

McLaughlin, Andrew J. (b)(6)

From: Andrew McLaughlin ([REDACTED])@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:04 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: EU Commission Whitepaper on ICT Standardisation and OFE Response

----- Forwarded message ----- (b)(6)

From: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Date: Wed, Jul 8, 2009 at 10:57 AM
Subject: Fwd: EU Commission Whitepaper on ICT Standardisation and OFE Response
To: amclaughlin@ostp.eop.gov

--

andrew mclaughlin

[REDACTED] - (b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Vint Cerf <vint@google.com>
Date: Wed, Jul 8, 2009 at 9:04 AM
Subject: Fwd: EU Commission Whitepaper on ICT Standardisation and OFE Response
To: Aneesh Chopra <[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov>, Vivek Kundra <[REDACTED]@omb.eop.gov>, Susan Crawford <[REDACTED]@who.eop.gov>, Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com> (b)(6)

You may already have seen advance drafts -

Begin forwarded message:

Whitepaper:

http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/newsroom/cf/itemlongdetail.cfm?item_id=3263&lang=en

OFE response to the EU Standardisation Whitepaper is attached and just got posted here
<<http://www.openforumeurope.org/>>

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Sent: Tuesday, July 21, 2009 8:46 AM
To: (b)(6) [REDACTED]@podesta.com
Subject: Re: ICANN

Perfect.

--a

----- Original Message -----

From: Claudia James <(b)(6) [REDACTED]@podesta.com>
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Sent: Mon Jul 20 23:05:52 2009
Subject: Re: ICANN

Let's do the Art Gallery at noon. It is located at 1712 Eye St. NW btween 17th and 18th. It is 2 blocks from White House. It is quick.

-----Original Message-----

From: McLaughlin, Andrew J. <(b)(6) [REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov>
To: Claudia James
Sent: Mon Jul 20 18:52:45 2009
Subject: RE: ICANN

Great. I need to be back at the OEOP at 1pm, so will need to pick someplace very nearby.

--andrew

-----Original Message-----

From: Claudia James [mailto:(b)(6) [REDACTED]@podesta.com]
Sent: Monday, July 20, 2009 6:36 PM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Re: ICANN

We can do noon lunch on Thursday. Thanks for getting back to me.

-----Original Message-----

From: McLaughlin, Andrew J. <(b)(6) [REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov>
To: Claudia James
CC: Elizabeth Sage
Sent: Mon Jul 20 15:20:55 2009
Subject: RE: ICANN

Claudia:

Apologies for the slow response. Yes, let's schedule this. I've got two openings on Thursday: Noon-1pm (lunch), or 2:00-3:30pm.

--andrew

-----Original Message-----

(b)(6)

From: Claudia James [mailto:[REDACTED]@podesta.com]
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2009 2:19 PM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Cc: Elizabeth Sage
Subject: FW: ICANN

Hi Andrew, could you meet Thursday am July 23 with ICANN's CEO, Paul Levins and me. Claudia

-----Original Message-----

From: Claudia James
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2009 12:30 PM
To: 'Kohlenberger, James C.'
Cc: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: RE: ICANN

Thanks much Jim. Andrew, I wish you much success in your exciting new position. We want to bring ICANN in to meet with you to discuss the JPA issue. Would you have time next Thursday July 23 between 9am and 1pm. If not we will try to find a time that works for your schedule.

Best, Claudia

202-[REDACTED] (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

(b)(6)

From: Kohlenberger, James C. [mailto:[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2009 11:38 AM
To: Claudia James
Cc: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: RE: ICANN

Claudia -
Andrew McLaughlin, copied here, is our lead.

Jim

-----Original Message-----

(b)(6)

From: Claudia James [mailto:[REDACTED]@podesta.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 15, 2009 10:33 AM
To: Kohlenberger, James C.
Subject: RE: ICANN

Hi, I wanted to circle back and see if person who will handle ICANN and JPA has come on board at this point, so we could schedule meeting with him or her. Thanks much.
Claudia

-----Original Message-----

(b)(6)

From: Kohlenberger, James C. [mailto:[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov]
Sent: Friday, May 29, 2009 5:02 PM
To: Claudia James
Subject: RE: ICANN

Claudia -
Great to hear from you. On DNSsec, our new cyber czar will help coordinate policy. On the broader issue leading to September, we are coordinating NTIA, State and others from OSTP. But the person who will be handling hasn't come on board yet.

Jim

-----Original Message-----

(b)(6)

From: Claudia James [mailto:[REDACTED]@podesta.com]
Sent: Friday, May 29, 2009 3:54 PM
To: Kohlenberger, James C.
Subject: RE: ICANN

Hope you are well. Can you share who is working on ICANN at WH? Much appreciated.

Claudia
202-[REDACTED] (b)(6)

-----Original Message-----

(b)(6)

From: Kohlenberger, James C. [mailto:[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, May 27, 2009 10:48 AM
To: Claudia James
Subject: Out of Office AutoReply: ICANN

I am out of the office on Wednesday May 26th with little or no access to e-mail. If you need to reach someone urgently, you can contact Ted Wackler at 202-[REDACTED] (b)(6)

Divider Page

(b)(6)

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Claudia James [mailto: [REDACTED]@podesta.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 12:15 PM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: RE: Thursday conflict/ Friday?

Sorry, he now has meeting at 1130. What about 1 or 130 for a meeting or lunch? Thanks for your flexibility.

-----Original Message-----

From: McLaughlin, Andrew J. [mailto: [REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 11:24 AM
To: Claudia James
Subject: Re: Thursday conflict/ Friday?

Lunch tomorrow at noon?

--andrew

----- Original Message -----

From: Claudia James < [REDACTED]@podesta.com>
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Sent: Thu Jul 23 11:22:19 2009
Subject: Re: Thursday conflict/ Friday?

We can do between 11 and 2 tomorrow. What works for you

-----Original Message-----

From: McLaughlin, Andrew J. < [REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov>
To: Claudia James
Sent: Wed Jul 22 18:00:23 2009
Subject: RE: Thursday conflict/ Friday?

I'm now booked until 11:30 on Friday -- sorry about that.

--andrew

-----Original Message-----

From: Claudia James [mailto: [REDACTED]@podesta.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2009 5:49 PM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: RE: Thursday conflict/ Friday?

Would Friday 8am work for coffee or meeting, or possibly 830am?

-----Original Message-----

From: McLaughlin, Andrew J. [mailto: [REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2009 2:12 PM
To: Claudia James
Subject: Re: Thursday conflict

Friendly re-ping.

