NIELS TEN OEVER:	Hello, everyone. On behalf of my co-Chair, Nigel Roberts, and me, I'd like to welcome you all to the first call of the Cross-Community Working Group on Enhancing ICANN's Accountability Work Stream 2 Human Rights Design Team.
	We are very happy you're all here on the call, and we'd like to kindly ask you whether you could mute your microphone when you are not talking.
	Nigel, would you have some words of welcome and a short introduction from your side as the other co-rapporteur?
NIGEL ROBERTS:	Yes. Thank you. I'd just like to welcome everybody to the call and probably we'd like to check who's on the call.
NIELS TEN OEVER:	Exactly. Let's start with the [admin] as per the agenda. We did not receive any absentees. Does anyone have an update to their Statement of Interests?
	No, there is not. Can we have a roll call for the people that are on the [inaudible] for the records?
BRENDA BREWER:	Niels, this is Brenda. I apologize. Did you want a roll call for people on phone only?

NIELS TEN OEVER: I just wanted to make sure [inaudible]. Yes. I called for the people who are on the register via the roll call. There's a roll call for people who are registered. They have their name. And the people that are on the phone which could perhaps their name so that they get registered in the call logs as well. That's the procedure, if I'm right. Right, Brenda?

BRENDA BREWER: Yes. If your phone number is listed, please announce your name for roll call purposes. Phone number ending in 4154 belongs to whom?

DAVID MCAULEY: Hi, Brenda. It's David McAuley.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you, David. Phone number ending in 0700? That line, if you could unmute and announce your name. Phone number ending in 0700.

                    We have no response. We also have a phone number that looks like it's from Europe ending in 2682. Announce your name, please.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Yeah, [inaudible] chat. It's Nigel Roberts.

BRENDA BREWER: Thank you very much. You may continue.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Thank you very much, Brenda. After this short part of administrivia, let's dive into the agenda. Does anyone have beforehand anything to add to the agenda? Of course, we can also later topics to Any Other Business as point [8].

If not, we'll go ahead to the opening remarks. Welcome, all, to the Cross-Community Working Group Work Stream 2 ICANN's Design Team on Human Rights. We will be working on developing the Framework of Interpretation of the Human Rights Bylaw that has been developed during Work Stream 1.

We'd like to welcome all the new participants, as well of the people who have partaken in Work Stream 1 and specifically also in Working Party 4 on the design of the Bylaw.

We are one of the different design teams working on the different topics, and we will try to coordinate with other design teams where needed and report back regularly to the CCWG plenary.

The scope and the purpose of our work is developing the Framework of Interpretation for the Human Rights Bylaw. We've received a template for what that should look like, and that template you can find on the screen. You have an executive

summary with a description of the issue and state of play, the recommendations for the CCWG, and the rationale for that, and an assessment of the recommendations, especially where it meets the NTIA criteria and whether it's compliant with Work Stream 1 recommendations.

Then there are several proposed timelines. There are the simpler and the lighter topics that we could perhaps already agree on by the beginning of next year, and the more complex topics that may to continue up to the final agreement by the CCWG up to May/June, 2017.

It might be hard to now already say whether we are a simple or a lighter topic or a complex topic, but we can always aim to work as efficient as possible, but of course with ensuring that we hear everyone's voices and we come up with a group proposal and then we go ahead. But let's really make sure that we do not go over the deadline that has been given to us by the CCWG.

The questions that we would need to answer in the Framework of Interpretation are specific parts of Bylaw that has been drafted. We have highlighted specific parts of the Human Rights Bylaw here that would need definitions, so such as: what are internationally-recognized human rights? What does it mean to respect human rights? What does applicable law mean? What does it mean not to enforce? What does it mean not going out of

ICANN's scope? And perhaps any other parts, because we might need to explain the Framework of Interpretation.

Together with staff, we've also been able to set up a scoping document for this topic to which several of you also have contributed, which gives us a scoping of which documents we will be basing ourselves on and what we refer. So we do not need to reinvent the wheel.

So content-wise, there are a lot of documents in which we can base ourselves, but also the ccNSO [inaudible].

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Have we lost Niels?

NIGEL ROBERTS: Hello. This is Nigel. It looks like we've lost Niels. We still have everybody else on the call.

