helsinki. But we'll continue building on this during our next call. I'm mindful of the time. So thanks to everyone who has joined us today.

Those people who are listening on the recording, please all follow-up on the mailing list. And we have a few action items here. Can I ask, Deidre did you take the action items down?

DEIDRE SIDJANSKI: I have a couple of actions. Preparation for the Helsinki face to face, with a sub item of perhaps meeting with the next CEO of ICANN. And do you have another one?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: There is another action item, yes, to send the IGF MAG consultation workshop proposal to the mailing list as well so that we start a discussion on this. [CROSSTALK]

Sorry Nigel? I couldn't hear you.

NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry, this is Nigel. Yeah, I think there were three actions. We've got them all. So we'll, yeah, take them forward.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Super. Well thanks very much to everyone on this call. Apologies for our late end to the call, but it was really interesting updates on all of this. So thanks. Speak to you sometime next week. Until then, have a very good weekend. This call is adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]