

TORONTO – ICANN and I.G. Landscape

Thursday, October 18, 2012 – 11:30 to 13:00

ICANN - Toronto, Canada

BILL GRAHAM:

Could you please take your seats. We are on a very tight schedule and people will come and throw us out of the room, I'm told, at 1:00. So to avoid injury, I think we'll start on time.

This is the session on Internet governance events and we have an excellent panel here. In looking at the audience, I can see we don't need the panel because the audience is as experienced as those of us up here. So I think this will be a good discussion. And I'm looking forward to that.

Internet governance, of course, became a major topic back just about exactly ten years ago in the negotiations for the World Summit on Information Society. It has gone from being a strange topic where people look at each other and say, "What could that mean" to occupying a very significant amount of the agenda for a broad number of organizations.

The WSIS produced a set of principles on Internet governance that have actually stood up quite well during the period that those have existed. But there is a series of events going on soon, which is what we're really here to talk about, that in some ways will have the potential of redefining those principles. So this is really a fairly critical period of time for Internet governance in general. So today we want to talk about the

---

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

Internet Governance Forum, which is going to be taking place in Baku, Azerbaijan from the 6th to 9th of November. We will talk about a process of enhanced cooperation that's going on inside the United Nations, and it will be discussed at the U.N. General Assembly this year and also leading up to the WSIS +10 review in 2015.

And then in Dubai, from the really from the 20th of November to the 14th of December, there are a pair of ITU, International Telecommunications Union, conferences. One, the World Telecommunications Standardization Assembly and the second, the World Conference on the International Telecommunication Regulations, happily known as the WCIT.

And those conferences both address issues relevant to the Internet and Internet governance.

So that's enough scene setting, I think. Those are the topics we have today.

The panel I will introduce very, very briefly as we go along. But opening on the Internet Governance Forum the 7th IGF meeting in Baku, we have Chengetai Masango who is with the Secretariat for the IGF and he's going to tell us how preparations are going and give us a glimpse into the future.

Chengetai?

---

CHENGETAI MASANGO: Thank you very much, Bill. I will just be brief and just do broad strokes. The 7th IGF meeting in Baku is going to take place between the 6th and



---

9th November with the 5th of November being pre events and there is also a ministerial hosted by the government of Azerbaijan.

The main theme of the meeting is "Internet Governance for sustainable human and economic and social development."

So I'm just going to highlight a few things that I think you might not know or you might not be able to get from the Web site.

The gala dinner is on Tuesday for those people I know some people want to arrange their own receptions, et cetera. So Tuesday is out because that's when the gala dinner is going to be.

People with special needs, if you have anybody with special needs, we kindly request you to contact the secretariat and we'll make arrangements for you.

There's the visa issues. If you haven't registered, please do register. The deadline for registration has been extended until Sunday.

And with that registration certificate that you get from the IGF Secretariat, you can apply for a visa letter from the Azeris.

You will need two letters, one from the ICT ministry and the other one from immigration ministry if you plan to get your visa at the airport.

As far as I've heard and I've seen, I have also experienced that getting the visa at the airport is not that much of a problem. It's a very, very smooth process.

For those people who cannot come to the meeting, we do encourage you to set up remote hubs. There are a number of remote hubs listed



---

on the IGF Web site. So if you feel that you are interested and you do want to participate, you can go on to our Web site and see if there is a remote hub setup in your facility. If not, we do encourage you to set up one and please just contact the secretariat and we will show you how to do that if you have any issues.

And for regional IGFs, we do have the inter regional dialogue sessions. That is going to take place during the IGF, where the regional IGFs can discuss issues that are common and issues that they don't have in common. It is very good to know these issues.

There is also going to be a more of a free flow session for the inter regional IGFs and the national IGFs. We're going to set aside three hours so people can just discuss any issues that they want to discuss concerning national and regional IGFs and also how these national and regional IGFs can put forward issues for the global IGF, especially starting next year. We do want to have much more interaction with the national and regional IGFs.

I will just leave it at that because I'm sure I will just answer specific questions. More information is available on our Web site or the host country Web site. Thank you.

BILL GRAHAM:

Thank you very much, Chengetai.

ICANN itself will have a significant presence of both staff and board members at the IGF. And I'll turn now to Nigel Hickson who is in charge of organizing that program to let you know what ICANN's plans are.



NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thank you. Thank you very much, Bill. Yes, the Internet Governance Forum, of course, we're looking forward to it immensely. It's as Bill said in his introductory remarks, this comes at a very important time in the Internet governance sort of landscape, so to speak.

And we'll get on later to a series of events, whereas this is a sort of precursor. But this is very important, the IGF, not just because it's in Azerbaijan but because it is a real opportunity for all the stakeholders across the Internet public policy landscape to come together.

And as such, of course, ICANN takes it very seriously. We don't clearly, we don't own the whole Internet landscape in any sense at all but we do believe in engaging in the IGF as a true vehicle of the multistakeholder approaches.

And as Bill has said, we'll be there. The board will have representation, and so will the staff. Fadi Chehade, our chief executive, will be going as will Steve Crocker, the chairman of the board.

During the actual meeting, we will be holding an open forum and two specific workshops, one on DNSSEC and one on new gTLDs. And, of course, we will be engaging with the community, of course, because a lot of you are going to the IGF and it's important that we engage across the community.



---

Having said that, what we are going to do is to try and get everyone together at various times from the community. That could be fun. We're having a reception on the Wednesday night, I think that's right.

Baher, is it? It gets rather confusing all these days.

So we will be having a reception on the Wednesday night.

What we would like to do purely as a housekeeping matter is those in the community that are going to the IGF, we'd like just to, you know, have a list and then we can engage at certain times, if you feel that's appropriate. And Mandy Carver will be happy to receive your name, so to speak, if you're coming.

I think that's all I want to say at the moment. Thanks.

BILL GRAHAM:

Thank you, Nigel.

One of the things that has really taken off in the Internet Governance Forum landscape is the development of regional IGFs. Recently, the first Arab region IGF has finished. There has been an African IGF, a number of national IGFs, certainly one in Asia, some in Latin America.

So, opening to the floor now, we've got about 10 or 15 minutes for comments on the Internet governance topic. And I want if there are people who have been participating in those regional forums if you'd like to say a few words about key issues that have come up there that we might hear about in Baku, that would be great. Or if you'd like to



talk about how you're planning on being involved in the IGF this year, that would be great.