--andrew

----- Original Message -----

From: McLaughlin, Andrew J.

To: 'Claudia James' <[REDACTED]@podesta.com>

Sent: Tue Jul 21 12:45:47 2009

Subject: Thursday conflict

(b)(6)

Claudia:

I now have a conflict on Thursday for lunch. Apologies for that. I still have the 2-3:30 period open, or else Friday is much more open.

--andrew

--
Andrew McLaughlin
Deputy Chief Technology Officer
Executive Office of the President | Office of Science & Tech Policy
e: [REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov
t: +1.202. [REDACTED]

(b)(6)

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Claudia James [REDACTED]@podesta.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 7:17 PM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: RE: Thursday conflict/ Friday?

See you then, thanks for your flexibility

-----Original Message-----

From: McLaughlin, Andrew J. [mailto:[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 7:14 PM
To: Claudia James
Subject: Re: Thursday conflict/ Friday?

Deal.

--a

----- Original Message -----

From: Claudia James <[REDACTED]@podesta.com>
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Sent: Thu Jul 23 19:11:22 2009
Subject: RE: Thursday conflict/ Friday?

How about Bombay Club, 815 Conn. Ave. at 1245pm tomorrow? (Between H and Eye St.)

-----Original Message-----

From: McLaughlin, Andrew J. [mailto:[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 6:48 PM
To: Claudia James
Subject: RE: Thursday conflict/ Friday?

Yes, that works great. I can be more flexible about the location tomorrow. What would work for you?

--andrew

-----Original Message-----

From: Claudia James [mailto:[REDACTED]@podesta.com]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 6:32 PM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: RE: Thursday conflict/ Friday?

Rod can do between 1245 and 2 tomorrow. Would that work?

-----Original Message-----

From: McLaughlin, Andrew J. [mailto:[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov]
Sent: Thursday, July 23, 2009 11:24 AM
To: Claudia James
Subject: Re: Thursday conflict/ Friday?

Lunch tomorrow at noon?

--andrew

----- Original Message -----

From: Claudia James <[REDACTED]@podesta.com>
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Sent: Thu Jul 23 11:22:19 2009
Subject: Re: Thursday conflict/ Friday?

We can do between 11 and 2 tomorrow. What works for you

-----Original Message-----

From: McLaughlin, Andrew J. <[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov>
To: Claudia James
Sent: Wed Jul 22 18:00:23 2009
Subject: RE: Thursday conflict/ Friday?

I'm now booked until 11:30 on Friday -- sorry about that.

--andrew

-----Original Message-----

From: Claudia James [mailto:[REDACTED]@podesta.com]
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2009 5:49 PM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: RE: Thursday conflict/ Friday?

Would Friday 8am work for coffee or meeting, or possibly 830am?

-----Original Message-----

From: McLaughlin, Andrew J. [mailto:[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 22, 2009 2:12 PM
To: Claudia James
Subject: Re: Thursday conflict

Friendly re-ping.

--andrew

----- Original Message -----

From: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
To: 'Claudia James' <[REDACTED]@podesta.com>
Sent: Tue Jul 21 12:45:47 2009
Subject: Thursday conflict

Claudia:

I now have a conflict on Thursday for lunch. Apologies for that. I still have the 2-3:30 period open, or else Friday is much more open.

--andrew

--

Andrew McLaughlin
Deputy Chief Technology Officer
Executive Office of the President | Office of Science & Tech Policy

(b)(6)

e: [REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov
t: +1.202. [REDACTED]

(b)(6)

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:07 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: icann

(b)(6)

Forwarded conversation
Subject: icann

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 28, 2009 at 1:52 PM
To: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Cc: denise kelly <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Carla Lafever <[REDACTED]@google.com>

andrew,

are you constrained at all to discuss ICANN? If you are able to talk, I have some fairly urgent concerns to draw to your attention.

I am in Stockholm until tomorrow (returning to DC in the afternoon on the 29th). I would value about a half hour of time for a phone call. I am copying Denise Kelly who has responsibility for my calendar while Carla is on vacation.

Saw Karen Rose here in Stockholm - as you know, she is back in DC now and a newly-minted MBA. I am putting her in touch with various possible places to land although I gather she's doing yeoman work for ISOC at the moment.

vint

(b)(6)

From: Denise Reed <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 28, 2009 at 2:00 PM
To: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Cc: Carla Lafever <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>

Hi Andrew,

Are you available for a call tomorrow, July 29th at 4:30pm EDT?

All the best,
Denise

From: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 28, 2009 at 2:38 PM
To: Denise Reed <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Cc: Carla Lafever <[REDACTED]@google.com>, Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>

Vint: Yes, now that I'm here, I can finally talk ICANN. I'm eager to connect with you.

Denise: I could do 5:15 pm EDT tomorrow.

--andrew

--
andrew mclaughlin

[REDACTED] - (b)(6)

2009/7/28 Denise Reed <[REDACTED]@google.com>

From: Denise Reed <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 28, 2009 at 2:43 PM
To: andrew.mclaughlin@gmail.com

Thanks Andrew. Vint will call you at [REDACTED] tomorrow at 5:15pm EDT. (b)(6)

Denise

From: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 28, 2009 at 5:32 PM
To: Denise Reed <[REDACTED]@google.com>

Please also give Vint my mobile as a backup: [REDACTED] (b)(6)

Thanks.

From: Denise Reed <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Tue, Jul 28, 2009 at 5:34 PM
To: [REDACTED]@gmail.com

Will do.

Denise

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Andrew McLaughlin [REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:07 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: ICANN, SSAC, DOC

(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Tue, Aug 4, 2009 at 7:30 AM
Subject: ICANN, SSAC, DOC
To: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>, Rod Beckstrom <[REDACTED]@beckstrom.com>
Cc: Steve Crocker <[REDACTED]@shinkuro.com>

Andrew and Rod,

I hope you have met by now but if not, you should, as you share a common interest in the health and successful operation of ICANN.

Andrew, I understand you were able to attend a recent meeting at DOC at which Doug Maughan was asked by DOC to present on the subject of ICANN's Security and Stability Advisory Committee. As you know, I asked Steve Crocker to form the SSAC while I was chairman.

I would urge you to get in touch with Doug Maughan, if you have not already. He is at DHS and can offer additional perspective on the posturing at NTIA over security matters. By some accounts, NTIA has impeded progress on DNSSEC substantially.

