DESIREE CABRERA: Okay, there you go.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Desiree. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, everyone. This is the Cross Community Working Group on Internet Governance, on the 18th of May, 2016, at 13:02 UTC. Welcome, everybody. Let's start with a roll call, please.

DESIREE CABRERA: Okay. In the room, we have Alan Greenberg, Avri Doria, Ffion Thomas, Gangesh Varma, Klaus Stoll, Paul Blaker, Ryan Johnson, and Timea Suto. And for staff, we have Nigel Hickson and myself, Desiree Cabrera. And for the Chair, we have Olivier Crépin-Leblond.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Desiree. Have we missed anybody in the roll call, by any chance? I note more people are joining as we speak, so Desiree will keep track of them.

Today's agenda is going to have a very brief report on the WSIS Forum that took place two weeks ago already in Geneva. And then there'll be a report on the CSTD, which is, I think, probably something even a little bit more important, because we're likely to focus on some work on this. And then we'll be discussing the proposal for a workshop at the next IGF at the end of the year.

Are there any additions or changes, amendments to be made to the agenda?

Hearing no one, the agenda is adopted as it currently is on your screen. And just one thing to add though. This call is going to be, I guess, primarily a policy call, since we've got much reporting on WSIS Forum, CSTD, and possibly even the discussions on what we might wish to have for IGF 2016.

So the first thing is there is actually an item missing in the agenda, and that's the action items. There were three action items. I put the link on the chat for anyone, if they wish to click on this. The first one was for me to follow up with the list on a possible face-to-face meeting in Helsinki. I have made the request to the ALAC to set up a meeting. As you know, this meeting's organization is a bit different. It's the supporting organizations and advisory committees that have built the schedule. So I've asked for a slot. I haven't had response yet on this. But I'm hopeful that we can have a face-to-face meeting in Helsinki.

The second item was to start a Google Doc on the ideas and topics for IGF. Well, that hasn't been done, but we can certainly start the discussion during our call today.

And third was just a Doodle for the call. And I think it was for the week of the 9th of May, actually is the week of the 18th. Well, not the 18th, but this week, because we had to move one week back due to the CSTD.

I don't see anyone putting their hand up to respond to any of these action items, so let's move then directly to the reporting on the WSIS Forum. There are two links in your agenda. The first one was a link to

the session that ICANN had organized. And that's the ICANN New gTLD Program Reviews and Lessons Learned. It was well attended, and I think the audience managed to learn a lot about all of the programs. And Avri Doria and Jonathan Zuck both acting as Chairs of their respective working groups, Avri in the Subsequent Procedures Working Group, and Jonathan in the Consumer Trust Review.

So the second workshop was the WSIS Forum workshop where we spoke about IANA stewardship and transition and enhancing ICANN accountability. That was very well run by Matthew Shears. And we had Theresa Swinehart, who spoke to us about the program. And we had the luck of having Lise Fuhr, the CWG IANA Co-Chair; Thomas Rickert, the CCWG Accountability Co-Chair; and a few community members being able to provide their insights.

I think that went really well, as well. And the videos are out there. You've all seen this on the mailing list. So altogether, it was quite helpful, I would say, and certainly is something which we might wish to consider later on in this agenda, if we want to do something like this at IGF.

I'm going to open the floor. I don't know if anybody else who was there wants to add anything to this. I see Matthew Shears has raised his hand, and I think – is that Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: Yes, I'd like to speak after Matthew. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks, Marilyn. So Matthew Shears, you have the floor.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Olivier, can you hear me all right?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, we can hear you. That's fine.

MARILYN CADE: Somewhat.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Okay. Yeah, thanks. I actually thought that the session was a particularly useful session, not only because of the fact that it took place in an environment that is somewhat distinct from the more typical ICANN/IGF space that we work in. It brought the transition to a broader audience, which was important. And I think perhaps most of all, though, I really have to take my hat off to the panelists, because the issue is not easy to explain to someone who is not deeply versed in the transition and enhancing accountability discussions. But the selection of slides was excellent. The confidence with which the panelists spoke and addressed questions and put forward their own comfort and confidence in the transition and the accountability recommendations was wonderful.

