Transcription ICANN Toronto Meeting

Multi-Stakeholder Process from the NGO Perspective Meeting

Wednesday 17 October 2012 at 09:00 local time

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.

Alain Berranger: My name is Alain Berranger and I chair the NPOC constituency at ICANN. NPOC stands for not for profit operational concerns. And is part of two constituencies that make up the non-commercial stakeholders group of the generic name support organization of ICANN.

Let me tell you why NPOC is organizing this session. My early observations of the multi-stakeholder at ICANN, in my humble opinion, points to the need to reflect on the way it is used and understood. The new gTLDs will challenge the capacity of the organization to evolve and adapt to this record growth of ICANN's takeovers.

So will the shifts in powers and legitimacy in the various internet government's players. But that could be the subject of another session. We don't need to open up or close this dialogue, we would just like to be contributed to what we believe will be a continuous evolution of the multi-stakeholder model at ICANN.

So it is my pleasure to welcome you to this session entitled Multi-stakeholder Process, from the NGO perspective. Organized with a collaboration with the at large advisory committee. In fact, (Renalia) pointed out to me that the title of that session is a bit of a misnomer. But we had to file the title before we

actually planned the session, for logistics and time constraints thanks to (Glen) discipline in reminding us to be on time.

We will be discussing the multi-stakeholder model being the NGO perspective. So we should call it more precisely Multi-Stakeholder's Model of Collaboration, Lessons from the real world and the internet world.

The agenda is as follows. After these opening words I will turn to Jean-Jacques Subrenat. We will share the session to the end. Panelists will then introduce themselves. We will have two presentations to whet our appetite, after which the discussion will start.

Allow me now a little housekeeping. When you speak please always, on the speakerphone, please always state your name for the recording. We will take questions from the remote participants. (Unintelligible). We will keep eye contact with Jean-Jacques. We will also take questions from the audience, you can plan them and write them on this if you want, if you want a sheet to write the question. Or you can make a direct intervention.

In closing, in the session Jean-Jacques will summarize the discussion, so we will leave the last five to ten minutes for that. And suggest perhaps a way forward on this important subject. So Jean-Jacques the floor is yours.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you. This is Jean-Jacques Subrenat a member of the (ILAC), and a former member of the board of directors at ICANN between 2007 and 2010. And a former French ambassador. I was very pleased and grateful to be invited to this session. Because throughout the years, both as a board member and now starting my second term on the (ILAC), this is a subject that comes up all the time. But there is a presupposition that we're talking really about the same thing with the same parameter and with the same content (unintelligible) perhaps. And also the implications whether they are economic, political, or for instance in terms of public safety.

So it is in the light of this ambiguity that I was responded very favorably to this kind of (unintelligible). To have it all in this and I don't know how to speak about it. I'll just moderate the session and hopefully come up with a (fair) appraisal and at least a resume of what will happen. Presented first by the panel and discussed with all of you, including those of you who are not present in this meeting room.

So we should start immediately, the proceedings, and ask the three panelists to introduce themselves for us. And then the order will be (Renalia Abdul Rahim) who will speak about the internet and ICANN, and then Evan Leibovitch who will concentrate more on the paper which was (unintelligible) paper, entitled - I must get the order of the words right. Making ICANN relevant, responsive, and respected. Otherwise known as the R3 paper.

And then Professor Sam Lanfranco will speak about the multi-stakeholder model in the wide world. But not really ICANN centric and not internet centric. Then I will open the floor for debate. As our host just indicated, we will keep the last ten or five minutes for summing up. Thank you very much.

So (Renalia) could you introduce yourself and then (unintelligible).

(Renalia Abdul Rahim):   Thank you Jean-Jacques. This is (Renalia Abdul Rahim) for the transcript record. I am a Malaysian citizen, currently residing in Hong Kong. I am a member of the at large advisory committee and I have been privileged in my past life to have been exposed to and participated in various multi-stake holder collaborations at both the national level as well as the global level.

At the National level I was involved with the Malaysian National Information Technology council, which was a high level think tank that advised the Malaysian government on the development and utilization of ICT as a strategic technology for national development.

At the international level I've had more exposure. First as the executive director of the Global Knowledge Partnership from 2001-2008. Basically the multi-stakeholder (GKP) the global multi-stakeholder network of organizations that promoted the innovative use of ICT knowledge for sustainable and critical development. It involved government agencies, business entities, civil society organizations, and intergovernmental organizations.

I also participated in the United Nations Global Alliance for ICT development and was a strategy council member and high level advisor. I was vice chair of the network of global action networks. Which is a group of various multi-owner stakeholders networks, each focused on a different issue areas which came together basically to learn from each other on how to improve on multi-stakeholder partnerships and collaborations.

And I was also participating in the technical advisory group on partnerships for education, which was an initiative launched by the world economic forum in Moscow.

And actually, just an amendment to Jean-Jacques introduction, my presentation is focused on the broadest aspect of multi-stakeholder collaborations. Basically identifying the common characteristics and challenges and then Evan will go into the ICANN context. Thank you.

Even Leibovitch: Hi my name is Evan Leibovitch. I currently serve as vice chair of the at large advisory committee. My background actually is fairly outside the realm of internet governments. In fact I didn't get involved in it at all until about 10 years ago. At which time I had been doing a lot of Linux and open source advocacy.

Led a delegation of 15 people to (lease) as one in Geneva. Promoting a Linux and open source software. Sometime after that, ICANN actually recruited me and my organization the Canadian Organization for Open Source, as an at

large structure. In fact, we were one of the first ones involved in the North American region.

And so I have sort of had a trial by fire here at ICANN and my exposure into the internet governments. So it's been an interesting ride, a bit of an outsider. And it's been interesting to see the perspective from ICANN within that.

In my time I have had a chance to see where the ICANN model has worked out and where it hasn't worked, and I'll go into that in more detail in my topic.

By the way, sorry, I'm based in Toronto so I live about 10 km from here. So this is very strange having this ICANN conference that I can go home from.

Sam Lanfranco: My name is Sam Lanfranco and I am a professor emeritus at York University. I'm the outsider on the presenters today. I've worked on ICT issues since the late 1970s when I was at the technology division of (Muntab) at Geneva.

Most has been ICT for development. I won't go through the whole list except to say that all this had to do with electronic space as an organizational space and a space for social processes. And extremely important is social processes involving multi-stakeholder groups, since it's one place we can operate across time and space. And that's part of what I'll talk about.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you for the self-introductions and just a little bit about the timing I need to check with Alain that we have it until 10:30? Is that right? 10:30. So I'd like all of us to be aware of that. And the idea is to have each analyst speak for about ten minutes give or take, so that we can have enough time for real engagement and discussion and a bit of time for the conclusion.

So thank you (unintelligible) and now (Renalia) please start.