As you know, I am deeply concerned that NTIA's recent positions (e.g. on re-competing the IANA contract) are inimical to a healthy ICANN and that does not bode well for US interests let alone the two billion people who use the Internet around the world.

Vint

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Andrew McLaughlin [REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:08 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: Your Request to ComSoc for Assistance for Susan Crawford

Forwarded conversation
Subject: Fwd: Your Request to ComSoc for Assistance for Susan Crawford

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Wed, Aug 5, 2009 at 6:24 PM
To: Susan Crawford <[REDACTED]@who.eop.gov>, [REDACTED]
<[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

susan, andrew,

I think he may misunderstand that this has to do with not engaging on the topic on which he provided advice, not a blanket prohibition?

vint

Begin forwarded message:

From: David Lassner <[REDACTED]@hawaii.edu>
Date: August 5, 2009 11:49:03 AM EDT
To: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Subject: Your Request to ComSoc for Assistance for Susan Crawford

Vint - I got this from ComSoc. I doubt you track the details and I don't have an email address for Susan since she joined the administration, but feel free to forward this on if you want.

Just so you know: NTIA seems to be doing whatever they can to alienate every qualified reviewer. They started by declining to reimburse expenses, which is unusual. But I still thought it would be worth volunteering to review so I could try to figure out what on earth these people are thinking.

But now, per the July 30 FAQ (excerpt below), if you review for BTOP you can **never** submit, prepare or even advise on a future proposal for your current or future employer or anyone else. That is unheard of in my experience.

From the BTOP/BIP FAQ (July 31 edition), item D.4, Pg 27:

"Reviewers must agree not to use any information learned during the review process for
personal

(b)(6)

or private gain and must agree not to provide advice on or to participate in the preparation of any BTOP grant application for any party, including any existing or future employer, or on a consultancy basis."

On top of issuing a NOFA that was clearly not ready for prime time in any number of ways, they seem to be working hard to ignore all relevant NTIA experience (which was extensive in the 90s: TIIAP and others) on how to run a program. Good reviewers could have been one of their best sources of input to fix the NOFA for Rounds 2 and 3, but now they've cut that off. There's a Senate Commerce Committee hearing shaping up for Hawaii later this month and I *may* have the pleasure of sharing my pleasure:-)

best, david

Begin forwarded message:

From: [REDACTED]@comsoc.org

(b)(6)

Date: July 29, 2009 4:34:37 AM HST

To: [REDACTED]@hawaii.edu

Subject: White House request for assistance

Reply-To: [REDACTED]@comsoc.org

The following is being sent at the request of Vint Cerf on behalf of Susan Crawford, National Economic Council

We need your help in support of a broadband initiative that President Obama cares deeply about. Specifically, we are seeking subject matter experts who would review grant applications being filed with the federal government by applicants seeking financial support for broadband projects throughout the country.

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act appropriated \$7.2 billion to the Department of Commerce's National Telecommunications Information Administration (NTIA) and the Department of Agriculture's Rural Utilities Service (RUS) and to expand broadband access to unserved and underserved communities across the U.S., increase jobs, spur investments in technology and infrastructure, and provide long-term economic benefits. The Department of Commerce's program, the Broadband Technology Opportunities Program, or BTOP, will distribute 4.7 billion dollars in grant funds directed at enhancing network connectivity as well as broadband education. These grants should provide lasting value to commerce, economic development, education, research, health care, and energy conservation.

The Department will be giving out funds in three categories. A large share of the funds will be dedicated to developing broadband infrastructure in unserved and underserved communities. Two additional programs include grants for innovative projects that will drive the demand for broadband and grants for increasing public computing center capacity to provide access to those that can't afford a computer or broadband service at home.

This is where you come in. Commerce is expecting a large number of applications and is using experts to rate the various projects. Many of your employees may be uniquely situated to assist in this process. Of particular interest to the Department of Commerce are people with a background in broadband related activities, including engineering, business development, economics, research and development, and project management. The Department is also interested in staff that have significant experience in the analysis and oversight of infrastructure projects.

We could also use your help in spreading the word. It would be appreciated if you could reach out to your friends or business contacts that have had significant expertise and experience in any of these areas.

Participation by high quality expert reviewers will help ensure that these funds are well invested for our future. The Department is looking for a minimum time commitment of approximately 20 hours between mid August and mid September. You may apply directly to serve as a reviewer at btopreviewer@ntia.doc.gov. More information about being a reviewer is available at <http://broadbandusa.gov>

Susan Crawford

(b)(6)

National Economic Council

From: Crawford, Susan.P. <[REDACTED]@who.eop.gov>
Date: Wed, Aug 5, 2009 at 6:44 PM
To: [REDACTED]@google.com, [REDACTED]@gmail.com

It is indeed a strict conflicts policy. It is a competitive grants program that is under a lot of scrutiny. We are hoping for reviewers that aren't connected to grant applications.

From: Vint Cerf

To: Crawford, Susan P.; Andrew McLaughlin
Sent: Wed Aug 05 18:24:43 2009
Subject: Fwd: Your Request to ComSoc for Assistance for Susan Crawford

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Wed, Aug 5, 2009 at 9:10 PM
To: "Crawford, Susan P." <[REDACTED]@who.eop.gov>
Cc: [REDACTED]@gmail.com

sadly i got linked to a grant request from the president of Gallaudet University (broadband for deaf consumers) so I am not able to serve as a reviewer as I would be conflicted.

v

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Andrew McLaughlin [REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:09 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: innovation journalism
Attachments: pastedGraphic.tiff; pastedGraphic.tiff

(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Thu, Aug 13, 2009 at 4:14 AM
Subject: Innovation journalism
To: Aneesh Chopra <[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov>, Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>, "Thomas A. Kalil" <[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov>, vivek kundra <[REDACTED]@omb.eop.gov>, Susan Crawford <[REDACTED]@who.eop.gov>, Alec Ross <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Cc: David Nordfors <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

Dear Brain Trust,

David Nordfors popped up on my radar screen several years ago with a catchy notion "innovation journalism." I said, "what's that" and it has turned out to be a very interesting area of research and debate. It is innovation IN journalism and journalism ABOUT innovation rolled up into one. David heads the Stanford University Innovation Journalism program that is strongly supported by the Swedish Wallenberg Foundation.

So why am I cluttering up your inbox? Well, David speaks for himself and his program below. The problem of erosion of the quality of journalism in the traditional media, partly a consequence of new technology and alternative sources of news (mostly online), poses a hazard to democratic processes. An uninformed democracy leads to poor quality decisions, especially those put into the hands of the public. Some of the raucous debates about health care reform can be traced to misinformation, disinformation, urban legends and a variety of other information impairments, by way of example.