And I will say that, as was to be expected, Richard Hill was the first person to ask questions. He had a series of five, which took rather a long time. But the panel dealt with them very, very well, and it's quite well

known that Richard Hill has had issues with participation and transparency throughout the process and has perpetually, in a sense, questioned its legitimacy. But the panel has dealt with those issues particularly well. So I think it's something that we should probably do more often, but maybe in selective spaces that are not the ICANN space, but ones in which [inaudible] a [inaudible]. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Matthew. Next is Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I want to really compliment the content of the session. And for some on this list, you know this, but others do not, that I am the substantive coordinator of the national regional IGF. I'm very deeply knowledgeable about these sessions, but many others are not. I think that advantage, if we could encourage taking just the factual participation and presentations and turn that into a factual briefing that could be widely shared, I would welcome that and could commit to post that to the national and regional IGF.

I welcome your comment, Matthew, that, yes, we need to explain more to the non-usual suspects. And so if I can encourage our turning not the question section, but the presentation session into a sort of YouTube presentation that the ICANN staff might support, I think that would be really helpful and useful for debunking. This is a complicated set of issues, but this presentation, I think, was absolutely stellar in just the facts, just the facts. And that is really important for us to get out.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Marilyn. It's Olivier speaking. Let me turn to Nigel Hickson and find out if it would be possible to do something like this. I absolutely agree with your points, and we definitely need to be able to send the message out there to the non-usual audiences. It's pretty useless for us to do a presentation about IANA stewardship transition and ICANN accountability in an ICANN setting. But certainly, in IGFs both global, but also local or regional, or in other fora as well, if this video was made available, that would be super.

Nigel, is there an ability to have that video? And I'm not quite sure where the copyright lies regarding the video and whether that can be shortened and edited and put online or made available on YouTube. Nigel Hickson?

And at the moment, you might be muted, because we cannot hear you, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: All right, sorry, good afternoon and apologies. Yes, I'm not sure why… Yes. Anyway, apologies for the background noise. Yes, I've approached the ITU to see if we can effectively edit the videos, which they've already put on their site. And they're going to come back to me.

If we can't do that – I mean, if we obviously can do that at ICANN, but we just have to make sure that it's okay with the ITU because effectively, it was taken as part of the WSIS Forum. And it's all so public, so I don't think there should be too much of a problem. But we just

EN

have to go through the niceties. And if it's okay with the ITU, then we can certainly do something in ICANN to use it as a promotional material and share it, or whatever. Good idea. Thank you.

MARILYN CADE: I see that Olivier was going to dial back in. He was dropped. I'm just going to thank you, Nigel, and particularly for your follow-up. As the substantive coordinator of the NRIs, this would be fantastic. So Olivier will be joining us momentarily, I'm sure. But I want to thank you for your follow-up.

And I don't know if we've all had the chance to acknowledge all of the speakers who are on the call. Olivier is back online now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: And thank you very much for this, Marilyn. For some reason, the whole building had a one-second power cut, which was very strange. And it seemed to have completely cut everything off. But anyways, we're back on there.

So I'm not quite sure what were the last words that Nigel said. And apologies for this.

MARILYN CADE: Actually, the last words were, I welcome this, and I hope that Nigel is going to be effective with the ITU. And if I need to intervene with him and the ITU, he should let me know.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this. So any other comments on the WSIS forum? Any questions regarding the WSIS Forum? Marilyn? Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: Yes, might I? I'd like to comment about the WSIS Forum on a different issue very briefly. I'll make it brief, but I want to comment on it. The WSIS Forum took a different approach this year, and that different approach, I think, is important for us to be aware of. There's an effort to be more welcoming to non-government stakeholders. So for the first time, the high-level session had a different approach, not just reading out of sessions, but 16 appointed high-level track facilitators, all of whom came from non-government. And they worked with the high-level speakers to take a more interactive approach. And while nothing is perfect, it was a step forward. I was privileged to be one of those high-level facilitators. I see a few other people also who were among that.

I think we should think about this as a very positive step and think about also not just the workshops that we were able to propose – and I think those were really important – but also to think about how we are evolving the WSIS Forum to be more multi-stakeholder. This is a small step forward, but it was a step. And I just want to comment about that.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Marilyn. That's very helpful to know the organizational part. And certainly to see that the WSIS Forum is moving in a more multi-stakeholder fashion is a good thing. I personally have

now attended two WSIS fora, the one last year and the one this year. And certainly, it looks as though there is more interaction than there was in the past between participants and the people on stage. And even I think that a couple of the [wide] sessions in the large hall that took place in the high-level sessions, I think towards the end of the day on the second day, there started to be intersection with the audience. And it certainly, having spoken to people around there, it looked as though people were enjoying a lot more being able to respond or being asked questions or contributes from the floor, rather than just having a lineup of people on the stage going on about their business and coming up with their declarations whilst everyone else is checking their e-mails. But it seems to evolve and improve in the right direction, and I hope that it will continue going in the same direction as it has in the past years.