(Renalia Abdul Rahim):   Thank you Jean-Jacques. I'd like to start with the basics. Could we have the next slide, thank you. When people talk about multi-stakeholder

collaborations they tend to be not very specific most of the time. So I'll focus on the common characteristics so that we're clear about what we're talking about.

And I want to emphasize that I'm speaking about multi-stakeholder collaborations at the global level, okay?

So talk about the rationale, in terms of characteristics. Multi-stakeholder collaborations tend to merge to address complex transborder issues. And particularly where there is no global governance system that can address the complexity of the issue sufficiently.

So they're essentially trying to address a governance job. The first phase of these collaborations is on problem solving and the leverage on the resources that stakeholders bring to the table to solve the problem. In terms of stakeholders, the stakeholders tend to engage based on interest, which is dependent upon the role that they assume or are mandated with in dealing with the problem as well as how they are impacted by the problem.

In terms of the range of actors, the actors in multi-stakeholder initiatives or collaborations can be any combination of actors from government, inter-governmental organizations, business, academia, and civil society or non-profit entities. There is however a view, especially in the internet community, that a true multi-stakeholder approach must involve actors from governments to private sector and civil society and not for profit sector. The tri-sectorial approach, in my language.

Now, I want to talk a little bit about the knowledge imperative, because it's very important and it has been apparent to me throughout my exposure to very small multi-stakeholder collaborations around the world. For every multi-stake holder initiative that focuses on global problem solving in any issue area, there is a critical need for knowledge on how to solve the problem.

Part of the knowledge is provided by the actors, or stakeholders themselves. Because they see different aspects of the problem. And part of the knowledge is sourced from experts. But inevitably there is a process of learning that has to happen among the stakeholders in figuring out how to address the problem. Particularly when the problem is newly emerging and extremely complex. So you cannot run away from being forced to actually learning and mutually learning from each other.

Next slide please. Here is some examples of multi-stakeholder initiatives. These are global multi-stakeholder networks that have been classified as global action networks. And they are classified as global action networks because they are focused on delivering something. Now scholars have indicated that since the end of the cold war, nearly 50 such networks have been established and are already making substantial impact in the fields of anti-corruption or transparency, human rights, youth employment, water, poverty, and sustainable forestry among others where they serve as systemic change agents of global government in the issue areas that they are engaged in.

Now there are also scholars who have studied multi-stakeholder initiatives that involve the UN and they have identified about 400 collaborative initiatives that focus on a range of activities.

And I'm going to quote a researcher who has looked at these collaborations. He said that, "Beside from the multi-stakeholder approach, which they all share. There is no formula which otherwise unifies the varying combination of actors, goals, and timescales involved in the different projects."

Which actually ranges from concrete and time limited corporations and projects working towards financing, carrying out national and international political goals, establishing networks or running networks, coordinating state and non-state actors in a particular sector, formulating international

(unintelligible) standards, and creating permanent international institutions with a range of functions. Which actually include what I mentioned before.

Such as, financing, policy making, coordination, (norm) setting, and decision making. Next slide please.

Now, how I think about it in terms of what multi-stakeholder collaborations or models engaging. It's actually two sets of activities. This is how I categorize it. One, is that they discuss what the problem is and what can be done about it. And this would (encompass) activities such as agenda setting that sets priorities and would involve negotiations involving the stakeholders. Advocacy in terms of trying to advocate different aspects of the issues. Learning. And building the capacity for action learning.

The internet government forum is one such example of a multi-stakeholder initiative that is able to construct a dialogue amongst a diverse group of stakeholders towards the goal of mutual understanding and consensus on how to govern the internet. The Global Knowledge Partnership to some extent also carried out similar activities in the area of ICT development.

The second type of collaborative activity, in my classification, is solutions development and delivery. And here the collaborations are involved of establishing routes and this includes standard setting and policy making. Examples of multi-stakeholder networks or collaborations that have worked on them would include the world commission on dams, the ISO, and global reporting initiative, providing or mobilizing financing.

So the collaborations have involved global alliance for vaccines and immunization. The partnership for disaster relief after the tsunami, providing services and technical support for building the capacity for the delivery of these services. For example, the UNESCO west partnership for education. And lastly providing coordination support. The (UNIC) taskforce attempted to do this, as well as the Global (Water) Partnership.

Next we move on to challenges, and I think this is the most important thing when you talk about multi-stakeholder collaborations. Because almost every single one of them is suffering from similar problems. Including ICANN I would say. The first challenge is long term sustainability. And for many of the networks that I touched on before, financial sustainability is a critical issue.

And tied to that is the challenge of being able to measure their impact. And it has not been easy to do that. Another challenge linked to sustainability is actually continuing relevance. Because the issues evolve. If you address (multiple) topics, the issues would evolve and you'd have to make sure you continue your relevance and sometimes relevance will die out and you have to repurpose the collaboration itself. Sometimes making the hard decision of saying I think we should close shop and we build something else.

The second challenge is establishing and sustaining legitimacy. In the global action networks that I have highlighted, their legitimacy is based on democratic imperatives. Specifically transparency, participation, and accountability. Now these are extremely difficult and challenging values to uphold continually in the dynamic involving complex operation.

The next challenge is insuring effectiveness. This includes efficiently, adaptability, scalability, the speed of response - particularly with growing numbers of stakeholders (unintelligible) the requirement from negotiated outcomes in any multi-stakeholder collaboration.

The next one is correctly identifying the resources needed for delivering solutions. And this includes knowledge, capacity and competence, selecting the right delivery partner. Which could be quite difficult if you choose the wrong partner and then everything goes wrong.

And the last one I would categorize as challenges for organizational category is under resourcing key organizational skills as a glue in multi-stakeholder

initiative. A lot of organizations don't pay enough attention to this, and this includes the skills in process management and facilitation as well as skills directly under - in correctly estimating the difficulty in reaching common goals and activities. Next slide please, and this is my last slide.

It is about stakeholder management. The hardest challenge, and ICANN is suffering from this right now, is balancing the different interests of the stakeholders. Specifically ensuring that one does not over dominate, and in various multi-stakeholder collaboration there is specific concern about the over influence of the private sector and how to manage that.

The next set of challenges, how to represent the interests of those who are marginalized and voiceless. These are the people or individuals who are not at the table, does not speak the language, requires facilitation to understand the intricacy of the issues, and yet they are impacted either directly or indirectly.

Next is determining what is a fair level of contribution from each partner or stakeholder. When you come together in a collaboration and you decide you want to do something together, how do you decide who will contribute what? Depending on what sector they come from and what they can afford, and in terms of both financial and non-financial assets they can contribute.

A sustainable working relationship based on trust, mutual respect, communication and understanding among stakeholders about each other's strengths and weaknesses. This is also quite difficult to sustain continuously. Communications tend to break down, people tend to misunderstand and fight with each other. It takes up a lot of time and energy to manage that.