NIELS TEN OEVER: ccNSO as early on [inaudible] end date. A large part of people said that 19:00 UTC would be best, and then most people agreed also on Tuesdays. So for now, it might be a good – you do not [inaudible] – oh, I'm very sorry. Am I back now? Okay. Where did I lose you? In the previous [inaudible] talking about the questions? End of Page 6.

So, yeah, we have the different questions that we need to answer, the different topics that are mentioned in the Bylaw. We have a scoping document that refers to relevant documents which we could base ourselves, both in terms of content – the human rights framework, etc. – but also the ccNSO has already developed a Framework of Interpretation, so we can also learn from that. But of course, if anything is missing, we can definitely add something here if needed.

When it comes to the planning of our meetings and our working schedule, we had a Doodle poll, in which we talked about whether we would have a fixed date or a rotating call. A very large majority of people said they preferred the fixed time and date, and they preferred 19:00 UTC. There was a slight preference for Tuesday over Thursday. So I propose we continue working like this, and we evaluate this towards the end of the year or in Hyderabad if needed.

To really come up with a work plan, we need to decide who, what, where, and when. We have suggested some steps, but perhaps it's [still] good to discuss the earlier slides on how to go forward. Some suggested steps on how we could go forward is that we first ensure that our background paper has all the relevant documents that we think we might need. Then we could start drafting the FoI based on the specific questions and content that we just drafted there and see what the [easy] part are that we could already

present to the CCWG and see what the contentions are, which we will need to discuss and maybe get some external advice on.

So that was a rough overview of how the co-Chairs think the work would go ahead. I would now like to ask my other co-Chair whether I might have missed some points. I'd then like to open the floor for how people perceive this work going ahead and proposed structure of work.

NIGEL ROBERTS: My apologies. I'm on the phone connection, so I have to press *6, and it takes an inordinately long time to come back online. I take it I'm there now.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Yes, you are.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Good, good. I'm happy with what you're proposing so far.

NIELS TEN OEVER: That's great. Now it'd be great to open up the discussion to the other members and [inaudible] of the call to see how this [inaudible] how this [inaudible].

Kavouss, we do not hear you. You might be muted. Hello? Do you [hear] me?

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Do you hear me, please?

NIELS TEN OEVER: Kavouss, come on in. You're at the top of the queue. Yes, we hear you, Kavouss. Come on in.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Good evening or good day. I don't know. First of all, the [inaudible] –

NIELS TEN OEVER: Yes, we hear you, Kavouss. Come on in.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: There is some noise from time to time. Sometimes your voice is [inaudible]. Sometimes your voice is comes back and forth. Is there a problem with your microphone, with your telephone, with your something? I don't know.

Having said that, I wish you all the best. I have raised some questions, and I wish, if possible, some of those you have not answered yet it's possible to answer.

I have a general statement. We should not be too much ambitious. We should limit ourselves to the human rights relating to ICANN and the Internet.

As I mentioned in my e-mail to Nigel, we are not a General Assembly of the United Nations. We should not discuss issues which do not have any relation to the Internet. So we should limit ourselves to [inaudible], please. Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Next one in the queue is Paul Twomey. Paul, please come in.

PAUL TWOMEY: Thanks for that, Niels. I'm also having the same problems with your communications coming in and out a lot.

I'm looking through the materials that are presently in the Human Rights Issues paper in the Google Docs. I'm wondering whether there may not be a useful place for also members of the group to then [download] a recording if they wish to [of] any concerns about unintended consequences. I know this tends to be a bit of a thing that I talk to, but I wonder if it's actually worthwhile – well, I think it would be worthwhile – for some people at least to put down on paper: "These are the scenarios we worry about (if they have my work)," which could just end up, as we go through this process, as tests. They could end up being: "Okay, we've put a proposal here. Do we think there's any risk that these things

we've put forward are going trigger these sorts of unintended consequences or potential consequences that we know we don't to trigger?"

NIELS TEN OEVER: That is an excellent suggestion, Paul, and I think that could indeed also be part of the rationale for our recommendation. I think we should definitely add drafting those to the work plan. So that's a great suggestion that I think we should take up.