I don't see anyone else putting their hand up for this, so maybe we can then move to the next part of our agenda. That's reporting on the CSTD. And that took place the week immediately after the WSIS Forum. And that, I understand, was a bit different in several ways. And for this, I know that several people in this group actually were present at CSTD. They were also part of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. So I'll ask for your feedback, from your perspective.

But first, I guess I can start with Nigel Hickson, who provided us with a good summary of various issues on the mailing list. And, Nigel, I guess you have the floor and you can focus our attention on points which you think might be of interested. And then I guess, Marilyn, you've also been there, and others have also been there. I can see several names who I think were also present. So let's start with Nigel Hickson, please.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you, Olivier. I'll be very brief, because it's noisy where I am, and others were also there as well. I think the CSTD plenary, which is an annual session, probably wasn't that unusual. It was well timed in that it came a few months after the high-level meeting in New York. It considered a number of a variety of subjects. It's not just on ICT issues. It covers innovation and scientific issues. But it did cover the WSIS agenda, so to speak, and reflected on what had taken place in New York and looked forward.

But one of the issues that we were certainly involved in, as well as the plenary on the WSIS, was the drafting of the WSIS Resolution, which is an annual exercise. It's a resolution on the WSIS that looks at what has taken place in the last year and looks ahead, comments on the IGF, etc. And this year in particular, it was significant because it was looking ahead to the Enhanced Cooperation Working Group, which is the working group which we have discussed in the calls before that was asked for by the Output Document at the high-level meeting in New York. And it was a long process, as we've described on the list.

So I'll finish there, and others will no doubt comment. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Nigel. Perhaps, Marilyn Cade, you might have a few words to say?

MARILYN CADE:	I might have a few words to say. I will also note that on the call with us, we have a couple of governments who were also [inaudible]. I don't know if they want to comment, but let me make my comments.

I've attended every one of the CD meetings long before WSIS was added to the Commission on Science and Technology for Development. I attended the Commission that was focused then only on science and technology and innovation for development. But I've also been privileged to attend all of the meetings since then, and this meeting was, as should be expected, a really interesting and perhaps sensitive set of negotiations related to the establishment of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation.

I'm going to pause and just say that it's really important that we understand that the work of this Commission on Science and Technology for Development is equally important to the WSIS follow-up. And now I'll return to a comment about the focus on the WSIS resolutions.

The Commission has 54 member states. And I'll be happy to post the list of the current members. They are responsible for developing two resolutions, one on STIs for development and one on the WSIS follow-up. The WSIS follow-up resolution is always very elegantly negotiated. It includes, this year, a recognition of the extension of the IGF for ten years. That is important language and was carefully negotiated and well supported.

The second set of issues that is very sensitive is the establishment of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. And there were governments

who were not satisfied with the Chair's proposal for the membership of the working group. At the same time, the member states who were there in the room were quite clear that they intended to have an open process, an inclusive process that would allow the input of all member states.

The negotiations went very, very long, but I think the good news, to me, is that there was clear recognition and support that the stakeholders from various groups need to be involved and welcomed to the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. Work is still in progress. We will take this resolution forward now to ECOSOC, but I am positive that support of the members states of the CSTD will advance support to launch the working group with an open process that allows member states that have concerns to also contribute, but also protect the participation of the other stakeholders, which is proposed as five plus five plus five; so five civil society, five business, five technical community. And we will launch the working group after July, because we can't launch until after ECOSOC approves it.

I'm just going to say, it was a difficult negotiation, but the good news is everyone stayed in the room, and everyone negotiated in a positive manner. And that's sometimes what it takes, just staying 'til the end.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this summary, Marilyn. It's very helpful to hear this. Just to be sure, are you basically saying that the list of people that have been chosen to be on this Working Group on Enhanced

Cooperation, which has been published, was effectively put to question by some countries?

MARILYN CADE: There was a challenge by a country that did not submit their request to be renewed to the CSTD in a timely manner. So they're very frustrated. But I personally find the working methods of the working group to be very open. No member state, whether they're a member of the CSTD or not, they've never been denied the opportunity to comment. So I do understand the particular frustration of this particular state, but I think all other member states of CSTD are saying that they welcome input. No one is denying the opportunity to comment. And I'm hoping we're just going to move forward.