Stakeholders from each sector tend to bring their own organizational mandates, interests, competences, and weaknesses to collaborations and partnerships. Without open acknowledgement of these factors and without

processes in place to facilitate negotiations among stakeholders for optimal outcomes, effective collaborations will not merge.

And finally, insuring that the long term interest of the public is not harmed by negotiated outcomes among stakeholders. This is also quite difficult when you cannot define properly what is the interest of the public. That's all, thank you very much.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Many thanks to (Renalia) for a brilliant expose. Very rich, very structured, and most of all I think it's a good contribution to the debate we are looking for in a few minutes.

Now if I may just have a word to keep your statement, your problems, in a long term perspective. I think that you mentioned World War II and the number of this type of organization which has evolved and increased considerably since then. I would add that there is another historical threshold which is actually development of the internet, which is another stage where all this is happening and at even a faster pace and wider scope. So let's keep that in mind as well. So now I will ask Evan to make his presentation.

Evan Leibovitch: Thanks a lot. Fortunately or unfortunately this is going to talk a little bit about my experience through ICANN and culminating with the production of R3 because it, at least from my point of view, reflects sort of what I've encountered at ICANN in terms of this particular implementation.

ICANN has a particularly narrow component of internet government, something that I find is lost on a lot of people that come into this world. Internet - ICANN regulates names and numbers. It's even in the acronym of the organization. ICANN is woefully ill equipped to deal with issues of freedom of speech, net neutrality, or the kind of things that a lot of people think of when they think of internet governments.

ICANN deals with identifiers. If an end user wants to go somewhere how do they get there? They associate it with the name which then is translated to an IP address. These two thing are the technical (remit) of ICANN. Which started as a technical body and has gotten more and more political and more and more involved in money. To the point where the entry point to create a new top level domain was $185,000 and that's just the entry fee.

So there is a lot of money flowing around here and that has had a very significant effect on the nature of the multi-stakeholder model. In fact, NPOC, the organization that is running this, is part of something called the GNSO. Which means that it can effect policy on the generic names, but its scope doesn't go beyond that. GNSO can't comment on ICANN's internal structure. GNSO can't comment on country code domain names. It can't do any of those.

The structure that involves ICANN's supporting organizations and advisory councils is a convoluted labyrinth that took me the better part of two years to get through. It's not an easy thing for newcomers to deal with and I think any newcomer at this table might probably agree with me.

Just getting the hang of this is really difficult and in fact, somebody when I first got involved said. "If somebody wanted to define, for instance, the way that the at large community is organized within ICANN. If somebody wanted to design something to make it as impossible as could be, to actually create good and effective policy, they designed it in order to do that." and it's been a very long haul to try and do that.

So the whole thing about what (Renalia) was talking about, the range of actors. Yes, there is a broad range of actors here. You have civil society, you have vested interests that are engaged in contractual negotiations with ICANN, you have people that are trying to effect it, you certainly have governments. And so you have a broad range of actors.

The problem is, to a certain extent, with the equity between the actors. And this is something that has been addressed repeatedly by the new CEO who talks not only of multi-stakeholderism but of multi-equal stakeholderism. And it's kind of unfortunate that this terminology even has to be introduced, one would have hoped that multi-stakeholderism would not even need that qualifier in order to be perceived.

But ICANN is going through some significant issues of public trust and I think it has to do with this imbalance. It has to do with the fact that the non-commercial players here have had a very hard time coming to the table and in fact very significantly to what (Renalia) was talking about. Even the definition of the public interest ends up being a matter of debate here. And even that the commercial interests say that they have the public interest in mind.

Earlier this week I was in a discussion with one of the organizations and they're here because they make money selling domain names to people. They said, "Well I sell domains." And they listed off how many x number of tens of thousands of people they sell to. Well this is all the public, so I know what they want. So I'm representing the public interest too. This is the kind of conversation that goes on all the time within ICANN. Sometimes even defining what constitutes the global public interest becomes a really unwieldy lengthy and distracting exercise.

And so in that context, the at large advisory committee formed something called Future Challenges Working Group. And the point behind that was to get us out of a cycle of constantly responding to other things that ICANN was doing. There'd be something that comes out, "Do a public comment." Something else comes out, "Do a public comment." Something else has come out, "Do a public comment."

So over the last few years the at large advisory committee has been churning out statement after statement. I believe we set a record last year with coming

out with 47, I think, (unintelligible) mention different policy statements. And that is going to be exceeded this year.

And so in that light, to try and set an agenda rather than simply respond to it, we created this white paper. And the point behind this white paper, I won't go into too many details. It's not very long so I would encourage you all to get to it. You literally need to just go to the ICANN wiki, community.icann.org and search for R3 and it shows up right away. In fact on the screen you see it in front of you. It's available in 61 languages, we designed it to be discussed and as a matter of public debate. Not only inside ICANN but outside ICANN.

We are dealing specifically with issues about the global public interest, about multi-stakeholderism versus the inter-governmental approach that has been advocated by some, there's fears to the rumor extent of what is going within the ITU. What's going to happen in the (wicket) process? These things sort of hang like a cloud over ICANN, in thinking what happens next.

The government advisory committee has found new life in its, and new vigor, in inserting itself into the ICANN policy process. So in this light, we have been trying to start a conversation with this R3 paper. That tries to deal with the global governance issues. That tries to make ICANN more responsive and communicative with other organizations.

And recognizing its own limitations, its own tiny little piece of the internet governance world. To try and do that as well and to try and balance the global public interest against the vested interest of those who make money off this world. And try and go forward and to turn this into something better. There is a general belief within at large multi-stakeholder model as it is in ICANN is heavily flawed. It needs a lot of work, but it is also very much worth preserving.

Because many of the alternatives that we see that have been proposed would be significantly worth. So R3 is an attempt to work within the multi-

stakeholder model, recognize its flaws, improve it in the ICANN context, and perhaps serve as a model that could be used elsewhere in this realm. Thanks.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thanks very much Evan for a very succinct and yet quite complete presentation of this effort. We'll come back to that I suppose in the discussion. Now I just want to pick up one point in your presentation Evan, and say that to me it points out a contradiction and perhaps a permanent problem within ICANN.

Which is the bad fit, or net imperfect fit in the complexity of structures and (unintelligible) trying to achieve. The complexity ensures, of course, a certain number of requirements that there is representativity at that level in the process which is, you know, included in all this -- makes it extremely difficult.

And I underline what you have just said as a co-initiative view and co-author with some others on this paper that the purpose was really to come out of the daily routine of word - crafting a wordsmith -- which is very common to all of our organizations throughout - within ICANN -- and to come up with a higher level review and ultimate debate.

I think this is a very important point -- open it to a wider debate. And precisely with that purpose in mind I'm handing the floor now to Professor Sam Lanfranco because he will speak about something which is not an ICANN specific.