PAUL TWOMEY: Just one additional thing. I think we should do that in a way that's even timing, drafting the sorts of concerns members of the community have that are rational and within the bounds of how their community's and ICANN's work for 15 years or more. We don't want to have those that are concerns somehow inflated by others as justifications as to why the IANA transition should not proceed, for instance.

So I think it's a good thing for us to do. I just don't want it to be misinterpreted by others.

NIELS TEN OEVER: I think that is duly noted, and I think that should be part of our work.

Next in the queue is Lee Hibbard.

LEE HIBBARD:	Hello, Niels, and hello, everybody. Can you hear me?

NIELS TEN OEVER:	Yes, we can hear you.

LEE HIBBARD: Great. Thank you. Once the group has decided upon the scope, from my point of view, from the Council of Europe as an international, intergovernmental organization dealing with human rights, I'm very much in touch with many of the other IGOs in the Internet ecosystem space. I think I'd be happy to try to collect relevant international law, depending upon the scope [inaudible].

Also because we're doing that within the context of the GAC Working Group on Human Rights and International Law, I'll be up to both spaces. If that's the wish, if that's the desire, I could help bring information to the group's work.

Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER: I think that would be very much welcomed, Lee. More information would definitely not hurt so we can really come as Paul Twomey said before, proper framework, which is not open to

too much interpretation. Thanks very much. Lee. That would be really great.

Paul, I think that's an old hand, so I will go ahead with Tatiana.

TATIANA TROPINA: Hello, everyone. I would like to suggest that, in addition to what Paul proposed – a write-in of concerns in the document – maybe we can also write some points or record some points which were discussed and agreed upon in Work Stream 1 because it also might be helpful for the newcomers. Not all the discussions or, how to say, the underlined arguments made it into the report, so maybe we can just outline some of the issues; for example, be careful with [inaudible] principles. Don't cherry-pick human rights. So some basic things which we can discuss further and elaborate on and so on. It's just an idea.

I don't know. Do we want to write all these in this document which you shared, or shall we create an additional kind of discussion document so as not to confuse everything?

Basically, that's all. Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Thank you very much, Tatiana. I think it's better to keep the scoping background paper relatively short. We already came up with some really great suggestions among other things by Paul, so

EN

I would really like to have a discussion on the list so other people can follow the progress of the discussion there as well.

Opening a Google Doc as our working document in which we record the history and things we do not want to happen – getting them in a Google Doc would be really great. So if we could open that and share that on the list, I think that will be a great way forward. Thanks, Tatiana.

The next in the queue is Markus. Markus, please go ahead.

MARKUS KUMMER: Hi, Niels. Can you hear me?

NIELS TEN OEVER: Yes, we can hear you very well.

MARKUS KUMMER: Okay. Thanks. Great job, [done]. As you know, I'm the Board liaison, so I cannot speak on behalf of the Board but I have very much the reactions of the Board in the back [inaudible]. But point said rang accord – what are the unintended consequences? – and I think that would clearly be one of the main concerns of the ICANN Board. It's great to be on principles, but there may be some unintended consequences.

In the lead-up to this, I always advocated for a very [loud] implementation rights, essentially mainly focused on UDHR. But okay, we have what we have. I just wonder, now that essentially the industry standard is that there are key principles, can we not take that as a baseline and see how it applies to ICANN?

Also, I think it will facilitate my job taking back to the Board: "Look, these are the Ruggie principles, and they are very solid. There's a broad international consensus behind them." I just wonder whether we could not focus our work a little bit more on how the Ruggie principles would relate to what we are trying to achieve. This is mainly a question that's [inaudible] person, and I think it might facilitate our work to base ourselves on what already exists.

Thanks.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Thank you very much, Markus. I think it would be great, in line with Paul's comment, that we could document the concerns of the Board so that, from an early point onwards, we take everyone's concerns and considerations into account.

When it comes to the Ruggie principles, I think we will indeed have a discussion in which we will also discuss the Ruggie principles when we come to talk about: what do we mean with internationally-respected human rights and what are the

applicable frameworks? So that's indeed a very good point for discussion, and as Tatiana mentioned, some of these points have also already been discussed. So let's recap the discussion so that we all start from the same point.

There was a really great comment. Thank you very much.