In the past, we've had practices that were the following. The member states, both the participants spoke and then the non-member states spoke, and then all other stakeholders were allowed to speak. And that is what's being proposed now.

I see Avri is saying that it's often too late to change anything. But, in fact, I don't really think that's true. I think we've always tried to listen to all comments.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Marilyn. I open the floor. Did I hear Nigel, who wanted to say a few words?

EN

NIGEL HICKSON: No, Olivier, other people first. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks. Well, there's nobody else in the queue at the moment. I wonder, Marilyn did mention there are a few members of governments who are on the call who might have attended the meeting. I'm not sure whether they are able to speak or whether it's not in their mandate to do so. That's all fine. But otherwise, yeah, with regard to the actual meeting itself, from just having reviewed the papers – I wasn't in Geneva, but I'm just looking at the papers and so on – it looks as though it was not great to be something so much out of the ordinary, I think, from previous years. And certainly, looking at the chairing, Peter Major was the Chair of the CSTD. I understand he's now passed on the baton to someone else, and he is now chairing this Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. So we have a Chair who's highly experienced on these things.

Oh, now we've got some hands up. So let's start with Paul Blaker, please, and then we'll have Young-eum Lee afterwards. Paul Blaker, you have the floor.

PAUL BLAKER: Hi, can you hear me?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, very well.

PAUL BLAKER: Okay, thank you. Yeah, well, I'd just add a few words to what Marilyn said. I think it was, in some ways, quite a difficult meeting because there was this challenge to the procedure that we had all agreed and we had all followed for identifying members of the working group.

Apart from that, I think it's really positive that we were able to agree a resolution on the follow-up to WSIS. We did manage to cut some of the text down, especially the many paragraphs that there used to be on the whole history of enhanced cooperation in that resolution. We did manage to get some updates, taking into account the outcome of the WSIS review, and also taking into account the new Sustainable Development Agenda, which was quite important to quite a few governments, to make sure that WSIS and the SDGs were more aligned in this resolution.

But it did become clear that the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation is going to be a very difficult conversation. We're pleased that the approach Peter Major has taken is to have a very open and transparent and fully inclusive approach. And we hope that all stakeholders will be fully involved in contributing to the work of the group. But we're going to need, I think, to take a very careful, cautious, step-by-step approach to considering this question of enhanced cooperation. We're going to need to start off by just, I think, revisiting what we mean by this concept in the light of all the progress that's been made over the last ten years, when enhanced cooperation was first invented as a term, and try to build consensus by starting at a high level – What is it that we're trying to achieve? What are the characteristics of what we're trying to achieve – before we dive into some of the more difficult issues.

So it's going to be a tough conversation, I think, starting in the autumn. And I really hope that all stakeholders get involved and contribute, and try and make some positive progress there. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Paul. That's very helpful. I just have one small question for you. Are there, at this point, any specific topics which are already appearing on the horizon that might necessitate extra caution or extra attention, if you wish?

PAUL BLAKER: I don't think the conversation has got that far. The last Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation got into quite a lot of complicated detail, with lots of sheets of different public policy issues. And it can be quite difficult to navigate for that reason.

Now, the WSIS outcome says that we need to take account of the work that was done by the previous working group. So the point the UK has been making is that we should avoid going straight back into addressing those detailed, individual issues, because there's a danger if we do that, we'll end up not being to reach [consent] and getting into quite a complicated place again. So that's why we've been suggesting, before we get into those particular issues, we try and take a more high-level view of, what do we mean by "enhanced cooperation"? What are the characteristics or principles of enhanced cooperation? And then hopefully, if we can agree that, it will help guide us and help boost confidence in trying to achieve some consensus on more specific issues.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Oops, I was muted, sorry. Thanks very much for this, Paul. It's very helpful indeed. Let's go to Young-eum Lee next.

And, Young-eum, we can't quite hear you at the moment.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Oh, you can't?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You sound very, very far away, so I don't know whether it's your microphone that is too far or the mic level isn't high enough.

YOUNG-EUM LEE: Okay. Let me set it just a little louder. Is that better?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, unfortunately, I'm unable to hear you here. The background noise from elsewhere is louder than you.

Young-eum?

No, it's not happening. Okay, for the time being, we can't hear Young-eum Lee. So I see that Paul still has his hand up. I believe that's probably an old hand. Are there any other comments or questions or any further contributions?