Sam Lanfranco: Thank you. Thank you very much. I'm pleased to be following the previous two presentations and I don't have a slide presentation so I'm just going to ask people to relax, put their pens and pencils down and just listen.

Mine is the view from the outside. I've watched ICANN for a long time but I am not a participant in ICANN. So my comments are designed to promote - to

move the discussion forward. I'm a big fan of rational discourse as part of an open and democratic process.

And so I start with some observations and that's that in the list of multi-lateral stakeholders - multi-stakeholder models that were just presented earlier -- ICANN is probably the most complicated -- without doubt. It's not dealing with just water or even the environment -- it's much more complicated.

It follows - the form follows function model of design and function kept changing -- getting more complicated. I sometimes think of the comment that people make about the Catholic Church that on important issues that arrived a little late and out of breath because they've been running to catch up. It's not because of inertia in ICANN but because of the complexity of it.

The view from the outside is that ICANNN breaks down into three parts -- it's got a technical aspect of keeping the domain name system running, making sure the servers are working and the databases are updated and so forth.

But the other two -- which are labeled as administration from the outside -- actually looked like legislation and adjudication. It's what's got a legislative arm and a judicial arm. And each something about that is that it has no real - there is not real status for a legislative arm and a judicial arm. The terms may grate a little bit but let's ride them for a moment.

It has - the three main stakeholders -- governments who are extremely sensitive about sovereignty and the interest of sovereignty. The commercial stakeholders who, of course, are interested in their commercial interested -- broadly defined. And civil society -- and I will use my term for it -- but civil society's mission is and that's that it's basically interest in social justice -- at least some broad definition of social justice there.

And I'll talk in a minute about the International Labor Organization that I'm quite familiar with. It was created after World War I. It's been around for about

100 years. It's a tripartite multi-stakeholder organization. And it's to guiding principles for both social justice and within the context of its realm -- decent work. And I'll talk about that in a little bit.

The multi-stakeholder process has already been described as how do you reconcile the different interests through a dialogue that arrives at a consensus -- what people are prepared to go forward with the consensus. That's what ICANN has been struggling with.

But what I'd like to do is put that in a slightly bigger context. And that's that at the beginning of the internet the internet was viewed as marginal. It was not important. Now it's this massive virtual electronic space in which we build organizational structures, we carry out social processes -- that range from governments to commerce to the objectives of civil society.

So it has grown like a mushroom at a phenomenal speed -- we all know that. No need to doctrinate (sic) that.

So what I'd like to comment on is well, what happens outside ICANN? With respect to things that ICANN should be worried about. And I'll get to that - well I'll get to that now and then I'll talk about the ILO model because the ILO model shows you some opportunities but the - more importantly the constraints.

And that's increasingly the things that ICANN works with are properties -- they're virtual properties but they have properties -- they have all the properties of properties with respect to zoning and appropriate use, ownership, control and so forth.

And a significant amount of what is being debated inside ICANN is also being written into legislation -- both nationally -- or not being written into legislation nationally. But more importantly is being written into multi-lateral global trade agreements.

The trade agreements - the big frontier on trade agreements at that moment is intellectual properties. The biggest growth area in intellectual properties and the biggest area for conflicts over intellectual properties is currently in the internet.

It's not that if you discount the number of cases but if you look at what's coming down the road. And especially with the new domain names -- top level domain names -- they'll be more and more scope for litigation that requires some additional structures.

The three key players there -- governments are reluctant to release, you know, give up sovereignty except in negotiated multi-lateral agreements. The corporate sector - the business sector sees the multi-lateral agreements as a very effective way for perusing its globalized strategies.

The civil society sector is in a bit of a quandary there because it's not a party to those agreements -- it's on the outside. Also frequently it's not a party to what's happening nationally because there's a conflict between civil society and national government.

So you've got some very interesting dynamics there that I won't explore now but what I will do is just back up and show - say a little bit about how the International Labor Organization -- the ILO -- as a formal tripartite multi-stakeholder group tried to address this.

First of all the three sets of stakeholders, their workers organizations, governments and industrial sectors all have formal legal status in the organization structure. But what the organization does for the most part is in the interest of decent work and social justice -- is that is does research and dialogue around best practices.

It has zero legislative power. It has (unintelligible) zero judicial power. It can't adjudicate, it can't create. It sits over there and tries to change the dialogue and change the environment.

Part of what ICANN does is that and will need to do that stronger and stronger. The ITU has moved in that direction -- other groups have moved in that direction -- partly for self-preservation and partly because that's the new frontier.

This is a challenge now that ICANN will have to face. They will have to incorporate something of a multi-stakeholder process that has the features of the ILO's strategy of what are the best practices. How those get translated down into - at the national level, within sovereign governments, how civil society participates in that -- particularly difficult one because it has to operate in both at the international level and at the national level.

How this links to this - the massive growth of multi-lateral trade agreement involving intellectual properties -- those are the outside challenges that ICANN will have to confront. It's been extremely resourceful to this point in time. This risk is that the stakes have gotten much, much higher. I'll stop there.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you so much (Simon). This has been very enlightening presentation the way you started off with some of the findings about ICANN and then went to why they're - the wider scope.

I would like to underline though the resemblance between a long standing detail of ILO which is at the sovereign division of social justice on the one hand and something which is I imagine in a very timely way in fact in ICANN which is the global public interests.

Although it existed potentially in some of the early texts about ICANN it was not felt to be a central issue. Now I think it is becoming that and I'd like to think that perhaps all of us are part of that awareness game.

So before I hope the floor I'd just like to recognize the important of the call is of the R3 paper that was mentioned by Milton. And to say first that it came up as an initiative by Evan and myself as cultures of the future challenges working group which was set up after I had suggested it shortly after I entered (unintelligible) -- because I was flabbergasted by the amount of routine work and the lack of wider perspective.

So as a core (unintelligible) presence as well Evan Leibovitch, Carlton Samuels, myself and the Professor Ching Chiao from China. He is a well-known intellectual property lawyer and administrator.

So now I'd like to open the floor with perhaps a word that I see that it's 9:49 -- which leaves about 31 minutes for debate. And I'd like to point that that's way above ICANN average so bravo and (unintelligible) and thank you very much. So the floor is open now to all of you. I see (Peter Knight) and then could someone take chair because I have to take notes on the content and not so much on who is asking to speak. Would you do that? Thank you so much (Eduardo).

So catch the (Eduardo) he's the important person.

(Peter Knight): Okay, my name for the record...

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (Peter Knight).

(Peter Knight): First of all I'd like to thank the Ambassador who chose the Cartesian clarify of the French I think in his perception of issues and leadership and ability to express the important of things. And all the authors of his paper which really

attracted my attention as a policy oriented person and a development oriented person. And that's my interest in ICANN really.