Susan's inter-agency meetings on Thursdays struck me as a potential venue in which Innovation Journalism might be fruitfully discussed. While David's attention was first drawn to Aneesh in his role as CTO, it seems to me that you, collectively, represent some of the best minds in the Obama administration who are grappling explicitly or implicitly with the role of innovation in American society and might find it informative to learn more about David's program at Stanford.

Vint

Begin forwarded message:

From: David Nordfors <[REDACTED]@stanford.edu>
Date: August 12, 2009 7:01:46 PM EDT
To: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Subject: Re: intro to Aneesh Chopra?

Vint,

(b)(6)

Thanks for helping me get in touch with Aneesh Chopra. As the CTO of the USA, he is instrumental for connecting the innovation economy and the democratic system. That's a challenging task in society today, because it's difficult to get that story into the news. The newsrooms are organized to cover stories about tech OR business OR politics, not about how they hang together - which is the key issue for innovation. The innovation story gets chopped into bits to fit the slots in the news, missing the bigger picture (check the picture below). Although newspapers will go away, we can be certain about the professional journalism will continue to be influential (Huffington Post is quite influential today).

The point is this: for democracy to be competitive in the global innovation economy, we need an infrastructure for facilitating public discussion around how we innovate. The key to this infrastructure for public debate are journalists, who have the ability (and incentive) to attract public attention to issues of public interest, on behalf of the public. Apart from the Innovation Journalism initiative centered here at Stanford, nearly nobody is working on developing professional journalism that focuses on innovation.

The innovation journalism center at Stanford is a start. Since 2004, we have been hosting journalists from around the world, mixing lectures on innovation here at Stanford with internships in leading US newsrooms. The curriculum for the Innovation Journalism Fellowship Program will be very much the same in 2010 as in 2009 (the 2009 curriculum is here http://docs.google.com/Doc?id=dhdcptz_58dgknf3cc). So far I know of getting journalism fellows from Sweden, Finland, Slovenia, Pakistan and Mexico. I am counting on in all around 15 Fellows. If other countries decide to join during the autumn, there will be more.

So Silicon Valley is today the world center for developing best practices in how to tell the story of innovation in the news. This sounds grander than it is today, since the need for this type of news is still not very recognized. As you know I coined the expression "innovation journalism" in 2003. It did not exist before. But still, the need is obvious as soon as one starts thinking about it. The recognition will grow, and with it comes the possibility of establishing the US as the world center for telling the story of innovation. (which is as important for the US in shaping the global perception of innovation, as the Dollar is for the world trade).

It would be great to get the chance to tell Aneesh more about what we are doing here at Stanford to make this vision come true.

We have a top notch set of advisors - yourself included. Some of the other names are: Don Kennedy - president emeritus Stanford and fmr Editor-in-Chief of Nature, David Demarest - VP Public Affairs Stanford & fmr head of communications of the White House, Curtis Carlson - President SRI International and Anders Flodström - Chancellor of the Swedish System for Higher Education and Executive Board Member of the European Institute of Innovation and Technology. They are engaged and I am in regular contact with them. We had an excellent advisory board meeting at the yearly Injo conference at Stanford <http://ij6.innovationjournalism.org> <<http://ij6.innovationjournalism.org/>>

The best comprehensive overview of the Injo conceptual framework and the Stanford + global initiative is in a review article I published a few months ago:

INNOVATION JOURNALISM, ATTENTION WORK, AND THE INNOVATION ECONOMY. A Review of the Innovation Journalism Initiative 2003-2009 <<http://www.innovationjournalism.org/archive/injo-6-1.pdf>>

Innovation Journalism Vol. 6 No. 1 May 1, 2009
By David Nordfors

This article presents a review of the innovation journalism initiative so far. The novel concepts of innovation journalism, attention work and innovation communication systems are presented and put into context, explaining why journalism and communication may be considered important components of the innovation economy, as well as how this may benefit society. The need for a new definition of 'journalism' is discussed, suggesting a definition based on the relation between journalism and its audience, rather than on its relation to the medium it uses for communicating with the audience. The role of journalism in the innovation economy is a novel academic research field. The rationale for this research is presented together with examples of plausible research topics. Innovation journalism

initiatives are emerging in several places around the world. The seminal VINNOVA Stanford initiative at Stanford University is presented together with the national initiatives in Sweden, Finland, Slovenia, Pakistan, Mexico, and the EU.

My bio is on wikipedia <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_Nordfors> , if you need it. Let me know if my full CV is needed, it can be supplied.

/David

David Nordfors. Ph.D.
Executive Director, VINNOVA-Stanford Research Center of Innovation Journalism
Wallenberg Hall, Stanford University
Phone: +1 650 [REDACTED]
Email: [REDACTED]@stanford.edu

(b)(6)

On Aug 11, 2009, at 1:55 PM, Vint Cerf wrote:

i think a one-pager describing what you want to talk about would be helpful.

v

On Aug 11, 2009, at 3:17 PM, David Nordfors wrote:

Wow - Aneesh is into the same stuff as I did with the Swedish Knowledge Foundation (with Mats Brunell) back in the early 90s. We got IT and Internet into schools, museums, government etc, talking about "information infrastructure" and who does what in it. Aneesh's Virginia Physics Flexbook could have been one of our projects. I built funding programs for collaboration between university and industry. We set up the II Foundation that owns the .se gTLD. I set up funding programs for innovation testbeds that put together people and machines for testing new services, involving both companies and universities. Aneesh speaks my language 99%.

If I could get a chance to chat with him interactively (IRL , Skype or phone) things might click.

You think it's possible to schedule a phone meeting around the topic of how to enable public discussion around innovation processes and ecosystems, and what we are doing here at Stanford, and only after that follow up with a proposal if he wants one? Or is a proposal needed in the first place to get his attention? Can you be interested in taking part in a chat with him about how we can bring up the quality of public discussion and decision making around innovation?

cheers,

/D

On Aug 10, 2009, at 10:25 PM, Vint Cerf wrote:

prepare a summary of what you want to have in the way of support and I will forward to him. You will need to explain innovation journalism as this may be a new idea to him.

v

On Aug 11, 2009, at 12:45 AM, David Nordfors wrote:

Hi Vint,

I saw a recent clip with Aneesh Chopra. He says "his top priority is to invest in the building blocks of innovation--primarily by ensuring we have smart, secure infrastructure, focusing the national \$150 billion research and development budget towards commercialization, and making sure that we have a 21st-century workforce.". You think he might be interested in supporting development of Innovation Journalism to make that happen in the US democracy? If so, do you know how to best get to him?

cheers,

/D

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Andrew McLaughlin [REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:10 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: IGF

(b)(6)

Forwarded conversation
Subject: IGF

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Sat, Aug 15, 2009 at 5:38 AM
To: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

Andrew, is IGF also on your radar screen? Do you know Marilyn Cade and have you been following her role in the so-called "US IGF"?

v

(b)(6)

From: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Aug 15, 2009 at 10:45 AM
To: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>

Yes, it's on my radar screen (I'm tentatively planning to attend, with some others). Yes, I know Ms. Cade, but don't know what she's up to these days.