NIGEL HICKSON:	Olivier, if I may just mention just one or two additional points. I totally agree with what Marilyn and Paul have said. I think it's worth noting that the resolution we came up with in the end, which was more difficult because of this membership issue, there was also a concern raised about the non-government members, the stakeholders, people like Marilyn and I, in that if you take the list of stakeholders, it's not that diverse. I think this was a concern for that. As we reflected before, the different stakeholder groups could really only do what they can, in terms of taking nominations. And clearly, this is a fairly specialized topic. So that's one issue.
	The positive issue about the resolution, as Paul has said, it touches on the sustainable development goals. It also has a positive [text] on IGF, welcoming the intercession or work that's carried out at IGF and the regional national structures. So I think that's positive as well. So there's some positive things on the WSIS Forum. So I think when we sit down this time next year, or whenever, to negotiate it again, we'll have a good base to go from. Thank you very much.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thanks very much for this, Nigel. I note that there is some discussion going on, on the chat, at the moment. Was that Marilyn Cade?
MARILYN CADE:	Yes. I'd like to comment about the full resolution. I think it's really important that we not be negative about the full resolution. The resolution is important because it comes forward to ECOSOC and then to the UN General Assembly. And we need to remember that it is this

resolution that actually helped to enhance the recognition of the IGF itself and led to the ten-year extension. And while that's not totally an ICANN issue, many members of the ICANN community supported that.

So I want to make a comment about the importance of the overall resolution. Happy to comment online. I've seen that there's a question about the composition of the members of the working group. I'm happy to provide clarification on that, but I don't know if it's really useful to take up the full call. I'll do this very quickly.

The composition of the working group is 32 countries, four from each of the UN regions, plus Tunisia and Switzerland as the host of the WSIS, and then five plus five plus five from the technical community, the civil society and business community, and five IGOs or regional organizations.

The nomination process was an open process. And happy to talk about this in more detail. My own view about this is we need to have more of us coming as observers, even if we're not members of the group. And that was the point I was trying to make.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thanks very much for this, Marilyn. And maybe I can have an action item for this call, because I did see a list of members sent around somewhere. I'm not sure whether we have sent one already to our working group. Maybe action to send the list of members of the working group to the mailing list would be a good follow-up on this.

I note that there is some discussion on the chat, with Avri being somehow unhappy about the parts of the resolution, and also composition. I don't know, Avri, would you be able to just expand on your comments, by any chance? I don't know whether you are able to speak.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, I'm able to speak. It's just that there's – oh, never mind. Yeah, my problem has not to do with the composition of the group. I think any group of us that they pick will be a fine group, and I think there's some very fine people in the group that have been picked for Round 2 on the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation.

No, my issue is more with resolutions from government-only decisional bodies, where, yes, people who can get the funding are allowed to be in the room and are allowed to speak at the end of many sessions. And so I think it's okay for us to have a generally positive attitude about it. But I really believe that we must be critical of things in those resolutions that are still wrong, and we still have to maintain being critical of a process that excludes us when decisions are being made. And I think that this group, as a group from ICANN, a group that is outside that decisional body, is basically CSTD and ECOSOC are not multi-stakeholder. And as stakeholders, ICANN is excluded.

So I think while having a generally positive attitude about the bits of progress that they make, I think we are entitled, and perhaps even obligated, to maintain a critical stance and to point out the things that

EN

might have been different, had all stakeholders been allowed to fully participate.

That's the point I made. It has nothing to do with the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. I think that as long as enhanced cooperation is primarily a government deal and it's separate from the rest of the stakeholders, as I said in my comment, it'll continue to go in circles. And I think some very important things will be said by all who participate. So that part's fine. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Avri. You mentioned that ICANN is not taking part, but the composition being the five, five, five, five in the technical community and academia, we do have Nigel Hickson, who is in there representing –

AVRI DORIA: I mentioned the CSTD.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The CSTD itself, okay, sorry.

AVRI DORIA: The decisional parts of the CSTD. No, I acknowledge that, as I said, we have some very fine people. I think Nigel will do great. I think others will do great. I'm very much looking forward to Anriette's contributions. So I think it's a great group of people. That's not my issue at all.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Avri. That's very helpful. I note that we also have on the call – yes, we do have on the call Timea Suto, from ICC BASIS, who was also at the meeting, a representative from the business community. I don't know, Timea, I'm sorry to be putting you on the spot here, whether you… Feel free to jump in if you have anything else to add on the work of the working group or its composition, etc.