I think - and I invest in the first quarter to the labyrinth. I had got a long way to go to find the monitor or whatever's at the other end.

But I mention, I just came from a session on the ICANN Academy and one participant there made a very interesting comment with regard to outreach that this - the courses seminars were, you know, virtual seminars or whatever that this will emerge eventually.

It should not only be open - not be only internal but also external for those that want to learn about ICANN there could be an important part of the outreach, an important part of getting the three R's dealt with if you like.

It could be used as module in courses and universities. It could, you know, in computer science but also on political science, international relations and public policy things. So I think that could be a very important initiative in this area.

I guess that's my main point here and I certainly find this a very powerful session, very useful.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: That is noted. Thank you (Peter). In our conclusions we will have to deal, of course, with what are the next steps if we envisage any and there's certainly our creatures -- one of the aspects we want to touch upon. Thank you.

(Eduardo) who's next? Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: This is Klaus -- for the record Klaus Stoll. I want to take (Peter)'s point straight away. It's about, for example, (unintelligible) this week on that we will have three outreach seminars, we will have webinars, we have a lot of

outreach stuff. And that brings me straight to the point what we now (unintelligible).

First of all I want to say that I think all these three presentations were more than excellent. They were brilliant. But what has outreach to do, for example, what (Renalia) said. (Renalia) was talking and using the word problem/solution, problem/solution. And we tend to look at everything in these multi-sector partnerships as there's a problem and we do a solution.

And I would like to propose something which might sound abstract and might sound a little bit out of the way but how about getting away from problem and solution and starting thinking about opportunities?

Because I think that we have to -- and for example -- what you said about ICANN's scope. Yes, you're absolutely right. My own organization -- Globalized Partnership -- has a certain scope. ISOC has a certain, (NPOC) has a certain -- but they all have a certain scope and we tend to set up problems and solutions.

Instead of thinking -- going out of set scope and saying, "Hey, outreach, why don't we put (unintelligible), ISOC, everybody together and make it a big opportunity."

And the same in this area with the paper -- I think the next step for the last paper is where are the opportunities? Not solving of the problems but making the opportunity. That's all. Thank you.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you. (Eduardo)?

Man: Thanks. As I heard some of the comments and some of what Sam was thinking -- two words came to my mind that really haven't been mentioned yet and one is legitimacy and the other one is trust and the two are related.

One thing it must be noted -- there is not international treaty that created ICANN. ICANN is a non-profit California corporation that exists because of contract with the U.S. Department of Commerce.

And that's a franchise that can be invoked. And in fact on occasion the Department of Commerce has made noises about wanting to - is considering revoking it. Well, of course that begs the -- well what if? And who else would get the contract and what else could be done with that?

And that leads me to the point of trust. ICANN is built on a foundation of trust and tacit approval from other players that ICANN has the legitimacy to do what it does. It's not doing this because of a multi-lateral agreement between players.

The government advisory committee comes in and they talk about what they'd like to do. The ICANN Board is free to -- and has frequently contradicted its own government advisory committee.

And what implications that has going down the road is hard to tell but the trust issue is a big one. A document called the Affirmation of Commitments is a very, very major document that forms some of the cornerstones of what we were doing with R3 because it is a document that ICANN -- basically a contract that ICANN made with the world saying this is what we are going to do for ourselves now please give us legitimacy and trust.

Well one of the things we need to do is to confirm that this affirmation of commitments is being adhered to. The road to that path is a very, very slow one. But it provides a framework but it also - the very existence of the AOC reminds us of the fragility of ICANN's - of its actual franchise, of its actual mandate to do what it does. Thanks.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: I haven't seen any hands pop up there but - yes Sam.

Sam Lanfranco: Just two very short comments. One, (Peter Knight) referred to the ICANN Academy and then there were a couple comments about outreach. If you could, I would put an X through the term outreach and say that what you're talking about is inclusion. What you really want is a process in which people become included in this.

Not necessarily formal but you - feel a part of it so that they begin to think of their own interests in terms of what this is about.

The other is a comment about the other negotiations that are going on outside ICANN. There is a - I have a farm and there's a saying among farmers that as a farmer I don't want to own all of the land. I just want to own my land and the land next to it.

And that's a problem with respect to -- in my view -- as an economist the negotiations that are taking place around intellectual property in the various multi-lateral trade agreements -- which you have two players at the table but not the third.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Alright (Peter) you have another go.

(Peter Knight):   Very, very quick. I'm an economist too Sam but in public policy Graham Allison coined a phrase in his dissertation that was very important. It was a dissertation on the Cuban Missile Crisis and the bottom line is about bureaucratic politics. Where you stand depends on where you sit. And I guess that's the essence of all these stakeholderism.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Yes, (Renalia).

(Renalia Abdul Rahim):   Thank for you that (Peter). There are a few things that came to my mind during the discussion and interventions afterwards. I don't think that there has been enough or sufficient scrutiny on the multi-stakeholder processes that happens within the multi-stakeholder institute itself.

And with regards to ICANN I think it is somewhat unique. I agree that it is probably the most complex of all the entities that, you know, as Sam said. But it's also the most open and yet it has a different set of challenges for that openness. Because of the complexity -- even though it is open -- it's very difficult to navigate -- and we've already established that.

But when we look or try to scrutinize in terms of the rules of engagement within the network itself or the organization itself then you can identify where the weakness is **vis-à-vis** the other multi-stakeholder collaborations that exist.

For example, we are all aware of the competition of the Board and it's touted as the multi-stakeholder model of ICANN -- the starting point of that. And then there's the uniqueness of the policy development process.

And I'm very pleased to see that actually because I can see that it originates from the field of public policy. I don't know if you're aware the GNSO has a public policy development process which is interesting but it had been modified based on the - what's been used in public policy outside in the world itself.

But the difference is that the decision maker is actually the Board whereas in the real world the decision maker is the government.

And in terms of participation itself it's worth thinking about the stages of policy development and wondering about whether or not participation of the stakeholders are necessary or mandatory for each stage of policy development -- which starts with agenda setting, policy formulation, decision making, implementation and impact evaluation, monitoring evaluation and the cycle continues.

Now in terms of the theory in public policy is that largest participation happens in terms of stakeholder starts agenda section. And then it narrow in policy formulation because it's dependent on the stakes -- who really has interest and who has the knowledge about how to solve it.

And then the decision making gets the most narrow because clearly somebody has to make the decision -- exactly. But then in implementation it opens up again. And that's where the stakeholders come in.

And of course you can have participative evaluation where you can have a more rounded view of whether or not it's been impactful. And that for me is interesting because I'm studying public policy theories.

And something that (Stan) mentioned earlier in terms of the ILO and best practices. A lot of the market stakeholder in that world actually do that. And the critique with an internet government forum is that it just stays as a constructive dialogue perhaps sharing of best practices but it doesn't have decision making power.