So I will open the mics now. Lines can form on both sides.

And I see our first speaker. When you're speaking, please introduce yourself.

ALAIN BERRANGER:

Thank you, my name is Alain Berranger. I'm chair of the not for profit operational concerns constituency of ICANN. For information, I wanted you to know in partnerships with internal partnership with At Large and NCSG and also reaching outside to the global knowledge partnership foundation that we have been granted a slot in a side session on the theme of civil society and Internet governance. So I wanted to let you know that three of our constituency members will be there. And we have advised Mandy.

So our community will be present, and we are looking forward to it, of course.

BILL GRAHAM:

Thank you, Alain. I will alternate between the panel and people at the mics.

Alejandro, you wanted to say a few things.



ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Very briefly, Bill. Thank you. This is Alejandro Pisanty speaking. An number of people in this meeting, including myself, attended the Latin American and Caribbean preparatory forum for the IGF a few weeks ago in Colombia, in Bogota, Colombia. There are, I think, two key take home messages from that meeting.

One of them is it increased the regard for the open Internet, especially among government officials who have been more concentrated in the broadband, I.T., and telecommunications tasks of contributing to development in Colombia and other countries in the region.

The second one is that the often vexing question of results from the IGF, of concrete results or outcomes, came up. And I think it's fair to report that a lot of people came out of the meeting understanding that the real value of the IGF is not looking for results or reports that are action level but coming with there with discussions and understanding gained in the forum to meetings like this in ICANN or to other meetings where decisions can actually be made and policies can be pushed with that better understanding and the networking among people and organizations gained there.

BILL GRAHAM: Thank you, Alejandro.

AYESHA HASSAN: Thank you, Bill. Ayesha Hassan for the International Chamber of Commerce and its BASIS initiative. ICC BASIS has been working to bring business expertise to this IGF in Baku. And we will be co organizing two



---

workshops this year. One with The Internet Society on solutions for cross border data flows with a lineup of multistakeholder perspectives to talk about some of those policy challenges and opportunities.

And, secondly, we've coordinated with APC and the Government of Kenya to put together a multistakeholder workshop on technology and social and economic opportunities for women. They both hopefully will be interactive and exciting discussions. So we look forward to having people come and contribute from the floor.

The other thing I wanted to raise awareness about is that every year at the IGF, ICC BASIS organizes a daily business briefing that is open for everyone from business who comes to the IGF. And it is a good opportunity to share experiences and help new people to get integrated into the IGF workshops and main sessions and issues. So I welcome anybody from business who is coming to IGF to come. 8:00 in the morning every day of the IGF at the convention center. Thank you.

BILL GRAHAM: Thank you, Ayesha. The mic on the other side, please.

OPE ODUSAN: Thanks, Bill. My name is Ope Oduson from .ng, Nigeria. We have a Nigeria IGF meeting. And I was a multistakeholder. We had support from the government from the NCC, which is the communications commission, and then the Technology Development Association.

A lot of stakeholders came from ISOC, and other Internet ecosystems were represented. Some of the the main agenda for the IGF was to



---

galvanize support from the multistakeholder environment and to come up with a uniform set of guidelines and discussion topics that we're going to take to the IGF in Baku.

One of the issues that came up was the issue of Internet address profiling, especially from the Nigerian perspective, where I.P. addresses had been blocked. And it would start off as a national issue that should be discussed at the Internet Governance Forum where I.P. block belonging to the country and sometimes when the government I.P. address has been blocked by people outside.

So among other things, that's one of the main issues that came up. And we have representatives that are coming from Nigeria, that are coming from the government side and also the privacy sectors that will be represented at the IGF in Baku.

BILL GRAHAM: Thank you. Manal, please?

MANAL ISMAIL: Thank you, Bill. My name is Manal Ismail. I work for the Telecommunication Regulatory Authority of Egypt, and I represent Egypt at the GAC. I believe a significant outcome of the IGF in general is the regional and national IGFs that's been going on. We have hosted the African IGF in Egypt a couple of weeks ago, and it has witnessed very constructive discussions that have tackled several issues: The need to enhance infrastructure development and access to Internet including establishment of IXPs, establishing a legislative framework to facilitate



---

ICT investment and enhance policy and regulation that would enable innovative solutions that can address the gap and promote content applications that respond to local needs and promote the use of social networks and remote participation to engage in the IG debate.

It was also stressed that we should encourage consolidation and remain conclusive in the ongoing national IG initiatives with the involvement of all stakeholders stressing the importance of having a multistakeholder model in place and the need to recognize the different trends of the government, private sectors, civil society and especially to involve and support the use.

Also, it was stressed that we should work on developing African TLDs and the overall domain name industry within the region. And the much appreciated African ICANN strategy for Africa was also mentioned. And it's interesting how things are evolving and community initiatives are being created in a bottom up approach.

Also, a pressing need was mentioned for capacity building within the region and the importance of linking the national dialogue to an international dialogue.

There was also the first Arab IGF that was held in Kuwait a week ago. And despite the fact that I was not there in person, but I was able to follow the event remotely and I was also briefed about the meetings. And it was, again, another great success and a step towards the right direction.

As a first meeting, discussions also identified and highlighted the absence of strong presence of the private sector as one of the major



problems that is that exists within the region. And it was, hence, agreed that the technical community should work on enhancing users' experience. Policymakers should work on creating and enabling environment and ccTLD managers should play their enabling role.

And, again, there was a need for a regional initiative and it was agreed that there should be community efforts in that regard and that a task force should be created. And there was present at the event also the ICANN, the SCWA, and the League of Arab States, the three of which should express interest to help in these community efforts. So thank you.

BILL GRAHAM:

Thank you, Manal.

On this side, please.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Bill. My name is Olga Cavalli. I'm the GAC representative of Argentina. I'm a MAG member. But I'm here as the director of the South School of Internet Governance. We will organize two workshops: One about teaching Internet governance and the other about the usage of Latin languages and Native American languages in the Internet.

And I also want to invite you and let you know that the next School of Internet Governance will be held in Panama in April 22nd to 26th of April after the Beijing meeting. So it doesn't coincide with it.



This year it was held in Bogota in March with more than 120 fellows. And we have already trained more than 300 fellows in Latin America. Many of them are already pretty much included in ICANN processes and IGF processes.

Thank you very much.