Kavouss, I see your hand is up. Please come in.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: First, on the last point you made, where you said that we have to document that concerns of the Board, I understand that you mean that we have [seen] from the Board the concerns. It's good to receive it at the very beginning rather than at a very later stage. We don't want to have the same difficulties that we have involved in Work Stream 1 with respect to other issues about the type of membership. So we prepare this [inaudible] as soon as possible if we can. But that does not limit them to not make any point later on. This is number one.

Number two, I think we should be quite conscious that we don't have so much time to have open-ended discussions. We need to be selective. What are the relevant issues in ICANN and the Internet which directly relate to human rights? And we're not addressing any other things.

The third point is that we have spent a considerable amount of time on Leon Sanchez, and some of those discussions are useful, at least to be picked up, documented, and not repeated.

Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Okay. Thank you very much, Kavouss. I am very happy that the opinions and the discussions seem to be converging when it comes to work that is going ahead.

If I may summarize, we have said that it's important that we document what might be risks and unintended consequences, and we want to document what was agreed and what the discussions were during Work Stream 1. This can then also work as a background document together with the scoping document for the people who just joined the discussion.

Since we have weekly calls, I think this could be a nice bite-sized work for the coming week. Are there volunteers that would like to start work on this?

Oh, I see I have a hand raised by Sonigitu. Sonigitu, please come in.

SONIGITU EPKE: Thank you. I think I have a little concern. I asked a question on the chat for some clarity on human rights standards, principles,

access, and quality because these rights seem not to be equitable across jurisdiction. So human rights in another jurisdiction might not be human rights in another jurisdiction.

Could we not try to see how these [hover] around human rights? Did you get me clear?

NIELS TEN OEVER: Yes. We got [inaudible]. I think that, in the Bylaw, it's clearly outlined international human rights. So I think we will need to clearly look at what are the international documents or what are the international documents we want and can refer to in this work. So I think that is still very much up to discussion.

SONIGTU EPKE: Okay. Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER: I see that there is a flurry of discussion in the chat that I did not follow completely. First, I'd like to see if people could agree with the proposal just made – that we would start to document with risks and unintended consequences and document what was agreed and what was discussed during Work Stream 2.

Is this something that people could see as something we would want to work on in the upcoming week? I'd also like volunteers who would like to lead this work.

I see a few green marks. Could people use their green marks or red marks to say whether they agree with going ahead like this?

Okay. That is great. That seems like work with which we could be going ahead. Then I will ask: who would like to lead on the risks and unintended consequences?

Tijani, I see your hand is up. Please come in.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much. I am not volunteering. I want to make a comment. People spoke about how we have to bring what we had in Work Stream 2 – what the discussions were – about human rights. I'd like [inaudible] on the fact that we have only taken into consideration what is in the final report of Work Stream 1, not the [older] discussions because if we follow the [older] discussions, we'd be lost. We have a very tight timeline, so we will only take [inaudible] report from Work Stream 1.

Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Thank you, Tijani. So you think it would not be useful to have a look at discussions that we've had? Because also I'm afraid we might be repeating discussions that we have already had. So at least documenting them would be useful, I'd say, though I'd not

necessarily say that they are normative for our process. Is that something you could live with?

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Yes, very good.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Great. Thank you, Tijani. Paul, please come in.

PAUL TWOMEY: Thanks, Niels. Having raised the issue, I should of course [earn] it, so I'm happy to put my hand up to start the leadership on the unintended consequences. I suspect this is a piece of work which is really like a wiki in the sense that – I'm happy to put some first [thoughts] down and share, and then others of course will add and critique. But I'm happy to take the leadership if you like.

NIELS TEN OEVER: That would be really great, Paul. Perhaps you could start a discussion with an e-mail to the list and then perhaps open a Google Doc in which we people could start adding texts.

PAUL TWOMEY: That's fine. I just want to manage expectations. It's going to take me at least several days before I get the first comments there.

NIELS TEN OEVER: I think that's very much okay, Paul. If other people have strong opinions on this, of course they can already share it on the mailing list so we can jointly work on the document.