I wanted to stress one more question before we move on to agenda item 4, knowing full well that time is ticking. As far as the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation is concerned, how does it affect ICANN? In what way? Because we always have to remember, we are an ICANN working group, and ICANN's limited remit of domain names and identifiers. How has this work got the potential to affect ICANN, and in what way? And so why should we be tracking this so closely?

It's an open question. But you know, Nigel, if nobody else answers, you know that you often are the on the receiving end of these, unfortunately for you.

MARILYN CADE: Let me give a comment, and maybe Nigel can follow up.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, go ahead, Marilyn. Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE:
Thank you. I think ICANN exists in a larger ecosystem of Internet governance events and activities. And it also sometimes draws fire from people who don't fully appreciate the narrow, but critical, aspect of its role and try to assign other responsibilities to it. ICANN does a very good job, in my view. And for many people on this call, you do know that I was actually very involved in founding ICANN. I think ICANN does a very good job of trying to adhere to its narrow, but critical, mission and agenda. But sometimes, others want to assign other work to it.

The fact that ICANN shows up and explains what it does and what it does not do, in my view, is very important. And explaining, in particular, right now the importance of the IANA transition and the accountability mechanism, which have called ICANN into higher attention, it's really important that ICANN staff or members of the community are showing up in these broader fora and explaining what is and what isn't. And at the same time, I think ICANN also contributes to building the ecosystem around ICANN by contributing to things like the national and regional IGFs, participating as speakers, bringing forward training, etc. But staying within their mantra and their mission, really important.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:
Okay, thanks very much for this, Marilyn. Any other comments or questions? I hear the beep of the background. That must be Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON:
I'm very sorry. Yes, I'm on the 65 bus, so that's the extra information. But just very briefly, thank you, Olivier. Enhanced cooperation, we could

EN

spend two or three calls going into what it means to anyone. But if one takes that it has something at least to do with the ability of governments to engage in public policy decision-making and Internet governance, then it's important to ICANN in the sense that we believe that the multi-stakeholder vehicle, however imperfect it might be in how ICANN practices, it's pretty essential in terms of the Internet governance agenda.

And we hope to be able to show, as we did in the first working group, how the role of GAC, in terms of the governments coming together, has a role in public policy, in terms of what ICANN does anyway. Of course, there's a wider field. So in terms of issues like the IANA transition and the conditions under which gTLDs are issued globally, then I think we can submit evidence that government views on public policy do have an effect. And so the converse is true. If the Enhanced Cooperation Working Group decides that governments in the part of the ecosystem which ICANN occupies are not being able to fulfil their public policy duties, then obviously that points to the fact that ICANN is not the vehicle to do this, which of course would be unfortunate. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. That's an important point that you've made here. I noted that Avri had briefly put her hand up, I think. Was that –

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, I did, and then I thought better of it. But one thing that has changed – and I'm sure that Nigel will be able to build on this quite nicely – is that since the last go-around in Working Group on Enhanced

Cooperation, while not to the degree that GAC perhaps would have liked, they did gain some bit of decisional participation in ICANN, assuming that the transition is allowed to go forward. Actually, no, they'll get that anyway, I guess. They have actually gained a role in the decision-making capability of ICANN, which certainly the rest of the stakeholders don't have anything in CSTD or ECOSOC [does]. So in terms of those conversations, ICANN, as a multi-stakeholder organization that does get things does, does make decisions and does implement stuff, has given governments part of the decisional voice. And I think there's a lot he'll be able to do with that. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Avri Doria. Thank you. I don't see any other hands, so perhaps can we close the chapter of the CSTD with nine minutes remaining on the call? I think that we can just leave this as a watching brief for the time being. I think I'd heard that the next meeting of the CSTD will be in September. Obviously, whoever is on the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, please let us know if there are any developments.

I note that Nigel Hickson has shared with us a resolution, the WSIS resolution, that's in draft form at the moment. So that will no doubt be somehow confirmed in a few days' time. But having read through the resolution, there doesn't seem to be anything at the moment that really stands up as being some kind of red flag of some sort at this very moment.

Now, let's move on then to the proposal for our workshop at IGF 2016. The call for workshop proposals is open until the 6th of June, which doesn't give us very much time to both decide on whether we wish to have a workshop there and also decide, if that's a yes, what topic we should have this workshop on. I have sent an e-mail to the mailing list, making a few suggestions. But, of course, the decision lies entirely in your hands as to whether, first question, we should be having a workshop, and secondly, what topic we should focus on.