BILL GRAHAM: Thank you, Olga. Congratulations on the continuation of the school. This side, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Chris Disspain, dot au for this. We have just completed our first national IGF. With our innate sense of the timing, of course, it was run almost immediately before this meeting so my travel schedule is even more hectic than it should be. And in the spirit of the IGF, it was an outstanding success. But I'm not going to talk about what happened at ours rather than just perhaps a rallying call.

The thing that most I took away most from our IGF is the amount of pent up enthusiasm there is if you give people a venue to come and talk about Internet governance issues. So I would encourage all countries who are thinking about this to really go ahead and try and do it. It certainly brings a lot of people together to talk about these important issues. And running ours has resulted in New Zealand and Australia redoubling our efforts now to build a Pacific Islands IGF. Thank you.



BILL GRAHAM: Thank you, Chris. I'm going to close the lines on this now. I've got three or four speakers left. Byron, please. Please be brief.

BYRON HOLLAND: Sure. Thank you. Byron Holland from CIRA. We are the country code operator for dot ca. We have put on a Canadian Internet Forum the past two years. We are in the planning for our third one this coming February. So if you all want to experience what a Canadian winter is all about, come and join us in February.

But I think it has been interesting because we have seen an evolving series of questions coming out of the CIF process, or the community Internet forum process.

A couple of years ago people were focused on price and access issues which we still hear as themes. But I thought one of the interesting take aways we are really starting to hear about is the notion of territoriality. And that's in conjunction with the cloud and what is that.

This cloud is an amorphous thing, but my data is where exactly? The cloud is a server in a data center in somebody's legal jurisdiction. And what is the impact of that?

And how does that affect my data security, my critical information, et cetera. So there's a growing awareness of that in terms of a theme. And the other one that was starting to come out much more clearly was that of legislation, surveillance legislation, in particular. And we saw, in the Canadian context, we had our own what was known as surveillance legislation the government brought forward but then had to shelf



because of significant public outcry. It was really a SOPA Canadian version.

So those are some of the key issues that we're seeing. I think, also, I'd just like to mention the value of the Canadian Internet Forum. We bring government officials, senior government officials to it. And they get to hear firsthand the public speaking directly to them in a true multistakeholder environment. So I think just that, in itself, is incredibly valuable for senior government officials to have to come face to face with end users and people in the Internet ecosystem. And it allows those people to come face to face with senior policy makers, which is a pretty rare experience and one of the significant values of the Internet Governance Forum experience.

BILL GRAHAM: Thank you, Byron. Theresa, please.

THERESA SWINEHART: Theresa Swinehart with Verizon. Is anybody from in India who participated in the Indian IGF? I'll just touch briefly.

We had an opportunity with business to participate in an Indian IGF, which was absolutely remarkable. It was co organized with Vicky (indiscernible) In the telecommunications. ISOC was involved. ICANN had attended as well. It was a 2 day event. It involved very senior level government officials from various ministries discussing a wide range of issues from Internet freedom to cyber security, dialogues around data protection, access, broadband, cloud, mobile devices, capacity, content



online, IPv6. It was intensely attended, even on the second day. So I think that's a sign. And it was seen as a very welcome dialogue within India on Internet governance. And I understand the intention is to continue that further. So we look forward to hearing about it at the global IGF as well.

BILL GRAHAM: Great. Thank you, Theresa. On this side, please.

FRANKLIN NETTO: Thank you. I'm Franklin Netto from Brazil. I would just like also to inform that Brazil has organized in July this year its national IGF forum and took part three weeks ago in the Latin American IGF for (indiscernible.)

The challenge we are facing in Brazil and also Latin American, and we're trying to address this issue and we do not have yet a perfect model is how to make this regional, national instances work as preparatory instances for the world IGF, I would say. Then we are on a process that we hope to go enhancing so that we can have a better dialogue between these national regional instances with the global IGF. And this is how we see this process. This is the greatest challenge that we're facing now. Thank you.

BILL GRAHAM: Thank you, Franklin. I'll let both of you go. But very quickly, please.



MARK CARVELL: I'll try to be brief. Mark Carvell from U.K. government and the U.K. rep on the GAC. There are U.K. IGF workshops, but I'll leave that for Martin from the Nominet to talk about. And I'll switch hats to the commonwealth where the U.K. is very active in the Internet governance field. In Baku we will have two workshops as commonwealth IGF workshops. The first will be updating on the child protection toolkit, which we developed about two years ago within the IGF. The second one will be about the commonwealth cybercrime initiative. This is a unique partnership which involves ICANN, Council of Europe, the ITU, U.N. Office of Drugs and Crime, telecom organizations, parliamentary organizations, a whole rash of commonwealth entities coming together to tackle cybercrime. Law enforcement, of course, very much involved in that.

So we'll be presenting on the initiative. It's well under way, and we'll get an opportunity to engage with stakeholders on that. Thank you.

BILL GRAHAM: Thank you. And the final speaker, please.

MARTIN BOYLE: Martin Boyle, Nominet, but for the IGF here. And this year we've very much used the U.K. IGF as a preparatory ground for workshops that we're putting in and that came up through a bottom up process nationally. And so, in fact, we've got three workshops that we are sponsoring one on standards of behavior on the Internet for developing trust, which involves Russian parliamentarian and somebody from Nigeria who will actually be talking about that profiling problem



---

that we heard just a moment ago. The second one is about content and developing business models. And that one, again, stimulates lots of interest within the U.K. The third one is a continuation of some work that started a couple years back and on identity management.

And I'd like here just to put a little bit of a plea in. If we're trying to develop our thinking on a national stage to feed into the international IGF, it would, I think, help quite massively if the process of thinking through themes and priorities in the international IGF would start just a little bit earlier.

Two additional points: We will again have a couple of members of the U.K. Parliament attending in Baku, and I believe that U.K. ministry is also going to be there.

And we will also be presenting the Nominet Internet Award winners both through our stands and in a reception on the Thursday night. So, again, if we can perhaps latch into the ICANN circulation list, that would be helpful. And thank you for letting me sneak in to the back of the list. Thank you.

BILL GRAHAM:                   Thank you, Martin.

(Scribes receiving a language other than English.)



-- enhanced cooperation was one of the things that emerged from the WSIS in 2005 and with a call that there be enhanced cooperation in Internet governance.