Kavouss, I see your hand is up. Please come in.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. May you kindly clarify: what do you mean by "unintended consequences"? This is a very general expression I have seen and heard many, many, many times. In what aspect? In what respect are you talking about with unintended consequences? Of action of the Board? Of actions of other people? What is unintended consequences? Are you talking of something that the people talking of the tests or – I don't know – pressure tests or whatever type of tests? What is unintended consequences?

Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Paul, since you brought this up, would you care to respond to the question of Kavouss?

PAUL TWOMEY: Thanks, Kavouss. I think perhaps the better way to put it is some people at least sharing scenarios that they would be concerned

may emerge from work. They would say, "Here's a scenario, and it really isn't [inaudible] of ICANN and the broader world in the Internet that this scenario emerge." They might [be] concerns or very technical ones around operations of the root zone and things like that.

I think the issue about consequences and unintended consequences is that you can never foresee all of them, and I think it's probably useful from the varied experience of this group people may have other scenarios they're also concerned about. That at least gives us a set of scenarios or tests that we can then use against our positive statements and say, "Is there anything here that we need to put some boundary around or recognize as where we express as such so that we don't end up with a potential outcome that we think would be harmful?"

So that's my thinking. I don't think there's any chance that you can write out all the possible unintended consequences.

As this applies to which part of the ICANN ecosystem, I will leave that to others to make decisions about what their concerned about in the ecosystem. My ones will be more focused, I think, more on the practical running of the IANA functions and ensuring that the Internet runs [inaudible] by 24.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Perfect. That is very useful. Thank you, Paul. Now, next in the queue is Jorge Cancio. Jorge, please come in.

JORGE CANCIO: Hello, everybody. Do you hear me?

NIELS TEN OEVER: We hear you very well. Thank you.

JORGE CANCIO: Okay. This is more a comment on procedure about priorities with our work. I agree that we don't want to have unintended consequences, understanding that unintended is when we, as a community, consider some consequence as unintended or not wanted. But I'm not sure whether we can do that exercise as a start because at least my Germanic part of my brain tells me that first we have to look into the elements of the commitments in the final, which needs interpretation. [inaudible] Framework of Interpretation. In defining that interpretation we will see what we [inaudible] more specifically and what we may not intend.

I think that, when we are at that level of specificity, when we are already talking about specific elements of interpretation of the commitments in the Bylaws, we may also be more specific about what we may [inaudible] unforeseen or unintended consequences.

But to start with [inaudible] at the beginning before we even start to talk about what needs to be integrated in the commitment, [inaudible] to put the cart before the ox. So, something like that. [inaudible] Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Thank you, Jorge. I think next in the queue is Paul McGrady. Paul?

PAUL MCGRADY: Thank you. Just to maybe counterbalance a bit what the other Paul has mentioned, if ICANN were not under the belief that it will inherit policy function as well as IANA functions after the transition, maybe we could limit this to root zone maintaining issues. But so long as ICANN retains its policy function, which would affect end users, then I think we have to really refrain from picking which human rights win and lose and put them all in and do the balancing that some in the chat have suggested. But to essentially not have those human rights compete in the milieu of ideas here I think would be a mistake.

If all ICANN were doing were root zone maintaining, none of us would be on this call. None of us were on the call for the first 25 years that people were root zone maintaining. It's when the policy function kicks in. That's where end user issues come up.

So I would suggest a broad approach, bringing to the table all the ideas and dealing with all the human rights issues and attempting to balance the formula the correct way. Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Thank you, Paul. Next in the queue is Sonigitu.

SONIGITU EPKE: I think I still have a little issue following up the non-unintended consequences. Today, what are the existing international laws that bind the global citizen or all nations that currently are participating in this ICANN stakeholder governance? That's my question.

Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Thank you, Sonigitu. I think the documents, such as the Universal Declaration for Human Rights, and several of the treaties that codified into international law can be found in the scoping document that is referenced in the presentation. I hope that that clarifies your question and can also inspire our further discussion here.

Next in line is Greg Shatan. Please, Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN:	Thank you, Niels. Just thinking about some of the discussion earlier of unintended consequences and looking at the basic definition – that it's consequences other than those intended or planned for from purposeful action – I think, as we look at the actions we intend to take, we need to look at the consequences, both intended and, if we can identify them, unintended, so we can anticipate them.

Kavouss, could you go on mute while you're typing? Thank you.