--andrew

--
andrew mclaughlin
[REDACTED]@gmail.com
{ [REDACTED] } - (b)(6)

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Sat, Aug 15, 2009 at 10:57 AM
To: [REDACTED]@gmail.com

Theresa can probably bring you up to date.

v

From: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Date: Sat, Aug 15, 2009 at 11:03 AM
To: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>

(b)(6)

We're to talk this week.

Is the IGF losing further steam? Does it need to be worked hard? Ignored? Somewhere in between?

On Aug 15, 2009, at 10:45 AM, Andrew McLaughlin wrote: > Yes, it's on my radar screen (I'm
tentat...

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Sat, Aug 15, 2009 at 11:07 AM
To: [REDACTED]@gmail.com

the Chinese want to stop IGFs either after Sharm El-Sheik or the subsequent (5th) meeting. Others have expressed a desire for a decision making body (cf. Vivian Reding). I spoke with Alec Ross and Secretary Locke recently and offered the opinion that a non-decision-making body was vital to getting multi-stakeholder perspectives and issues on the table. If the body were to take decisions, the discussions would turn into negotiations and I believe would be far less candid. I am a strong proponent of continuing the IGF as a multi-stakeholder forum.

It even occurred to me that ICANN might offer, through the GAC, to undertake to support IGF after the 5th meeting. I mentioned this to Rod Beckstrom but he would obviously have to discuss with the Board and ICANN community.

It is very important in my estimation to have a strong and united US delegation to this IGF. That will take leadership and coordination and I know you are well-equipped to provide that.

Vint

From: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Aug 16, 2009 at 12:16 PM
To: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>

(b)(6)

Roger all that, thanks. I concur. Will endeavor to get our ducks in a row.

My view is that the USG needs to signal a new level of energy and engagement (and a new, positive attitude) in both the ICANN process and the IGF. The past 8 years have been marked by contempt and annoyance; I'd like the next 8 to be marked by engagement, appreciation, respect, and vigor.

--andrew

--
andrew mclaughlin

[REDACTED] - (b)(6)

(b)(6)

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>

Date: Sun, Aug 16, 2009 at 1:10 PM
To: [REDACTED]@gmail.com

(2/6)

boy that would be SOOOOOO nice!

v

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Andrew McLaughlin [REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:10 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: private message

(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Tue, Aug 18, 2009 at 8:04 PM
Subject: private message
To: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

andrew, this is a mess. Would you have a moment to talk to Robin?
I am VP and treasurer of the National Medals of Science and Technology Foundation and we fund the gala for the medals winners. Coordination with DOC, White House and NSF has always been a problem but this is really quite a surprising and messy situation. your advice and guidance will be very much appreciated.

vint

Begin forwarded message:

From: Robin Rathmann-Noonan <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Date: August 18, 2009 1:46:11 PM EDT
To: Steve Burrill <[REDACTED]@b-c.com>, Vinton Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>, [REDACTED]@yahoo.com
Cc: Sarah Thompson <[REDACTED]@b-c.com>, Carla LaFever <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Subject: Release of Laureate name and ceremony date

Steve, Vint, and Ted,

A few weeks ago I was told confidentially by Seth Cohen of OSTP that the White House had committed to an October 7 date for the Laureate events. I told Seth that we could schedule the gala for that night but it wasn't ideal for a number of reasons particularly that there are very few hotels in the DC area that week so guests would be lucky to find rooms let alone affordable ones (the best rates we can find are over \$275 per night). He said there was no negotiation on the date because it had already been signed off on. He also assured us that the release would come soon (preferably that week) once the staff sec signed off on the list of laureates. Since then I have been pushing to get language in for approval by the lawyers at the WH/DOC/NSF (they threw out the language approved last year), the SOW with NSF and JPA with USPTO through clearance, invitations lists, etc as well as contracts signed with the Ritz Carlton and the other vendors since we thought the announcement was coming any day. It has been over two weeks now and OSTP will not even release the names to Barbara and me (as has been done in every year previously) so that I can start getting my contact lists in order and so that Barbara can do research to get her interviews ready. I cannot start fundraising and selling tickets and tables because the date and names are still being held by OSTP/WH. I met with Seth again the end of last week and he hasn't even been told when they expect to get the names and date signed off on so that I can proceed with funding and Barbara can begin her work on the videos. I asked that he let me release the date of the event and not the names so we at least can begin inviting people and he said no to that too. We are now less than 8 weeks out. Seth's last real day with OSTP is this Friday and his replacement hasn't been named.

After being continually dismissed throughout this process, I am not sure how to proceed to get OSTP to pay attention to us and get the names through staff sec. I was hoping there might be something you three might be able to do, though I will gladly open it up to the whole board as well (or if you have a particular board member in mind that you think might be able to help). Rick Weiss is Director of Strategic Communications at Office of Science and Technology Policy and can be reached at 202-██████████ and ██████████@ostp.eop.gov <mailto:██████████@ostp.eop.gov>. Seth and he work under Dr. Holdren, the Director of OSTP (as you probably know) at 202-██████████

Thanks,

Robin

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Cohen, Seth M. <██████████@ostp.eop.gov>
Date: Wed, Aug 12, 2009 at 5:28 PM
Subject: Possible Conflict
To: Robin Rathmann-Noonan <██████████@gmail.com>

Dear Robin,

Please see email stream below. There may be a potential conflict for Dr. Holdren and the gala. The White House event (see below) is a Presidential event so will take precedence if it is decided that they can't both happen the same night. Not sure what you think is the best course of action here. Please give me your thoughts when you have a chance.

Seth M. Cohen, Ph.D.

AAAS Roger Revelle Fellow in Global Stewardship

Office of Science & Technology Policy

Executive Office of the President

Washington, D.C. 20502

202-██████████ (Office)

Seth we have a problem: The evening of Oct. 7 is the Astronomy on the White House Lawn event.