Happily, enhanced cooperation was never defined by the WSIS. And I'd say the last seven years there has been a process going on trying to understand what that means first and then understand whether it's going on. That has given rise to, actually, the compilation of a tremendous amount of information of the kinds of cooperation that do take place in Internet governance.

And that will be the background, I suppose, for the general assembly. I've got three of our panelists lined up to speak on this. And I'd ask Markus Kummer, the vice president of policy for Internet Society, to start.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Thank you, Bill. Yes, indeed. Nobody really knows what it is. Enhanced cooperation was one of the outcomes of Tunis. The IGF was another one. The IGF has established itself and has been recognized as offering much value as a forum for policy dialogue, and some of the speakers before me have underlined this. However, there are people who felt they were a bit short changed with the IGF. They thought it would be something that would actually live up to their ambitions to change existing arrangements. But this was not what was intended. Also the question whether the IGF has any relationship to enhanced cooperation is something that has been left to interpretation.



---

The general assembly has passed resolutions that says there are two separate processes. However, it's difficult to ignore the fact that the IGF has brought people together who have not talked to each other beforehand. And, in our interpretation, it is very much a catalyst for enhanced cooperation.

The process was started by the Secretary General back in 2005, as called for by the Tunis agenda.

The consultations on enhanced cooperation so far have produced, strictly speaking, not much. There are different interpretations of what it is. The language in the Tunis agenda was carefully negotiated, carefully crafted. It's full of diplomatic and creative ambiguity. Everybody can read into it what they want to read into it.

It is clear that it means people should cooperate and should enhance their cooperation.

Our interpretation is that it is within and between existing organizations. And there is no need for a new body or a new process. However, others hold a different view and think it's a clear mandate to either set up a new body to give government role or then to start a process.

There were two consultations on this one in New York in 2010 and one in Geneva this year. And this year there was a negotiating process which almost achieved agreement on how to move forward on this issue, but it was blocked at the last moment. And the stumbling block was whether or not the process should be multistakeholder. Those who



---

blocked it wanted a government only process, which was not acceptable as a basis for a consensus.

Well, based on that, we, as an Internet society, got together with all the stakeholders, with the business community represented by ICC basis and also with civil society organization, the Association of Progressive Communication. And we decided to move on with this process and to have an event, one day event on enhanced cooperation in Baku the day before the meeting on 5th of November.

So allow me to make a commercial for this event. Please show up, if you're in Baku. And you're encouraged to register online so we know a little bit how many people will be there.

We will try and take stock a little bit of what happened since 2005. And we think much has happened since 2005. The Internet governance landscape is not the same any more as it was then. There is much more cooperation going on between the Internet organizations but also with other international organizations, for instance, Council of Europe, the Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development, the OECD. They both have opened up multistakeholder cooperations. They're still intergovernmental organizations, of course. But they're much more open. And they have invited civil society and the technical community alongside of business to participate in their deliberations. In the OECD, in particular, at the high level meeting last year, where the non governmental stakeholders were able to participate, to engage in the negotiations of a final communique.

So we think this is, indeed, enhanced cooperation. But we would also like to maybe be a little bit more proactive. And, Bill, you mentioned in



---

your introduction there has been a little bit of slippage on the Tunis principles. And the Tunis agenda, also the Geneva principles, were actually very good. And I think it is time to be also maybe a little bit more aggressive about it and to recall that Internet governance needs to be based on multistakeholder cooperation. And this is not always the case. This is something, I think, we need to recall. And we hope that our pre event will maybe give more clarity of where we stand with regard to enhanced cooperation.

We're certainly willing to discuss that. And I would invite you all to engage in this discussion and to try and engage with those who have different views of what enhanced cooperation is.

With that, I close my remarks.

BILL GRAHAM:

Thank you, Markus.

Our second panelist speaking on this is Manal Ismail from the National Telecommunication Regulatory Authority of Egypt. Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Thank you, Bill. And, as Markus rightly mentioned, there has been so many discussions on what enhanced cooperation is and what it should be and how this can be achieved. The term is quite flexible and could be interpreted differently. Yet, it is important to agree that the contribution of the different stakeholder groups is essential and should be an integral part of any efforts towards achieving enhanced cooperation.



---

The full realization of enhanced cooperation should definitely be through an open and inclusive process that ensures a mechanism for full and active participation of all the relevant stakeholders.

Discussions should be multilateral, transparent. Decisions should be reached collectively through a process built upon a foundation of transparency and inclusion to ensure there is confidence in the process.

So, I mean, it's only it's only normal that, if we are keen to reach one decision, we have to all engage in one dialogue. So thank you.

BILL GRAHAM: Thank you, Manal. Markus has a point to add, and then we'll ask Alejandro to speak.

MARKUS KUMMER: My apologies. I forgot to mention that the pre event has support of three host countries Brazil, Egypt, and Kenya.

BILL GRAHAM: Thanks for that addition. Now Alejandro Pisanty from the National University of Mexico and also Internet Society of Mexico.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Bill, thank you. I will be anecdotal first and very short afterwards. I remember, during the negotiations in the second phase of WSIS when the words "enhanced cooperation" finally emerged, talking to the German representative who was also speaking on behalf of the EU. He



---

was saying things like why don't you accept something innovative like governments getting better cooperation levels?

I said, you know, you've always had it. What's innovative? It's a step backward in this context.

My basic memories enhanced cooperation what remains in my metabolic memory almost is enhanced cooperation was meant for governments. It didn't get moved along. And, in the meantime, as has been mentioned by the previous speakers, a lot of other forms of cooperation, including governmental entities it's a total multistakeholder this takes place are being reported regularly. Even organizations who have no mandate to report to the ITU, for example, have been receiving these calls for annual reports on their enhanced cooperation activities. And they've been delivering it because it's in their own interests. And I would say that happens for ICANN, ISOC, the RIRs, and many other entities. So that's where I see it as a GAC on steroids sort of idea in the minds of those who pushed it. And it has become something much more much broader.

BILL GRAHAM: Thank you, Alejandro. So I'll open the mics for comments from the floor. But I see, Jeff, you had something to put in.

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN: Yeah. I wanted to just link this enhanced cooperation discussion back to the IGF discussion a little bit.



I had the opportunity to participate in several briefing sessions at the U.N. in New York that were co organized by ICANN and ISOC and ICC basis.