And therefore, we could maintain a list, pretty much rolling along. Obviously, we can't identify the unintended consequences until we identify the purposeful actions. So there is an order there, but I think we can, as I think John Laprise suggested, keep a running list as we identify an intended action, a purposeful action. We can look at the unintended consequences.

As someone once said, "When you're up to your ass in alligators, it's hard to remember your intent was to drain the swamp." So this is a situation where we have to look and identify the alligators that may come along.

I would also, just as a general note – I was a couple minutes late so I may have missed this – encourage everyone to read the scoping document carefully because I think it does answer some of the questions that have been asked here. Clearly, we need to delve into them much more deeply, such as what human rights are we referring and what documents and what is the legal effect

if those documents, in terms of hard law, soft law, and international law, etc.?

I think starting from the baseline from the scoping document, which reflects both the work of Work Stream 1 and some good work done in refining it after it was initially drafted – people definitely helped us as go forward.

Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Thank you very much, Greg, with that very concrete intervention. I would echo Greg's comment that we could also take the coming week to have a look at that.

Tatiana, you're next in line. Jorge, is that an old hand or have I skipped you for a couple of times?

TATIANA TROPINA: I saw that we are arguing so much around this terminology of unintended consequences. Maybe we call these documents [less] negative consequences or concerns because, for example, what I'm going to write about is prohibition on protection and enforcement. It's rather referring to how to avoid negative consequences, be they unintended or, I don't know, surprising or whatever. I think it's rather a concern position paper – not on the unintended consequences but any negative consequences

possible. It doesn't matter how we name them. Let's just leave our concerns there.

Thanks.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Thank you very much, Tatiana. I do think that I will hope to offer some convergence. I think it will really help our discussion if we have clear where we come from in terms of discussions and what we base ourselves upon when it comes to a knowledge outside of the ICANN sphere, but also what concerns people might have. I think, if we start mapping that early on in the process, that'll really help our discussions and arguments in building and writing the work ahead. So I really hope that this can be a way forward, or at least something that we can try for a week, and then see if that works.

I see Nigel's hand is up. Nigel, please come in.

NIGEL ROBERTS: Thank you. I'll be extremely brief because I believe we will deal with this in detail in the section of applicable law. Sonigitu asked what international human rights bind the global citizen, if I remember the question correctly. The answer is none. That's a hard answer. That's an absolutely precise answer because human rights define the relationships between the state and the individual, not between individuals.

Since what's happening with ICANN is that it's becoming an entirely private sector organization, it will have no formal obligations to respect human rights whatsoever, unless or until we voluntarily, whether it's through the Ruggie principles or whether it's through our framework or interpretation, or however we do it, explicitly adopt certain principles, such as, for example, the right to fair and impartial hearings and so on – things that are pretty obvious that ICANN must and has to support to remain credible.

But the literal answer to Sonigitu's questions is: not at all.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Thank you for that intervention, Nigel. I see Kavouss's hand is up. Kavouss, please.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: I'm sorry. I'm still not convinced about this term, "unintended consequences." You can hide many things under this coverage of unintended consequences. You can reject an idea, or you can include something as a – I have no problem to, say, address effects. I have no problem with negative impacts. I have no problem with positive impacts. But unintended consequences? I'm sorry. I am not convinced of the argument given by people. I don't want to name them.

Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER:

Tatiana is proposing concerns, so we don't even need to use that word if that is so problematic for you, Kavouss. Then we can go ahead with that [inaudible]. There seems to be enough people who want to contribute to that, so that seems good.

I'd like to go to the discussion of the [inaudible] part of the work that we agreed upon that we would do, and that is documentation on what we agreed on and what was discussed during Work Stream 2.

Do we have a short overview or a bit less short overview of what things have been discussed? Sorry, I see that I was [inaudible]. I'm very sorry. I'm in rural Mexico for work, so the connection is not as spotless as I would like it to be. I'm very sorry.

So I proposed that we would go ahead with the second part of our work that we agreed upon, and that was to document what was agreed on and what was discussed during Work Stream 2. I'm looking for volunteers for that. Theni saw that Nigel Roberts and Kavouss's hands were up.

Nigel, go ahead, and after that, Kavouss.

NIGEL ROBERTS:

I'm sorry, Niels. That's just me [fighting] to take it down.