So I'd like to open the floor for suggestions, perhaps even responses, based on the message that I sent out to the mailing list. Is there any support for having another workshop of the same type as the one that we presented at the WSIS Forum? Or is another topic more likely to be perhaps more important? Then bearing in mind that this year's IGF is very late in the year – I believe it's in November, isn't it? It's in November or is in December. I don't even have the exact date. It's very late. So by then, will ships have sailed? Will trains have left the station, etc., etc.? Insert your favorite analogy. Where do we go from here? What should we do? And we need to decide quite fast.

Alan Greenberg, you have the floor.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Based on the most recent comments from the NTIA, that things, quote, "look on track" and there's no reason to believe the transition won't happen, you're right, a number of ships will have sailed by then. But talking about both the process of the ships

being launched, so to speak, and the environment that results, I think it does warrant a session.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this, Alan. Any other comments?

A note from Marilyn Cade. The next IGF is December 6-10, from the 6th to the 10th of December. I'd be inclined to say, based on the success of the workshop that we had at WSIS Forum, we'd be tempted to say, "Well, let's have the same thing in Mexico." The only concern I have, though, is that if by then we have that video – sorry, the [inaudible] there, maybe we do a double duty of this.

Are there other topics that we might wish to present? Alan Greenberg again.

ALAN GREENBERG: To be clear, I wasn't talking just about accountability. Assuming the transition goes through, this is a sea-change. It's required a level of cooperation. And I'm not talking about the details of the transition or of accountability, but the overall process. And I think there will be a lot to talk about, about what the environment of the world is in December, if indeed the transition happened, as we're expecting it to at this point. So it's more than just the accountability session.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thanks for this. So it goes a bit further than this, and maybe the dialogue and discussion might have moved on the line a little bit.

Any other comments here? I see suddenly everyone is very quiet. I'd like to see at least some support of some non-support.

Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: I think Avri might have already preempted me by saying perhaps we could have a number of ideas. I think Avri said up to three proposals. And maybe you could have a number of ideas and explore those.

One really – look, I'm a MAG member, and I will have to recuse myself completely from voting on what you propose. But I do think that we need to remember that the audience at the IGF, just as the audience at the WSIS Forum, is not the same audience as ICANN. And so in my view, you should think about the idea that an informational session is going to reach a very large number of people who aren't the usual suspects. And so I would encourage the idea that you do a session, taking advantage of the experts in the CCWG IG, and giving the [state of play]. I think that's really useful, and I would personally encourage it and then recuse myself.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Marilyn. You are now officially recused.

Matthew Shears, you're next.

MATTHEW SHEARS:	Yeah, thanks, Olivier. Just to agree with and pick up on what Alan said, I think we will be in a very interesting point in the discussion that – and in a way, I completely agree. I think we will have moved beyond what the accountability recommendations are and what the IANA proposal is. But we will be, hopefully, in a post-transition IANA situation. We will be in, hopefully, the midst of Work Stream 2 matters. But I think that really you could entitle it something like, "Post-Transition ICANN," something like that, and I think it will be a wonderful opportunity to again do a very good, factual-based session, similar to the one we had at WSIS, but obviously with a different focus. Thanks.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	Thanks for this, Matthew. That's very helpful. Post-Transition ICANN, we might even have the title of the proposal.
	Okay, I don't see anyone putting their hands up, so I guess we've probably reached the end of the discussion on this topic too. I'll follow up by e-mail, I guess. And I certainly would like your feedback on this. I'm quite neutral, personally, on the topic now. So obviously, it really is for this working group to decide where to go. But Post-Transition ICANN is certainly something that sounds good.
	Now, as I see we're reaching the top of the hour, we are moving into –
NIGEL HICKSON:	Excuse me?

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Nigel Hickson? Sorry, I…

NIGEL HICKSON: I do apologize. So just on the IGF, and sounds splendid to me. I don't have an input on this. But I think what Alan and Matthew have said is absolutely spot on. Post-Transition ICANN has a sort of ring to it.

We have to submit by the 6th of June – sorry, by the 9th of June for a workshop. So I can do that on behalf of the group, if you wish, and consult people on the necessary paragraphs and that. But it's in your hands. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this, Nigel. What I will do is to report back to the group on the mailing list, since we only have a subset of the overall group, and see if there is further input on the Post-Transition ICANN topic. And within a few days, then we can probably file something. I guess you can draft the pre-proposal, and then we will share it with the working group on the mailing list, and that will move forward.