And the intent of those was to do both a general educational session for the missions in New York. And one of the reactions that we've been hearing is that there's a benefit to this community educating more consistently the U.N. participants on what's happening with the growth of the Internet and the growth of ICT and the issues to better ground them in the substantive issues. But there's also a value in educating them about what's happening in the IGF and ICANN and other processes. There's either misinformation or lack of information about these issues. And they can be intimidating, I think, for a lot of if you think about it, from a generalist perspective, if you're in a delegation.

So I think it's incumbent on all of us to think about that as an audience when we are also trying to directly expand participation within the process. But let's also try to help raise awareness and information for those who aren't directly participating.

BILL GRAHAM: Thanks, Jeff.

Couple of people coming to the mics now I see. The very rapid Adam Peake first.

ADAM PEAKE: That won't happen again. Two things. First, I was remembering the high level GAC meeting earlier this week. It was interesting to hear



governments talking about the emphasis of the multistakeholder processes that they've adopted recently. Many of them were almost boasting of it. This is something that we do, too. I think that's a positive step forward. And it's one of those intangible benefits of what WSIS and IGF has achieved. And so, you know, that was something that was important.

I also heard that the Internet processes like ICANN and the IGF also started to become part of government portfolios. And that is also a very important recognition. Certainly, it means it makes it much easier for representatives to participate.

So that was one thing I wanted to just note.

The best example or very good example of enhanced cooperation is, I think, the Affirmation of Commitments. We've seen that. It's one wonderful thing that the Department of Commerce has done and should be acknowledged. At the same time, I think the IANA contract is not a good example of enhanced cooperation. And so, as a challenge ongoing, it's a long time frame that contract. It's something we could look at and how could we turn that current contract into something that looked more like the Affirmation of Commitments. That would be something we could work on, think about, and do it in a time frame that is non-threatening. If that's a reasonable way of saying it. So those are my thoughts. Thank you.

BILL GRAHAM:

Thank you, Adam.



---

Franklin next, please. Again, please introduce yourself when you speak.

FRANKLIN NETTO:

Thank you. Regarding enhanced cooperation, I could not fail to mention that Brazil was very much frustrated with the discussions in Geneva earlier last year.

We fully agreed with Markus that we were on a path where we almost got to a point where we could have a space to discuss this concept. Unfortunately, last time it was not possible.

We think that this discussion is very important. Because it's true that the concept is very complex. There is no, up to this moment, real interpretation of what the concept means.

But the Tunis agenda, on the other hand, is very clear on what is what the process should lead us to, which is that this process should lead us to public global policies on issues of deemed important by the stakeholders. Since we have even if the process is not very clear, even if the interpretation of the process is not clear, there is a clear goal where the process would be meant to get.

This is why we understand that we should continue seeking in Geneva for a space where we could discuss about these concepts. We're not creating a new organization. We're not creating putting this into the role of a new body. But just to create a space, a working group, let's say, where we could discuss this concept furthermore so that we could get to the real interpretation of what it is. All of us, all the countries and stakeholders, could benefit of this process. Thank you.



---

BILL GRAHAM: Good. Thank you. With an eye on the clock, I'm going to just close the lines now with two more speakers. And then we can move on to the third topic.

Bertrand, you were there first.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Okay. Bertrand De La Chapelle.

Just a quick point. This can become discussions a little bit and it has become a little bit like religious or theological discussions. You know, in the 6th, 7th, 10th century, they could spend years or ages or even centuries on discussing the meaning of a word.

What is at stake here is about doing good. It's about building structures and processes that solves problems. ICANN is attuned to solve a certain number of problems, but only certain problems. What is at stake is that we don't have many other multistakeholder tools as the WSIS summit says, we need to be multistakeholder when we deal with Internet matters. We don't have many multistakeholder tools to address a certain number of issues that are related. They're more to the use of the Internet rather than the infrastructure of the Internet.

ICANN is one component in an ecosystem that deals with the governance of the Internet. But let's be frank. We don't have multistakeholder processes beyond the IGF, which is an issue setting system, to address issues regarding usage, regarding freedom of expression, regarding phishing, regarding many other things.



So I would encourage people to make this distinction between governance of the Internet and governance on the Internet. And, when they talk about enhanced cooperation, we fundamentally talk about how do the different actors that are relevant for a given issue get together and work together to address it? And, in that regard, I would encourage people to begin to use the expression "enhanced cooperations" or "enhancing cooperation among stakeholders" rather than focusing on something that looks sometimes at least in some presentations and I don't include the Brazilian delegate here who absolutely makes the distinction in the balance sometimes looks like the establishment of a digital security council, which, clearly, is not the solution to the problems we want to solve.

BILL GRAHAM: Thank you, Bertrand. Theresa, please.

THERESA SWINEHART: I think it's pretty clear this is a complex issue already. But just to touch I mean, the enhanced oh, the enhanced cooperation, while the term was defined in the Tunis agenda and it came up in the Tunis agenda, it actually existed already prior to that and during the WSIS process. We saw the formation of AFRINIC. We saw the formation of LACNIC. We saw the formation of different kinds of cooperation. So I think it's good to reflect on the evolutionary factor that exists. And, since Tunis and leading into Baku, we also have numerous examples of things that happened. We've seen the Affirmation of Commitments touched upon, IGFs. We've seen partnership MoUs between different organizations evolve. ICANN and UNESCO, for example, or Pacific Island



Telecommunication Association such as all these organizations. But we've also seen recently, for example, the global standards organization endorsing principles. Five standards organizations IEEE, IEB, IETF, ISOC, and W3C.

All of our business have engineers involved in these entities. So we have entities involved in different stakeholder groups. We look at the technical aspect and the Internet aspect. But we also should look at eHealth and eEducation. There's cooperations and collaborations among different institutions involving governments, health institutions, educational institutions. So, as we look at this, I think to Bertrand and some other points, we need to look at where the gaps are and where the problems are and where we need to do the mapping. And the IGF and the preIGF event is a great opportunity.

I'd like to touch on something that Markus made. I think, as part of this, we also have an opportunity to reaffirm and reconfirm our commitment to Tunis principles that are really the basis of a lot of dialogues that are happening today. And I think we should use that opportunity at the preIGF event and now in order to reaffirm that not just for this year but we have the WSIS+ 10 process. We have other dialogues occurring. And that reaffirmation would be good. Thanks.

BILL GRAHAM:

Thank you. One final very quick point from Alejandro, please.



ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Building upon what Theresa Swinehart has already said, it's even easier to make it brief. To the points raised by Mr. Franklin Silva Netto and by Bertrand De La Chapelle, Internet governance has been built and has to continue to be built on a problem solving basis. It has been it has to be problem specific. There's no way to build a single comprehensive organization that will take care of all aspects of Internet governance. Any allusion to that at this stage comes from the illusion of a world government, which has been proven wrong over a few centuries already.

There are in deference to what Bertrand has stated, there are a number of global fora that are addressing many of the questions that you mentioned. There is the anti-phishing working group to meet next week in Puerto Rico.

There's Mail Anti Abuse Working Group, the MAAWG, which is very effective in handling whatever little what is possible to do against spam and other forms of abuse by e mail, whatever little is possible. Because spam relies on human contact and that is uncontrolled and so on.

You mentioned some questions like access to Internet, which is mostly a national issue. It is mostly an issue of national policies, investments, private realization, whatever way a country decides to do. And there are at least regional fora addressing questions of access like the African Economic Commission or the Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean known as ECLAC. If they're not being effective, it's for their stakeholders and members to make them more effective.



BILL GRAHAM: Thank you, Alejandro. And I see we have a remote participant wishing to speak.

>> Yeah. The question reads could the civil society speaker on stage explain how Internet governance caucus and other civil society groups view the matter of enhanced cooperation?

So, yeah.

BILL GRAHAM: Alejandro, do you want to take that?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: I have no view on what the Internet Governance Caucus can do. It has held discussions online about enhanced cooperation. And I think civil society in general can contribute to the discussion of Internet governance and whether enhanced cooperation among governments or between governments and other parties is the subject. The reply will be different.

There is nothing holding governments away from meeting grouping together as all other stakeholder groups do to discuss their specific concerns. In fact, if there is one group in the world that has never been held back, it is governments. They represent the ability to convene among themselves.



---

I believe personally that the better evolution of the term and action of enhanced cooperation has been shown in practice. Reality has been much faster than theory there, and we are having enough cooperation.

BILL GRAHAM:

Thank you. Turning now to the final topic of the session, there are a series of International Telecommunication Union meetings, world conferences, taking place over the next few months and, in fact, the next few years that will certainly have an impact on various parts of the Internet space and how Internet governance takes place. There first is the Standardization Assembly and then the discussions about the international telecommunication regulations. Next year there is a World Telecommunications Policy Forum, which the Secretary General says will be all about Internet governance.

In 2014, the plenipotentiary conference of the ITU which is where they will consider making changes to the mandate of the ITU and then moving out to the ITU into the broader U.N. context of 2015 with the WSIS +10 discussions, whatever form those take.

So it is quite a series of very formal treaty and intergovernmental conferences. And Nigel Hickson will explain these to you. Nigel, please.

NIGEL HICKSON:

This could take a few hours. Thank you, Bill.

I think before we go through some of the acronyms and there are a lot of acronyms I think we should link the last discussion on enhanced cooperation with the WSIS review because I think it is important to



understand the review of the Tunis Agenda. The WSIS review is an ongoing process. The United Nations may well meet. The UNGA is meeting in the second committee in the next month. They may well decide the format for the review of the WSIS process.

Now, this is important because it links back to enhanced cooperation because that whole understanding of what enhanced cooperation and how that feeds into the multistakeholder approach could be up for discussion again. So I think it's something that although it is a very sterile argument on the one hand, it really has importance as we move forward.

In terms of the more immediate issues coming up in Dubai next month, we have the World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly that runs from the 20th to 29th of November. This is the T sector in the ITU. This is the sector that does standardization, that does a lot of work on protocols and various other issues.

It is an important four yearly assembly because not only does it set out the agenda for the work groups in the ITU that look at all the various standard areas, but it also this year is meeting directly before the WCIT. And, therefore, some of the discussions that will take place at the WTSA on issues such as cryptography, naming and addressing will feed into the issues in the WCIT, if not in a formal way, certainly in an informal way as well. The WTSA is something a lot of the technical folks follow, and it will be something that clearly something we will be looking very carefully at in terms of the proposals that are put forward.

The WCIT itself. Now so much has been said about the revision of the ITRs, it is difficult to know where to start. Quite a lot of rubbish is

---



written, isn't it? And one can understand the frustration of the ITU as an organization when one reads some of the comments on the blogs and in the media.

So what's it all about? We've discussed it before so we needn't. But, essentially, it is revising the international telecommunication regulations, which were last negotiated in 1998 in Melbourne. These international telecommunication regulations at the time, and the Secretary General of the ITU has pointed this out, were seen as a liberalization. They were seen as moving away from a very sort of fragmented telecommunications market.

But, of course, they are being revised and the process of revision which we're now almost at the end of, apart from the conference itself, will give the opportunity for many different proposals and many different proposals have been put forward for the review of these international telecommunication regulations.

So although you have got a text that you're revising, essentially the text could be put to one side and people can revise completely new sorry, people can propose completely new proposals.

In terms of the process for the WCIT, it has to be remembered that it's governments that put forward the proposals. We've all read quite a lot about the so called ETNO proposal, this proposal on sender party pays which has caused a lot of discussion.

Well, ETNO have no more jurisdiction in the ITU than I do. It is governments that are going to decide on what is discussed, and it is governments which have to take proposals made by sector members

---



---

and put them into their own proposals. Therefore, we have seen that the Arab group, for example, and the African Union in their draft proposals have taken up some of the ETNO proposals in their drafts.

The European Union – the European grouping sect last night released a statement from Istanbul where they are meeting saying they are not going to put forward the ETNO proposals in their own proposals for the WCIT forum.

So moving to the WCIT itself, as I said, there is a lot of different proposals being put forward. A working document is being assembled. This is important because this working document is going to go live in about two or three weeks' time, and it will be a live document that will have essentially all the proposals that have been made from the different regions and from the member governments. And it's that which we will be doing work in ICANN and no doubt other associations and people will be doing work to try and track what's important. And, of course, what's important for you depends on your viewpoint.

For our viewpoint at ICANN, of course, we'll be looking at proposals that might in some way affect the ICANN mission.

I think I will leave WCIT there because no doubt there will be further discussion. I might say something at the end about the way we plan to coordinate internally if that's of use to you.