We will have to figure out a way to deal with this conflict, perhaps the best option being to have the gala on the night of the 6th, though we can talk about that.

Rick Weiss

Director of Strategic Communications

and Senior Science and Technology Policy Analyst

Office of Science and Technology Policy

Executive Office of the President

202 [REDACTED]

[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov

(b)(6)

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Andrew McLaughlin [REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:10 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: Updated draft of Rockefeller-Snowe cybersecurity bill
Attachments: S773SUB2.pdf

(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Thu, Aug 20, 2009 at 6:21 PM
Subject: Fwd: Updated draft of Rockefeller-Snowe cybersecurity bill
To: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>, vivek kundra <[REDACTED]@omb.eop.gov>, Susan Crawford <[REDACTED]@who.eop.gov>

you probably have this data but just in case it is not readily available to you, here is the latest draft I have.

v

Begin forwarded message:

----- Forwarded message -----

From: "Lieu, Chan (Commerce)" <[REDACTED]@commerce.senate.gov>
Date: Aug 20, 2009 5:56 PM
Subject: Updated draft of Rockefeller-Snowe cybersecurity bill
To: "Lieu, Chan (Commerce)" <[REDACTED]@commerce.senate.gov>

(b)(6)

I just want to share with everyone the latest staff draft of the Rockefeller-Snowe cybersecurity bill. This new draft captures a lot of the input we've received since its introduction. It is still a staff draft and has not been approved at the member level, but we believe it addresses many of the concerns that were raised. This continues to be an iterative process so we look forward to working with folks on additional feedback on this draft.

Best regards,
.cdl

Chan D. Lieu
Senate Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation | (202) [REDACTED] | (202) [REDACTED]

[REDACTED] f

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Andrew McLaughlin [REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:11 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: An oversight matter

(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Sun, Aug 23, 2009 at 12:04 AM
Subject: An oversight matter
To: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

Andrew,

As things stand, IANA/ICANN responses to cctld operators seeking to make changes to their root zone file entries are considered to be a form of assistance to the countries in which these cctld operators operate. A consequence of that is that these transactions require review by the Office of Foreign Asset Control. From my perspective, this seems to be a very strange interpretation of the scope of OFAC. I would have thought that the constraints of the scope of what IANA does here could justify a blanket waiver of need for review of the very constrained IANA functions regarding the root zone operation. While it may be convenient to leave this matter alone while the JPA matter is sorted out, it's going to be an element of concern when it comes to processing cctld requests in the future, especially as the number of IDN cctld's increases. I don't know whether this was on your radar screen during the time you served as policy VP at ICANN but I think we could reasonably improve the treatment of this matter by an appropriate agreement with OFAC. Failing that, I suppose an executive order might be an alternative.

vint

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Vint Cerf [REDACTED]@google.com]
Sent: Monday, August 24, 2009 12:22 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: query?

6/26/09

andrew,

did my earlier email arrive? I may have sent it to your gmail account inadvertently.

vint

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Andrew McLaughlin [REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:11 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: Reception @ Google DC next Tuesday

Forwarded conversation
Subject: Reception @ Google DC next Tuesday

From: Manuel Tamez <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Fri, Sep 4, 2009 at 7:22 PM
To: andrew.mclaughlin@gmail.com

Hey Andrew,
I hope you're doing great, it's been a while!
things here are business as usual, nothing very interesting to report. The process to hire a policy person for Mexico was opened around mid-June and is still ongoing, hopefully not for much longer =).

Anyways, maybe you already know about this, but we'll be offering a reception at the Google DC office this Tuesday from 5.30 to 8.00pm for all Gov 2.0 attendees. I'll be there and so will a bunch of others, it'd be great if you could make it as well! feel free to drop by and to bring anyone along if you want to. Hope to see you there,

best!

Manuel

--
Manuel Tamez
Manager | New Business Development
Google, Inc.
T: 650 [REDACTED] | F: 408 [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]@google.com

--
This email may be confidential or privileged. If you received this communication by mistake, please don't forward it to anyone else, please erase all copies and attachments, and please let me know that it went to the wrong person. Thanks.

The above communication may include discussions or proposals of a potential business arrangement, and if so, are provided solely as a basis for further discussion, and should not be intended to and do not constitute a legally binding obligation. No legally binding obligations will be created, implied, or inferred until an agreement in final form is executed in writing by all parties involved.

From: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Sep 4, 2009 at 11:02 PM
To: Manuel Tamez <[REDACTED]@google.com>

Thanks for the kind invite, Manuel. In my new position, I keep a very strict line between myself and Google (and Googlers), so I won't be able to attend the reception.

Good luck with Mexico, and everything else you're working on. :-)

All the best,

--andrew

--
andrew mclaughlin

[REDACTED]

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

From: Manuel Tamez <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Sun, Sep 6, 2009 at 1:39 PM
To: "andrew.mclaughlin" <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

Thanks for your quick reply Andrew, it makes total sense.
And thanks also for your good wishes, I certainly hope everything's going great for you as well!

Manuel

2009/9/4 Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

--

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Andrew McLaughlin ([REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:12 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: no need for phone call re: Medals

(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Tue, Sep 15, 2009 at 3:16 PM
Subject: no need for phone call re: Medals
To: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>, Rick Weiss <[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov>, "Patricia M. McLaughlin" <[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov>, Aneesh Chopra <[REDACTED]>, John Holdren <[REDACTED]@harvard.edu>

1. NMSTF will proceed to do what it can to host a gala - no videos etc.
2. I strongly urge that we work this out in the future so that the nominees are fully vetted, an announcement is made, but the WH event and gala are scheduled several months later so as to allow time for planning, fundraising, video production and so on. I know I have the concurrence of my colleagues at NMSTF.

please let me know if there is any way to be of assistance in making this possible.

vint

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Andrew McLaughlin [REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:13 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: [NNSquad] WSJ Paints Net Neutrality as Google Plot for "Internet Socialism"

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Wed, Sep 23, 2009 at 7:49 AM
Subject: Fwd: [NNSquad] WSJ Paints Net Neutrality as Google Plot for "Internet Socialism"
To: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

i thought you would appreciate this comment

(b)(6)

Begin forwarded message:

From: Lauren Weinstein <[REDACTED]@vortex.com>
Date: September 23, 2009 1:56:57 AM EDT
To: nnsquad@nnsquad.org
Subject: [NNSquad] WSJ Paints Net Neutrality as Google Plot for "Internet Socialism"

WSJ Paints Net Neutrality as Google Plot for "Internet Socialism"

<http://bit.ly/4DDJ0f> (WSJ)

There are some great people at the Wall Street Journal, including top-notch reporters. But this editorial has more misguided bull per paragraph than anything I've seen in a long time. And I'll add this personal note: Andrew McLaughlin is a good guy.