And the empathy that come -- the stakeholder that come to the internet government forum represent the various regimes dealing with intellectual property, human rights, etcetera. And the issue is how is there coordination?

Yesterday I had a corridor chat with (Evan) -- it was sort of like an argument. He always says, "ICANN has a narrow remit. That's always the excuse." We're not going to talk about these issues or change our decisions about technical matters based on these issues.

And yet it's always talking about we want more stakeholders to come to the table and express their concerns and participate in policy development. But then all these things that are happening outside.

People are concerned and they're thinking about where can I best make my intervention? Where can I best voice my concerns? And when they come to ICANN say, "Sorry, thanks for participating we can't do anything about that." And it's completely frustrating.

And the internet government forum doesn't have any teeth so where do people go? And this issue will continue to pop up until a property solution can come about. Thank you.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you. Next is Lynn and then I doubt - well (Ana) and then I'll ask (unintelligible) a Board Member to talk a bit about the meeting he called this morning in which I attended and in its first conclusions made were quite interesting for this particular group. So (Ana).

(Ana): Thank you very much Jean-Jacques. I wanted to ask the panelist if from their experience with multi-stakeholder organizations -- so I - my question is this -- if an organization that follows this model get its basic principles by the equality of participation, inclusiveness, consultation -- on an issue. And then we have the outcomes of that consultation. And the outcomes of the consultation points in a certain direction or solution. And that's great.

On the other hand of the spectrum you have a Board with roles and responsibilities and the decision by the Board often does not -- I'm not talking about ICANN, I'm taking in generic terms -- this decision from the Board may not correspond to the results of the - the outcomes of the consultation. In your experience how is this handled in other or in organizations in general?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: So we have the ensemble assembled.

Man: Well it tends to get handled in two different ways. One is if the organization has a legitimacy in law the Board tends to get replaced. But in more instances than not the Board doesn't get replaced the organization gradually

becomes marginalized. Something else responds to the needs that got articulated and not addressed.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: (Adam), (unintelligible) you want to take us up?

Man: One of the things that is always astounded me by the ICANN Board is that the fiduciary duty of the Directors is actually to ICANN and not to the community. It was traditionally my understanding that in any corporation that the duty of the Board Members is to the community or the Shareholders or whoever it is that brought them there.

It's my understanding that the duty within the Directors is to the organization itself and I find that the - there's very, very subtle ramifications of that. That have to do with the response to the community.

Man: It may be my limited exposure but I - and my own Board practice but usually the Board and the Director are kept separate. To hold a Director accountable to the Board or as in ICANN the Director is a Board Member.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: There are many things to say that we'll come back in a few minutes. But first (Louie) and then that's all.

(Louie):   Thank you. It's been a very interesting discussion and there's probably lots of points I'd like to have hallway conversations on or touch base on later. I've been participating in ICANN since before there was an ICANN and the DNSO and both organizations so I've seen, you know the organization grow and evolve.
And the one thing it has actually done is always tried to evolve. And, you know, while some people may think it hasn't done as well as it could have with respect to those in the community. I actually don't think it ever was for a lack of effort.

The one thing I actually find interesting in ICANN we talk about multi-stakeholder -- a significant piece of the organization is still driven through a constituency. I participate in a lot of multi-stakeholder organizations and multi-stakeholder processes and their organized around topics or specific subjects.

When you set a process up around constituencies you set yourself up for a really complicated process in terms of arriving at conclusions or consensus and by default you often have to default to the Board.

So I know ICANN has at some point in the past sort of experimented with that. But the more they can move it to the issue with broad participation from all the communities or constituencies that participate in ICANN -- I think they'll actually get a better outcome.

One of the other thing that I find is interesting -- when people talk about multi-stakeholder processes is -- is the definition of what consensus means. People tend to think it means everyone has to agree -- that's not what consensus is.

Consensus says you will move forward on a course of action once all reasonable objections have been addressed. It doesn't mean they've been stalled -- because in a process with lots of different voices and lots of participation you are probably not going to get broad consensus or broad support.

So I think really focusing again on what the definition of consensus means and how you operate to that would be kind of helpful in a lot of these processes.

And I think the - just another - kind of escaped me at the moment. It's all this stuff.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Well we'll certainly call you back whenever you feel ready Lynn. Thank you very much for that. Two remarks - your thing about ICANN is still very much constituency driven and not issue oriented - I think that that's a central issue for the call because of our throughput for anyone else in this discussion, and that will certainly be kept in our conclusions.

The other thing is definitions. It's true about what you just said about consensus. It's also the definition of the global public interest - conflict of interest picture.

So there are certainly things that we have to delve into much deeper. Now I'd like to ask Bertrand to say a few words, because this morning I attended a meeting he was chairing and of which he took the initiative.

So I'll let you speak about that and give your first conclusions or at least impressions from this morning's debate.

Bertrand de la Chappelle: Thank you Jean-Jacques. Apologies for not having come earlier to this session but in a certain way I'm very happy I didn't, because given the amount of comments that I want to make on just the ten minutes that I've attended, it would've been dangerous.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: But you won't have ten minutes to speak.

Bertrand de la Chappelle: I know. So very quickly the - as you know there's this process that the Structure Implement Committee of the Board, Ray Plzak, myself and a few others, have initiated regarding evolution and taking into account the impact of the new gTLD program on ICANN's structure and processes.

And it is a way to basically get the ball rolling and encourage and trigger a community wide discussion topic-based instead of constituency-based. And the meeting that we had this morning was a breakfast with the Chairs of the

SOs and ACs or their representatives basically to try to identify how to move forward and how to prepare the discussion in Beijing.

Interestingly enough we launched corporate input after Prague and I sent it to all the Chairs of the SOs and ACs. And I must say that the response by structure is relatively tightened, like we will discuss that in our own structure.

And we will come back to tell you what the impact is, which goes very much into the notion that Lynn is mentioning. Interestingly enough I got also in Paris certain number of comments that were more private and that were addressing the topic there.

And so the meeting this morning, without getting into all the details, was fundamentally going around the table and trying to identify a certain number of keywords that are going to structure the discussion so that everybody can go with the list of keywords in their own spaces.

And when they come back together they at least have to quote (Art Riley)'s expression the same vernacular, like they are talking about the same thing. And I want just to pick a few of those words that were very interesting.

One that struck me was the term taxonomy, the notion that everybody is labeled in this structure as belonging to one group or another. And distinctions like Contracted Parties, Non-Contracted Parties, Registries, Registrars, CCSGs and so on are going to partially blur but sometimes need to keep their value to structure the organization.

Another element that was a great addition to the discussion was a comment by Jeff Neuman saying, "We've been focused a lot on policy. Operations should not be forgotten."