The WTPF comes after WCIT. This is the World Telecommunications Policy Forum. The expert group on the WTPF is meeting. There was a meeting last week in Geneva. That's all about Internet governance.



---

So whereas the ITR discussion as the Secretary General of the ITU has said has got nothing to do with Internet governance, thank you very much we're glad it's got nothing to do with Internet governance the WTPF has got everything to do with Internet governance. That's the, if you'd like, the focus of it.

It is the Telecommunications Policy Forum. It has the advantage of being an open forum, so it is not just for sector members and governments. It is open to civil society and the multistakeholder environment to an extent.

And it will produce opinions on various issues such as naming and addressing, cryptography, various things. Those opinions are being drafted at the moment. So that's a process certainly worth following.

And then finally, as Bill said, these discussions as well as taking place in parallel to this even more important discussion on the review of the WSIS agenda also lead into the plenipotentiary of the ITU in 2014. Sorry that took so long.

BILL GRAHAM: Thank you, Nigel. That's a lengthy list to go through.

I would like to turn now to Jeff Brueggeman from AT&T to talk about how issues deals with some of these messages.

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN: Thanks, Bill. Nigel provided an excellent overview of the process. So I just would add a few observations.



First, as Nigel said, ITRs do serve an important purpose. One of the points we are trying to remind people about is that we tend to focus on what we don't want the ITRs or the WCIT to do. But it is also helpful to have in mind a positive agenda, that the liberalization that has occurred over the past 15, 18 years has had a tremendous benefit in investment in the deployment of infrastructure around the globe.

Those issues are not solved. Our work is not complete. So there is a very appropriate and important role for this process to keep focusing on the infrastructure deployment and those types of issues.

At the same time, we think it's important to maintain a clear line that we not cross over into Internet policy, which I would say is broader than Internet governance per se because as Nigel said, the ITRs are just a first step in a series of upcoming intergovernmental processes here. So I think it's important to have a clear position on maintaining a distinction between the traditional telecommunications regulation and how we approach Internet policy issues.

The third point I would just make is that some of the proposals that we're seeing brought up in this context are legitimate concerns, whether it's cyber security or economic issues or infrastructure deployment.

So at the same time, while we understand and are part of the efforts to keep them out of this process, I think it's incumbent on all of us to find ways to address the legitimate concerns in more constructive ways. I think that does feed into our discussion on multistakeholder.



---

How can companies and individuals and civil societies and organizations who aren't part of the WCIT process get involved? I think it is engaging with our national governments to express clearly our position, both in terms of what we don't want them to do and setting a right model for where we do not think it is appropriate to have a formal government or intergovernmental intervention but also to really make the multistakeholder process a meaningful, effective tool locally as well as the work that we do here at IGF and ICANN.

I think, on issues such as cyber security, we see growing concern among governments on those types of issues. And there is an opportunity to help set the right model for how to address those issues.

So I think our work is daunting because it is not only participating in all of these processes that are being set forth for us but also going beyond that, in my view, and trying to find ways to effectively address the issues outside of the processes so that we have something have some progress that we can show at the same time that we are raising concerns about some of the proposals that we're seeing. Thanks.

BILL GRAHAM: Thanks very much, Jeff. I would next like to turn to Byron Holland, CEO of CIRA.

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Bill. We in the country code community and CIRA in specific are definitely engaging in governments. I would just like to take a moment to talk sort of in general what the CC community is doing and then a



---

little more specifically what CIRA is doing in trying get engaged in this dialogue.

There are quite a handful of CC operators going to Dubai. And I think that in itself says something. Clearly, that is not our typical beat. And the fact that many of us are taking the time and spending the energy to participate in this process typically as members of our country delegation, but some as sector members, I think, should indicate the level of interest and/or concern that those of us inside some of the plumbing, the DNS operators, are feeling about this process. The small words are going to matter here.

The ccNSO here has actually spent quite a bit of time talking about the WCIT, getting the views of our membership because many of us are speaking directly and advising directly our governments on what might be the actual impact of those small words because they really are going to matter.

And I think that the CC community occupies an interesting nexus in this environment in that most of us have good and fairly close relationships with our governments.

We all operate our own policy environment, so we're sensitive to making policy. But we also operate the DNS. And we're very sensitive to policies actually impacting operations and often the rub and the tension that can happen there.

So our community's thinking very seriously about it. We're very interested in the notions around: What does quality of service mean? That does come from a very teleco centric world and mind set. A point



to point connection held open, whether anything is on it or not, that is one model.

We operate the DNS where any message is disaggregated and sent through an unknown path many, many unknown paths and reassembled at the end.

It's a very, very different environment. And notions that quality of service get very complex, very fast for those of us actually in the heart of operating DNS. Security. What does that mean? What burden might that put on those of us who hold that DNS information, the DNS logs and queries. So things like that have the potential to be very onerous for us or possibly not even achievable. And we want to be very clear that good policy also needs to be achievable for those of us who are operating in it.

In terms of what CIRA is doing, we're part of our country delegation. We work closely with the Canadian government in terms of primarily around education and information about what might be some of these impacts. And we're also very vocal in expressing, as I've said, some of our concerns about what might happen if those small words start to get changed or introduced. So, you know, I think the thing with country codes is we operate policy environments, so we're sensitive to them.

But we have to run the blinking lights and routers, too. And we have to do what is actually achievable on the ground.

BILL GRAHAM: Thank you, Byron. Alejandro, please. You were going to talk about how civil society and other sectors are dealing with this.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Bill, thank you. Again, bear in mind, I don't even pretend to speak on behalf of civil society. It's more a descriptive partial view. I'm not mandated, as we say in more political terms but descriptively. I think, in terms of civil society and technical community have about evolving landscape, a continuously evolving landscape in the ITU environment, are pretty well focused in a few points despite plus being all over.

The focused part is we see a number of things happening that may threaten the fundamental core values and standards and ways that the Internet operates and the ways that the Internet has grown. We see some words that are not as small as Byron thinks which are very significant attempts by different parties to insert into the ITR, International Telecommunication Regulations things like the word "processing" the definition, "data processing" in the definition of telecommunications, not only transferring data but also processing them. Of course, there is some processing involved in all telecommunications. But the level at which this would bring us would allow, for example, for things like deep packet inspection and many other aspects of teleprocessing in telecommunications. And it would also invite the opening up the ITRs to affect a number of sectors that are presently not at all included in the ITUs environment and that are not within the purview of the ministries of the telecommunications and telecommunication regulators in most countries.