--Lauren--
NNSquad Moderator

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2009 3:26 PM
To: 'Burr, Becky'; Crawford, Susan P.
Subject: RE: Privacy and innovation

So now I have a thing I can't miss until 6:30, Friday noon?

--
Andrew McLaughlin
Deputy U.S. Chief Technology Officer
Executive Office of the President | Office of Science & Tech Policy
e: [REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov
t: +1.202. [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Burr, Becky [mailto:[REDACTED]@wilmerhale.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2009 3:13 PM
To: Crawford, Susan P.; McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: RE: Privacy and innovation

ok, Wednesday at 6 pm. pick a venue

-----Original Message-----

From: Crawford, Susan P. [mailto:[REDACTED]@who.eop.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 29, 2009 12:31 PM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.; Burr, Becky
Subject: RE: Privacy and innovation

I could do Weds. 6pm

Susan Crawford
National Economic Council
202 [REDACTED] (p)
202 [REDACTED] (c)

-----Original Message-----

From: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 4:51 PM
To: Crawford, Susan P.; 'Burr, Becky'
Subject: RE: Privacy and innovation

Doesn't work for me. Open times for me next 3 days:

Tues: 2pm, 3pm
Weds: 6pm
Thurs: 10am

--andrew

--
Andrew McLaughlin
Deputy U.S. Chief Technology Officer
Executive Office of the President | Office of Science & Tech Policy
e: [REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov
t: +1.202. [REDACTED]

-----Original Message-----

From: Crawford, Susan P.
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 4:32 PM
To: Burr, Becky; McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: RE: Privacy and innovation

It is up to Andrew. I could do breakfast Wednesday.

Susan

(b)(6)

Susan Crawford

National Economic Council

202 [REDACTED] (p)

202 [REDACTED] (c)

From: Burr, Becky [mailto:[REDACTED]@wilmerhale.com]
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 10:14 AM
To: Crawford, Susan P.; McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: RE: Privacy and innovation

Excellent idea -

Anytime today, anytime tomorrow morning, anytime Wednesday. Breakfast wednesday?

From: Crawford, Susan P. [mailto:[REDACTED]@who.eop.gov]
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 10:06 AM
To: Burr, Becky; [REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov
Subject: RE: Privacy and innovation

Becky - I am definitely interested, and suggest that you meet with Andrew as well as me (unless you have met with him already).

This is a busy week, but I hope we can set something up. Please send us a few times.

Thanks

susan

(b)(6)

Susan Crawford

National Economic Council

202 [REDACTED] (p)

202 [REDACTED] (c)

From: Burr, Becky [mailto:[REDACTED]@wilmerhale.com]
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2009 10:00 AM
To: Crawford, Susan P.
Subject: Privacy and innovation

Hi Susan -

Wondering if we can get together to discuss the movement away from a "notice and choice" privacy paradigm to a more prescriptive/normative approach? This is an emerging theme in the academy, and seems to be gathering favor at the FTC. The move has some worrisome implications for innovation, and it seems important for the FTC to have administration input on this. I have discussed this briefly with Phil Weiser and with Peter Cowhey, and plan to approach Danny Weitzner as well. Let me know if this is something of interest.

B

J. Beckwith Burr | WilmerHale

1875 Pennsylvania Avenue NW

Washington, DC 20006 USA

+1 202 [REDACTED] (t)

+1 202 [REDACTED] (f)

[REDACTED]@wilmerhale.com

(b)(6)

Please consider the environment before printing this email.

This email message and any attachments are being sent by Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP, are confidential, and may be privileged. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify us immediately by replying to this message or by sending an email to postmaster@wilmerhale.com <<mailto:postmaster@wilmerhale.com>> -and destroy all copies of this message and any attachments. Thank you.

For more information about WilmerHale, please visit us at <http://www.wilmerhale.com> <<http://www.wilmerhale.com/>> .

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Andrew McLaughlin [REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:13 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: US IPv6 planning

(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Fri, Oct 2, 2009 at 7:05 AM
Subject: US IPv6 planning
To: vivek kundra <[REDACTED]@omb.eop.gov>, Aneesh Chopra <[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov>, Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>

Vivek, Aneesh, Andrew,

I wonder whether it would be helpful to issue an RFI to all US ISPs requesting statement of current capability or schedule of planned capability to assign IPv6 addresses to users and to router IPv6 packets to destinations in the Internet? There is a background question about the completeness of connectivity among all IPv6 capable ISPs (world wide) as well.

vint

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Andrew McLaughlin [REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:14 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: close hold

(b)(6)

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 7, 2009 at 7:22 AM
Subject: Fwd: close hold
To: Alec Ross <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>, Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>, Larry Strickling <[REDACTED]@barackobama.com>

FYI - I hope this doesn't strike you as cowboy diplomacy. My idea is that having another country sign an agreement similar to the US sets a major new tone the position of ICANN in international circles and would enhance Mexico's position as a policy leader prior to hosting the ITU Plenipot.

vint

Begin forwarded message:

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: October 7, 2009 7:20:46 AM EDT
To: Rod Beckstrom <[REDACTED]@beckstrom.com>
Cc: Alejandro Pisanty <[REDACTED]@servidor.unam.mx>
Subject: close hold

(b)(6)

Rod,

I met with President Calderon of Mexico yesterday for over an hour. I suggested to him that Mexico should seriously consider signing an affirmation of commitment with ICANN essentially identical to the one signed by the USG. He is willing to consider it.

Please provide me with a clean, soft copy of the agreement as signed by ICANN and the USG.

I urged the President to send a high level representative to IGF and to support the continuation of the IGF process.

Mexico is hosting the ITU plenipot in 2010. I recommended that Mexico become involved in agenda setting for this meeting.

ITU is making moves to become an IP address registry. I see no basis for such an application, do you?

Vint

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:14 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: Peace Prize

Forwarded conversation
Subject: Peace Prize

From: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Fri, Oct 9, 2009 at 1:04 PM
To: Aneesh Chopra <[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov>, "Thomas A. Kalil" <[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov>,
Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>, vivek kundra <[REDACTED]@omb.eop.gov>,
Susan Crawford <[REDACTED]@who.eop.gov>

For all of us who are very supportive of what this administration is attempting, the recognition of the President's initiatives is a source of great pride.