And a lot of the actors who are participating in ICANN are actually managers of the domain name system in terms of operations, and we need to beef up

the capacity for those actors to discuss together, especially as the new ones are going to come in and take responsibility.

Another element and this is largely in part to a comment that Jean-Jacques made is the notion that those reviews that are mandated by the Bylaws and the ATRT are getting across.

They are either vertical or horizontal in a thin slice, and there's a big difficulty to have a systemic analysis so what are the challenges moving forward?

And part of this exercise is aimed at triggering systemic analysis like something that is realistically holistic exploration of what the challenges are and what the evolution will be.

Evolution is another word that has been used because there are many meanings to evolution. People use it to oppose it to revolution like just opening up the box and redoing everything.

But at the same time anybody who knows a little bit about evolutionary processes in biology knows that you have new species that evolve, that there are changes, that sometimes a very minor change in the DNA can produce a very big change in terms of trajectory or embryology.

So this is an analogy that I would like to spread in our discussion. Sometimes very, very minor changes can have a long-term impact. And finally there are many other elements that I will not get into detail. Sorry?

Exactly. The last point is one of the reasons why the reaction was naturally - we are already taking steps. We are addressing this issue. That was one of the reactions.

We are resilient. The structures are going to be resilient. Beyond resiliency is the question of scalability and something can be resilient at one moment, but

enhancing the capacity to be resilient for the organization and particularly its adaptability - I think evolutionary terms are going to be very important here.

What we need is not to do any revisions to accommodate a particular constituency. We need to make sure that as it evolves the organization is capable of handling a second round of new gTLDs and then the third round and whatever, and also to withstand as the R3 paper said the shocks that are coming from the outside.

So there are shocks that we have triggered ourselves and shocks that will come out of the blue that are not our responsibility. So just a word to encourage you to participate in this discussion.

This will lead to a session in Beijing and what we discussed this morning is that there will be a sort of summary document on some of those keywords to use as takeaway.

And second that coordination would be done with the SOs, ACs and constituencies on how to organize a cross community session in Beijing.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you Bertrand. There's a distant participant and Mary Wong will kindly lead his comment or question or her comment or question.

Mary Wong: Yes, Katim is making a comment. He thinks that the important thing here is for people to know and feel that they have been given a fair hearing and an opportunity to genuinely engage in the issues.

He says that we all know that we can't agree all the time, that the way people take a Board's decision is always going to depend on to what extent they feel the Board is sincere about serving their needs.

And as has been pointed out ICANN needs to build trust to strengthen its relation with various other stakeholders, including those from developing countries. That will be it. Thank you.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you. Is that Katim Touray from The Gambia? Hello Katim. Nice to hear from you although indirectly. Thank you for your contribution. Bertrand is going to have to be very fast.

Bertrand de la Chappelle: Yes, yes. No, it was just in addition to entirely support on a personal basis the comment that Evan made regarding fiduciary duty to the organization versus the community.

This is something that I have raised in the Board and it requires some persuasion to go past the legal understanding.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you Bertrand. Any other comments before we ask the panel to give their concluding - to reach their concluding remarks? Perhaps Lynn first and then Peter.

Lynn Goodendorf: Just very briefly as well, the other thing I had wanted to say, in leading ISOC what I always try and do is first that you look to the principles and the mission. And honestly it's not actually about what one of our member communities believe.

It's first the mission and the principles. And I'm going to find this discussion kind of interesting whether it ought to be towards the Board or towards the community, because we all come and participate in ICANN because we support ICANN for their mission and their role in the Internet ecosystem.

And, you know, just some years ago we never heard a lot about global public interest, which should've been the very first things we ever heard at an ICANN meeting.

We also don't hear a lot about, you know, the organization's mission is X and we're all here to support that and we're all here because we care about it and participated.

It's just interesting and it seems to be either/or and it's either Board or community for our organization but not an issue.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you Lynn. That's a very important remark and please don't go away before I can come to the conclusions because we need you there. And before I give the floor to Peter -- I'm sorry Peter -- (Idoto) would you like to say something?

(Idoto): Thank you. Thank you for the panelist presentation. I think it's very enlightening. I'd like to make a couple of comments. First, what would be the way that NPOC and (ALARC) can collaborate further besides putting up this workshop together?

And I attended one of your sessions on - one of your working sessions and it was decided to make this our prepaid - their white paper on (ALARC). And what would - what's next - what's the next step for making these our - this white paper part of the discussion or the further discussion in the community? How can NPOC be helpful to these efforts?

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you very much (Idoto). Of course we will bring that up in a few minutes in the concluding remarks. Klaus, do you want to say something on that?

Klaus Stoll: No I just wanted to answer that question directly if I could. Well sorry for giving you the impression that we are under a time constraint, but after all it's true.

It's always true in an ICANN meeting so, you know, it's okay. I'd like to ask Alain and the panelists to give their closing remarks about all they have heard

here or anything they might have forgotten to mention or things they really insist on taking away from this meeting collectively.

And then I'll try to give a few concluding remarks by suggesting a way forward.

Man: Thank you Jean-Jacques. I'll be brief and I'll just repeat a point that I made in the introduction. There was no pretense to initiate or finalize any permanent discussion or final discussion at ICANN with this workshop.

We thought that the debate train was progressing and we had a chance to add an input from the NPOC community in France. So I think this is a work in progress as far as I'm concerned.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you. (Alexandra).

(Alexandra): Thank you Jean-Jacques. I don't really have much more to say. Multi-stakeholder collaboration has been a lifelong passion of mine because it relates to governance issues, which has been the thing that drove me to study political science and public policy to begin with.

And I'm still continuing on that and I look at ICANN with keen interest, because I'm studying it and I'm also a part of it. And I'll continue to update the community in terms of what additional findings I have about this as I continue the discussion.

And I just want to say that the challenges that I have flagged that pertain to multi-stakeholder collaborations at the global level are still relevant. They are still not yet sufficiently addressed and they are open questions. Thank you.

Man: Hi there. I'm just going to call attention to the - one of Bertrand's terms that resonated most with me, and that was evolution especially when it comes to ICANN.

When I first got involved here it was noted to me that there is no actual International Association of Registrars. And it was - somebody had mentioned to me as well there already exists one and it's called ICANN.

And ICANN has in the time I've been here evolved from something that has appeared to be an industry association with public input when convenient into something much broader and more important than that.

I've seen huge strides made and especially with the comments that have been made this week by the new CEO that the signs are all extremely promising. They're all extremely encouraging.

The cynic in me says, you know, "Let's wait for some action to come out of this." But the evolution is happening and happily in a direction with which I'm extremely happy to be involved with. I'm sort of glad I stuck it out and look forward to continued participation.

Sam Lanfranco: Okay, as the outsider I'd like to thank everyone for the opportunity of being here. This has been close to my heart even though it's been at a distance for a long time.