There is one item that I was going to touch on, had we had a bit more time. That's to do with the WTSA, which Nigel Hickson has mentioned to us on our last policy call. I just had one question as to the timeline for WTSA work. Are we, between now and our next policy call, which is likely to be in 3-4 weeks, are we likely to have any requirement for input in anything to do with WTSA?

NIGEL HICKSON: Others on the call, I recall, could be knowledgeable. So the WTSA is in end of October, November time. It actually overlaps with the meeting in Hyderabad that's just been called. It's at the beginning of the meeting in Hyderabad, so to speak. Regional preparations are underway. So I think I reported on this call on the preparations that were taking place in Europe. Preparations on positions for WTSA are taking place in regional groupings in many different places. But there is no specific, if you like, single document that we need to comment on. What we can certainly try and do, depending on the interest of the group, of course, is to circulate proposals as they're made, when they become public, so to speak, on certain issues that pertain to ICANN. But there's no absolute paper that's going to come out in three weeks' time. So a policy discussion in a month, or three or four weeks, I think would be opportune. But others would have a view. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Nigel Hickson. Paul Blaker, you have the floor.

PAUL BLAKER: Thank you. Yes, well, just following that, I would just encourage everyone to be keeping an eye on development as we head toward WTSA. There are already a number of Internet and cyber resolutions in the WTSA. But we're hearing proposals coming out from different regions covering new subjects, such as big data, digital identity, over-the-top services, combatting counterfeit devices, IOT roaming, mobile

EN

financial transactions, etc., etc., etc. There's a lot that we need to keep an eye on there.

WTSA is not treaty making, as such, but it does oversee the work of the Telecommunications Standards Sector in ITU, and it's a kind of indicator of where things will be going when we get to the ITU Plenipotentiary Conference in 2018. So although there isn't one piece of paper to look at, I'm afraid there's lots of different proposals coming from different regions. It is something that I think more stakeholders need to be keeping an eye on and be prepared to get involved in.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much for this, Paul.

Nigel, I was going to ask something of staff then. Oh, did you wish to follow up, Nigel Hickson?

I'm not sure if Nigel has been dropped, perhaps. I was going to ask whether there was a location where one could keep track of all of the proposals. I don't know whether Paul had mentioned this or a location of where you can track these proposals, or whether this is behind some kind of a wall so you need to be a member to track these.

And secondly, I was going to ask whether a calendar was published anywhere.

NIGEL HICKSON: Sorry, Olivier, I'm just getting on another train. So, yes, the proposals, as Paul rightly said, come out of the regional groupings and get reported.

So we see them in due course. But they are confidential, so to speak. So not exactly sure how we can handle them, but I'm willing to take advice on this.

In terms of a calendar, I think I circulated before, but I can certainly circulate again, the list of the dates of the regional preparation meetings. So this is where the member states, and stakeholders in some cases, get together to discuss regional preparations. And there's one coming up all over the place in the next two to three weeks. I'll circulate that. Now, this doesn't mean to say – I mean, Paul is absolutely right, that stakeholders should be aware and concerned about some of the proposals being made. But whether stakeholders can influence their role in the meetings is another question, because some of these meetings are not open to stakeholders. But certainly, stakeholders can lobby their individual governments.

So I think there's a lot more on this story. I don't think we should be alarmists, but we should watch it very carefully because of what Paul has said, in terms of the linkages with the Plenipotentiary. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks very much, Nigel. And Paul Blaker has put a link in the chat to the list of regional prep meetings. What I think we can have as an action item is to build a wiki page that focuses on this WTSA process so that we can always add further information onto that page, as time goes. And please do check regarding those documents. Since you said the documents are confidential, do check to what extent they can be

shared, or at least the contents can be discussed or shared one way or other. So that's a second action items.

And I note that we are now eight minutes beyond the end of this call, so I'd like to thank you all for having attended the call. I hope it was helpful for all of you. Our next call will be in a couple of weeks' time and will be purely on organizational matters. I haven't got any full details yet.

There is something which has come up. The Board has voted a resolution yesterday to create a Board Internet Governance Committee. And what I suggest is we might wish to speak to the Chair of that new committee during our next call, since that will be an organizational call.

And with this, let's follow up on the mailing list. I'd like to thank you all and to adjourn the call. Thanks, and goodbye.

MARILYN CADE: No, not goodbye. Who is the Chair of that?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: The Chair is Markus Kummer.

MARILYN CADE: Okay, fantastic. Let's send that invitation.

EN

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, and we'll be pushing on this as a follow up. Thanks everybody. Have a very good morning, good afternoon, and good evening and, therefore, goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]