It would, basically, bring the whole of the IT industry of information technology and industry under the fold, under the umbrella of the ITRs. I think that this is a very broad move that should concern everybody, including civil society. There are a number of other moves which have been presented publicly, mostly as an issue between commercial entities.

The over the top versus infrastructure discussion that goes around what is known as the ETNO proposal, for example, which, as Manal has very well explained, won't be a proposal in the ITR discussion unless some country brings it up.

There's a contradiction in rules here which is very striking for many of us. Officially, you cannot put anything into the discussion in WCIT if you haven't put it in by February 2012, which is way past. But, on the other hand, it keeps getting wilder and wilder and more open as the date comes close and, particularly, once the conference starts, it's all open. In those proposals are proposals that can affect the provision of service that can include what I see as an extortion operation. We will introduce a quality service and will leave a normal service called the Internet. That's an extortion operation against the companies that provide the service.

We would in civil society and a technical community will, in my opinion, tend to let the commercial entities do their agreements and contracts on their own but not in this case. We're not just watching passively how brief search or services companies deal with telecom with the carriers or tier 1s, because it may affect the prices and it may affect the very nature of the services. It may stop being the Internet



with what we call, in my environment, the "five alls," which is all ports, all protocols, all contents, all origins, all destinations in Internet communications.

BILL GRAHAM: Thanks, Alejandro. We'll invite people to come to the mics now. But there's a couple of quick comments from the panel. Markus please.

MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, thank you. As you may know, the Internet Society has been heavily involved in the preparatory process of WCIT. And, through our chapters, we have tried to engage with dialogue with governments all over the world. And some of our chapters have done an extraordinary job in talking to governments and drawing their attention to all these little details. And, as we know, the devil is in the detail.

At the very high level, yes, the ITRs in '88 opened paved the way to liberalization. So definitely what we would not like to see coming out of this year's conference is a step back in liberalization. There should be more of a good thing, more liberalization, more competition, more independent regulation. But some of the proposals clearly would bring us back before 1988. So there is a serious threat.

And, in the past, I had the past of trade negotiations there was always a saying "never go backwards in liberalization." Here we really face this risk.

I agree with Jeff when he said there are some legitimate concerns with developing countries. And we have talked to regulators, for instance,



from African countries who make the point, you know, they don't have the economy to roll out broadband infrastructure. And they would like to see the over the top players help them with it. But a solution that is based on market distortion is not a solution. There needs to be other measures to assist developing countries. There are development agencies. There is bilateral ODA. There are the development banks. They should be the actors who assist developing countries in rolling out the broadband infrastructures. And this should not be done through market distorting measures. Thanks.

BILL GRAHAM:

Thank you, Markus.

Manal, please.

MANAL ISMAIL:

Yes. Very quickly, I have three quick points to make. Actually, with the WCIT in mind and all those events, I cannot stress more upon the importance of national coordination even within the same stakeholder group.

The second thing is that we cannot ignore or diminish a problem that is being reported by a certain party. But we can definitely argue and debate the proposed solution.

And, finally, I would urge developing countries and emerging nations not only to understand thoroughly the issues at hand but also to assess and evaluate its implications nationally and on the wider Internet users afterwards. Thank you.



BILL GRAHAM: Thank you, Manal.

Not seeing anyone at the mics, I think, Nigel, you said you wanted to add a bit at the conclusion.

MARK CARVELL: Thanks for that. Thanks. One of the proposals that I made in the Commission on Science and Technology for Development with regard to enhanced cooperation is that there should be some mapping of what's been happening in terms of enhanced cooperation. Markus talked about OECD, Council of Europe. I mentioned the cybercrime initiative. And I talked about that as an extreme example of enhanced cooperation in our view. There are other examples, UNESCO and so on.

How can we ensure that the negotiators in New York that Jeff talked about in the missions, that the participants in the WTPF know what has been happening? How can we map and ensure that and that mapping should be global. We shouldn't establish that there are examples of cooperation between organizations going on across the world. How can we ensure that that information is effectively collated, mapped, so that everybody who discusses the reasons why we don't argue for a new organization or a new process because it's happening, how can we ensure that people understand what is happening so that with clear obvious examples? That's my question to Markus and maybe others on the panel. Thanks.



BILL GRAHAM: I think I'll continue with a couple more comments before we do that in conclusion.

John, please. We are down to about five minutes, and they have threatened to steamroller us.

JOHN CURRAN: John Curran, president and CEO of ARIN. ARIN is the regional registry for North America and parts of the Caribbean. I'm also chairman of the NRO, Number Resource Organization, which serves at the coordinating group for the RIRs working together.

I'm here to repeat a message that I stated in this session in Prague. And I want to make something very clear to everyone in the room. We have talked about how important discussion of Internet governance matters are on a multistakeholder basis. We've talked about all the regional efforts that feed, for example, the IGF, which is the primary body we have for open multistakeholder discussion. We've talked about other bodies that may not even provide for multistakeholder discussion. The IGF itself is not assured. There is nothing to say. It will be there when we want it. The host countries absorb primarily the expenses of the actual IGF meeting. But the IGF secretariat is essential to running the IGF. The IGF secretary is run out of UN DESA on a multi funded trust model. People make contributions.

These contributions are at record low right now. And it is questionable whether or not the secretariat can actually perform its function. I'd like to recognize the European Union, the Internet society, ICANN, Verizon, VeriSign, the Regional Internet Registries through the NRO, the U.N.

---



---

government, the Sweden government I mean, the U.K. government, the Sweden government, the Swiss government, U.K. Nominet. I might have left one other NIC Mexico for their contributions, which is what's been received this year.

However, that's not enough. If you're participating in this process and yet you're not making sure that the IGF actual secretariat has enough money to function, you may be feeding all of your input into nothing.

I highly recommend you consider whether or not we need the IGF to continue and whether or not you're adequately funding it. Thank you.

[Applause]

BILL GRAHAM:

An excellent closing set of remarks. For the transcript, I'd like to just note that the speaker before John Curran was actually Mark Carvell and not Nigel Hickson.

And we are absolutely out of time, ladies and gentlemen. I'd like to thank you all for attending. I'd like to thank you for the comments, the active participation. And look forward to seeing you, some of you at least, in Baku in a couple weeks. Thank you again.

(Applause)