Wow, at least three nobel prize winners at the top of this administration!!

President Obama
Secretary Chu
Co-chair of PCAST Varmus

are there others?

vint

From: Andrew McLaughlin <[REDACTED]@gmail.com>
Date: Sun, Oct 11, 2009 at 3:36 PM
To: Vint Cerf <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Cc: Aneesh Chopra <[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov>, "Thomas A. Kalil" <[REDACTED]@ostp.eop.gov>, vivek kundra <[REDACTED]@omb.eop.gov>, Susan Crawford <[REDACTED]@who.eop.gov>

It's a little bewildering to me, to be honest. It really adds to the burden on the President (and his administration) to live up to his promise and potential.

I can't think of any other Nobel prize winners in the administration. I doubt Paul Krugman will be joining any time soon; but perhaps we can recruit Toni Morrison for something?

--andrew

--
andrew mclaughlin
andrew.mclaughlin@gmail.com

[REDACTED] (b)(6)

Divider Page

McLaughlin, Andrew J.

From: Andrew McLaughlin [REDACTED]@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, May 06, 2010 12:15 AM
To: McLaughlin, Andrew J.
Subject: Fwd: Verizon+Google: Finding common ground on an open Internet

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Alan Davidson <[REDACTED]@google.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 21, 2009 at 7:17 PM
Subject: Fwd: Verizon+Google: Finding common ground on an open Internet
To: [REDACTED]@gmail.com

(b)(6)

Fyi.

<http://googlepublicpolicy.blogspot.com/2009/10/finding-common-ground-on-open-internet.html>

It took a year, but we finally got something.

----- Forwarded message -----

From: Google Public Policy Blog <public-policy-blog@google.com>
Date: Wed, Oct 21, 2009 at 6:17 PM
Subject: [Google Public Policy Blog] Finding common ground on an open Internet
To: public-policy-blog@googlegroups.com

Finding common ground on an open Internet

Posted by Eric Schmidt, Chairman and CEO of Google, and Lowell McAdam, President and CEO of Verizon Wireless

Verizon and Google might seem unlikely bedfellows in the current debate around network neutrality, or an open Internet. And while it's true we do disagree quite strongly about certain aspects of government policy in this area -- such as whether mobile networks should even be part of the discussion -- there are many issues on which we agree. For starters we both think it's essential that the Internet remains an unrestricted and open platform -- where people can access any content (so long as it's legal), as well as the services and applications of their choice.

There are two key factors driving innovation on the web today. First is the programming language of the Internet, which was designed over forty years ago by engineers who wanted the freedom to communicate from any computer, anywhere in the world. It enables Macs to talk to PCs, Blackberry Storms to iPhones, the newest computers to the oldest hardware on the planet across any kind of network -- cable, DSL, fiber, mobile, WiFi or even dial up.

Second, private investment is dramatically increasing broadband capacity and the intelligence of networks, creating the infrastructure to support ever more sophisticated applications.

As a result, however or wherever you access the Internet the people you want to connect with can receive your message. There is no central authority that can step in and prevent you from talking to someone else, or that imposes rules prescribing what services should be available.

Transformative is an over-used word, especially in the tech sector. But the Internet has genuinely changed the world. Consumers of all stripes can decide which services they want to use and the companies they trust to provide them. In addition, if you're an entrepreneur with a big idea, you can launch your service online and instantly connect to an audience of billions. You don't need advance permission to use the network. At the same time, network providers are free to develop new applications, either on their own or in collaboration with others.

This kind of "innovation without permission" has changed the way we do business forever, fueling unprecedented collaboration, creativity and opportunity. And because America has been at the forefront of most of these changes, we have disproportionately benefited in terms of economic growth and job creation.

So, in conjunction with the Federal Communications Commission's national plan to bring broadband to all Americans, we understand its decision to start a debate about how best to protect and promote the openness of the Internet. FCC Chairman Julius Genachowski has promised a thoughtful, transparent decision-making process, and we look forward to taking part in the analysis and discussion that is to follow. We believe this kind of process can work, because as the two of us have debated these issues we have found a number of basic concepts to agree on.

First, it's obvious that users should continue to have the final say about their web experience, from the networks and software they use, to the hardware they plug in to the Internet and the services they access online. The Internet revolution has been people powered from the very beginning, and should remain so. The minute that anyone, whether from government or the private sector, starts to control how people use the Internet, it is the beginning of the end of the Net as we know it.

Second, advanced and open networks are essential to the future development of the Web. Policies that continue to provide incentives for investment and innovation are a vital part of the debate we are now beginning.

Third, the FCC's existing wireline broadband principles make clear that users are in charge of all aspects of their Internet experience -- from access to apps and content. So we think it makes sense for the Commission to establish that these existing principles are enforceable, and implement them on a case-by-case basis.

Fourth, we're in wild agreement that in this rapidly changing Internet ecosystem, flexibility in government policy is key. Policymakers sometimes fall prey to the temptation to write overly detailed rules, attempting to predict every possible scenario and address every possible concern. This can have unintended consequences.

Fifth, broadband network providers should have the flexibility to manage their networks to deal with issues like traffic congestion, spam, "malware" and denial of service attacks, as well as other threats that may emerge in the future -- so long as they do it reasonably, consistent with their customers' preferences, and don't unreasonably discriminate in ways that either harm users or are anti-competitive. They should also be free to offer managed network services, such as IP television.

Finally, transparency is a must. Chairman Genachowski has proposed adding this principle to the FCC's guidelines, and we both support this step. All providers of broadband access, services and applications should provide their customers with clear information about their offerings.

Doubtless, there will be disagreements along the way. While Verizon supports openness across its networks, it believes that there is no evidence of a problem today -- especially for wireless -- and no basis for new rules and that regulation in the US could have a detrimental effect globally. While Google supports light touch regulation, it believes that safeguards are needed to combat the incentives for carriers to pick winners and losers online.

Both of our businesses rely on each other. So we believe it's appropriate to discuss how we ensure that consumers can get the information, products, and services they want online, encourage investment in advanced networks and ensure the openness of the web around the world. We're ready to engage in this important policy discussion.

--

Posted By Google Public Policy Blog to Google Public Policy Blog

<<http://googlepublicpolicy.blogspot.com/2009/10/finding-common-ground-on-open-internet.html>> at
10/21/2009 06:15:00 P

Divider Page