NIELS TEN OEVER: So are you still not hearing me? Oh, those were old hands. Sonigitu would like to volunteer. Are there other people that would like to help Sonigitu with working on that?

Kavouss, I see your hand is up. Please come in.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: No. It was an old hand.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Okay. It was an old hand. Are there others who participated in Work Stream 1 who would like to volunteer on this?

I see Andrew Mack's hand is up. Andrew?

ANDREW MACK: Sorry. I was trying to get you to clarify what you were looking for volunteers for. I didn't participate in Work Stream 1, so I'm going to take my hand down. My apologies.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Oh, thanks, Andrew. I was looking for volunteers for documenting the discussions and agreements that were reached during Work Stream 1, so both in the CCWG discussion as well as in the working party for discussion to ensure that we can learn from both discussions and that we do not necessarily repeat those discussions here.

Yeah, I see that Tatiana is proposing that, next to Sonigitu, Greg, Tatiana, and myself and David respond here. I would be very happy to do so. I'm not sure if Greg – ah, Greg has been volunteered and he seems to accept. I'm sure we can also get some inputs from David that'll be great.

I see Greg's hand is also up. Please, Greg, go ahead.

GREG SHATAN: That hand was just up to volunteer, against my own better judgment. But since I was involved in documenting Work Stream 1 while there, I will turn from journalist, so to speak, to historian for this particular purpose.

Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Thank you very, Greg, that you will be. That'd be great. Thank you very much.

Kavouss, please go ahead. I see Kavouss is lowering his hand.

I see the hand of David McAuley. David, please come in.

DAVID MCAULEY: Thank you, Niels. Seeing that the invitation from Tatiana, I'm certainly happy to agree. But I was just going to comment that I missed some of what you were saying, Niels. You were going a

little bit in and out. If we are summarizing the work of Work Stream 1 in this respect, Annex 6, which is the work product of Work Stream 1 on this issue, is very, very short. It's like a 5-page document, I think. It already does, I think, what you are asking us to volunteer for. Or I've misunderstood what we're doing.

But if there's volunteers needed, I'm happy to help the group that's already stood up. Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Thank you, David. I think the annex could very well be the starting page for this work, but there were also discussions and arguments that we had for a very long time that did not make it into the final document that would be useful to understand and to know to ensure that all people have joined us and will hopefully make this work a success have not been privy to.

So it might be good if we, as people who were active in Work Stream 1, would give a bit of an overview of the discussions that were had so that we can build on the shoulders of the giants that were in Work Stream 1. [inaudible]

We are almost at the full hour. We have two concrete tasks. We seem to have quite some agreement on the steps that we need to take and the very concrete steps that we will be working on until next week.

So I think we can look back on a very productive first call. I am very sorry that some of the productivity might have been lowered because of my bad connection. That is because I'm in rural Mexico for work. I'm very sorry. But I hope that next week I will be back at my own broadband connection in Amsterdam where it's smooth.

If I see no hands and no points for Any Other Business, I would like to – ah, I see Tijani's hand is up. Tijani, please come in.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you very much, Niels. I would like to ask you clearly to make use of the wiki rather than the Google Docs. The wiki is useful everywhere in the world. Google Docs cannot be used in some countries. So please use the wiki. It's better for me and for everyone, I think. I can use the Google Docs. It's not a problem for me. But I find it more, how to say, common for everyone. This is a tool that ICANN can provide us with, so I think we have to use it.

Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Thank you very much for that comment, Tijani. There is only one issue, and that is that wikis do not [allow] for collaborative editing synchronously, so you can only do asynchronous editing on wikis. The comments function is also limited. But I also understand the limits of Google Docs.

So I can do some work in analyzing what is possible, and then for next week I will propose some different alternatives that are possible so we can discuss on the call what we will be using for collaborative editing and working documents and how we go ahead with that.

For this week, we might be sticking with Google Docs. Is that something we could agree upon? Then I'll propose some alternatives next week.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes. Thank you.

NIELS TEN OEVER: Excellent. On that note, I would like to end this call and thank you all very much for your participation. I'm looking forward to see you all on the list and on the call next week. If you have any questions, always feel free to ping Nigel and me on the list.

Bye, all.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]