I won't recount anything I said before. I just want to make a comment about the terminology and use of the terms. One of the steps that we've made in the last 20 years is to understand how important it is to understand the terms.

The terms define the context, the framework within which the dialog takes place and they determine what's legitimate analysis, what's legitimate and so on and so forth.

And my comment on that is the important term evolutionary - I'm working with another organization and we're arguing there that the organization is pre-evolutionary.

It's in an incubator and it's in the incubator even before it's been fully conceived. The incubator is a lot of DNA floating around. And in a sense even this far into ICANN, ICANN is still in the incubator.

Its DNA was not predetermined at some conception at a time prior to going into the incubator. And that kind of metaphor as opposed to a more advanced evolutionary model I recommend.

Jean-Jacques Subrenat: Thank you Alain. Thank you (Reynaldo). Thank you Evan and thank you Sam. Now it's my duty to try to extract from all this magnetic wealth to take up the analogy you suggested Sam, your magnetic approach or biological evolutionary approach.

Several things - first of all I'm struck by the continuing complexion or nature of ICANN, which still wants to be a sort of a pioneer organization. We should recognize once and for all that they were pioneers, and that was a pioneer period and a pioneer task, had a pioneer agenda and pioneer methods.

It is high time now after the first decade of its existence that we move into normal operations, because the operational part is really important. But I think that in order to make operations sustainable as (Reynaldo) has called for them to be fair, to be open, to be inclusive as some has suggested is so necessary.

It is only possible provided that we - that all of the members of the constituencies and also of the Board cannot do the everyday work, which should be in fact done by Staff upon instruction by Board and others.

To take up one point since I did not take part in the debate personally, I just want to take up one question and give an immediate answer. This was brought up.

Who actually is the Board accountable to? And you will see there are three people we have drafted that we answer this very clearly in our recommendations.

Under the chapter Internal Governance Agreements or Arrangements it said, "Make the Board the Executive Committee of the ICANN community." It's a simple statement but not so easy to achieve. Let's try.

The second point is redirect the fiduciary duty of Directors to the community, not to ICANN itself, meaning not to the corporation as a California corporation.

So I think that is part of the challenge actually. Now my next set of remarks is actually in a way forward to answer and one of those query and follows the anticipation of what Klaus wanted to bring up.

First of all there is a context. We're not operating in a void. We are in whatever month it is of October 2012, and there's a October 2012 reality which is people honestly earnestly trying to enter - or to make ICANN enter into a new season as Fadi so nicely put it.

We cannot act against that. We should not. It is a reality. We have a good fortune that the Board chose a top personality. More than a technician in the making, it is the integrity of the individual which is important to me.

And I think that we have to observe him for the next three to six months. Beyond that it should be good. So that is the first reality. It is the context of ICANN itself.

The second reality is that there are challenges, which will have an impact on the Internet in general and on ICANN therefore whether we like it or not. For instance how solid is the domain name system as the only source of - type of local doing.

Are there technical alternatives? Are we looking at them sufficiently? And then there are things such as inclusiveness, in other words governance. And this is something which is way beyond ICANN and way beyond the Internet even.

The - what has been termed the Arab Spring is only one manifestation of this movement of humanity, which is crying out the following message. Sure, the whole history of humanity has been towards the gradual formation of states as the highest representatives of the global public interest.

But as pointed out in one of the presentations -- I think it is (Reynaldo) -- there has already been a huge change after World War II. And in fact Sam pointed out that ILO is more than 100 years old, so the multi-stakeholder model is older than that.

So we have to take stock that we inscribe ourselves and our action into an historic context, and also into the context of our time. Now because of these opening remarks I would suggest that we have to be very time conscious.

We have to have a short-term objective and a longer-term objective. The short-term objective is to aim at ICANN 46 in Beijing. So our proposal, after we discussed this earlier over a telephone conversation, is that we submit to you the R3 paper as one possible basis.

It's certainly imperfect. There's certainly other ideas but rather than starting the exercise all over again, it is our proposal that if you desire perhaps it would be considered as one possible basis and we're working on that.

The idea is to get a number of participants such as yourselves and that's where I was looking at you among others, because your experience in the leadership positions you have held and the outstanding direction and sense

of direction and also communication which you have been giving all along in ISOC is truly a model for all of us.

The statements you make are truly well in advance generally of what ICANN has to make as a statement, generally the ICANN CEO in the past few years. So we are at your disposal and my conclusion on this part of how do we operate is let's practice what we preach.

We've just been talking about the fact that we should not be constituency driven but agenda driven or issue driven. So my proposal is that we do not consider ourselves as ALAC or ISOC or NPOC or anything else.

Of course we come with the preoccupations of our constituencies, but the challenge is to come up with something bigger than that and more valid and more sustainable.

So there is a list of contact points which will be distributed to all those who have left their email addresses. And I think that Alain is kindly accepting to do that as the initiator of this meeting.

And we will get back to you with a sort of brief of our conclusions today, and elicit from you your suggestions on two things. One, content and also operationally a way forward between now and Beijing.

My second point about timeline is beyond Beijing, so that I think may have to wait for another iteration because we don't have time now. It's 32 past but I just wanted to signal that we cannot approach Beijing by milking out a longer-term perspective.

This is what it's all about actually. And I hope I haven't forgotten any important points. I must apologize for not having gone into the exercise of paraphrasing your remarks.

I saw no interest in that so I really wanted to leave you with a semblance of a conclusion for the way forward. Thank you.

Man: Just want to make a 30 second remark about beyond Beijing. We had a very quick conversation with Claudio and (Reynaldo) and there were people we - thinking about that it is not a large partnership.

On behalf and with NPOC we'll try to get a session going at the advice in Geneva next year in May, because we need to break out a little bit out of our silos here and be brave enough to talk about these things in other forums.

And Lynn and everybody here - I - please help us with that. We just want to be in the platform and nothing else. Thank you. I turned the Chair to Alain.

Alain Berranger: Well thank you very much. This is Alain Berranger from NPOC and my thanks go to the panelists that have invested their time and expertise in this. We had two conference calls and actually PowerPoint presentations and even some discussion paper, which we have shared with the community - an excellent discussion paper.

So that is my first thanks. My second word of thanks go to the participants here. I'm quite impressed with the lack of traffic in and out during this session.

There was mostly a 95% retention and I've not seen this short of locking the door. Of course we - and thank you also for the impromptu contribution, very timely contribution of Bertrand who got us - some of us up at 7 o'clock this morning to do this exercise, and he already had some sense of direction.

And finally to Dr. Touray in The Gambia where it is a absolutely a total cost to actually go through these distance contribution. And of course Jean-Jacques you are a master at facilitating and you already shared with us some of your ((Foreign Language Spoken)).

So Your Excellency, thank you very much for bringing that to us. And on that I think I will close this session and wish you all a good day or good evening. Thank you.

END