

ICANN76 – Looking Towards WSIS 20: How Can We Improve Multistakeholder Participation in Internet Governance

ICANN76 | CF – Looking Towards WSIS 20: How Can We Improve Multistakeholder Participation in Internet Governance
Wednesday, March 15 2023 – 10:30 to 12:00 CUN

ANDREA GLANDON: Hello, and welcome to the ICANN76 plenary session, looking toward WSIS+20. How can we improve multistakeholder participation in Internet governance?

My name is Andrea Glandon, and I am the remote participation manager. Please note that this session is being recorded and follows the ICANN expected standards of behavior. Interpretation for this session includes Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian, Portuguese, and Spanish. Click the interpretation icon in the Zoom toolbar to select your preferred language output.

Please remember to speak slowly and clearly for our interpreters. For in person participants, if you would like to ask a question there will be three roving microphones. Please raise your hand so the support team can see you. For remote participants, if you would like to submit a comment or question for me to read out, please start with comment and end with comment or start with question and end with question. Text outside of these quotes will be considered as part of the chat

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.

and will not be read aloud. To view the real time transcription, click closed captioning in the Zoom toolbar. Now, please welcome Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Good morning. Good morning, Nigel. Well, that's like it. I like a bit of response. So well, it's amazing that so many of you have chosen to discuss the WSIS +20 review process rather than going to the beach. But I take this as a real positive step. Thank you so much for coming this morning. We're very, very grateful to the ICANN community for approving the GAC proposal to hold this as a plenary recession.

Our aim this morning is to raise awareness as per engagement for what we think could be a very interesting process, the WSIS +20 review process, which I'll mention at the moment. We think it's important that we have this session because we think that the discussions that will take place during the WSIS +20 review process, and eventually, the UN general assembly in 2025 at its end could indeed address how both the governance of the internet should be managed in the future, and the role of ICANN and indeed the regional internet regional registries within that context.

We are not here, of course, to preempt the outcomes of the WSIS +20 process which will probably be finally negotiated

just by member states at the UNGA. But we, as part of the multistakeholder community, we are the multistakeholder community in ICANN. And as such, we are also part of the global internet governance ecosystem. We have a voice. And today, we hope that through this engagement and through this interaction and hearing from many different people, we might be more engaged in that process.

And finally, just to note that the WSIS +20 review process will look at amongst other things the outcomes of the two summits in 2003 and 2005, which include the Tunis agenda, which for those of you that are experts and most of you here as you know codified the role of different stakeholders and also recommended the setting up of the UN Internet Governance Forum. And also the action lines, the WSIS action lines, which set out targets for development and for inclusion within the internet ecosystem. So without further ado, I will turn over to my friend, who needs no introduction at all, Sébastien,

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Nigel. I will speak in English because we are in Mexico, and I think it is important to use the language that you prefer. You have a very good tool with our interpreters here today and there's also the headphones around here. So you can listen to the interpretation and understand what is going on here. Thank you very much.

It's also very important for me to speak in my mother tongue to tell you that there will be three parts in this meeting. We will hear discussions who are either here in the room or online. And for each one of those, three part. We will hear at the end of those intervention, of course, some comments from the room and each one of the discussions will introduce themselves, which of course will save me the trouble. As we have written the question in English, I will run the session in English. It will be easier for me.

We have three parts. The first part will be about explaining the history and landscape of World Summit of Information Society. The second part will be a discussion about the WSIS +20 review process, and then some stakeholder view who will be shared with you. And I would like now to give the floor to the first speaker who is coming from the region, is Carlos Afonso. Carlos Afonso, please take the floor.

CARLOS AFONSO: Yes, thank you. Are you hearing me? I hope you are. Yes, thank you. Hi, after what you spoke, I am really sorry that I didn't prepare my presentation in Spanish. I speak Spanish, I didn't know I couldn't do it. So let's actually go on in English. WSIS is a result of a long process within the UN, started in 1998 in the IPU meeting in many Minneapolis, which proposed to the UN to carryout of a summit on the so called

Information Society. IPU proposed to hold the WSIS in two phases, Geneva December 2003, and Tunis in November 2005. UN decided that the preparatory process should have contributions from all relevant UN bodies to be multistakeholder. The first phase in Geneva, the objective of this first phase was to take concrete steps to propose the foundations for an Information Society for all, reflecting all the different interests at stake. Nearly 50 heads of state, officials from 175 countries as well as international organization's private sector and civil society provided political support to the WSIS declaration of principles and plan of action that were adopted in that Geneva meeting of the WSIS.

These numbers in spite of the imbalance the multistakeholder process revealed the overall and worldwide interest in the ways and means of the evolving Information Society. One of the outcomes of the Geneva meeting in 2003 was the establishment of a multistakeholder working group on Internet governance, the WGIG in 2004. One of the main challenges posed to the WGIG was to build consensus around a working definition of Internet governance. The WGIG was comprised of 40 members from governments, private sector, and civil society who all were supposed to participate on an equal footing and in their personal capacity, and held four meetings in Geneva from November 2004 to June 2005.

I recall that in the intercessional discussions between the two WSIS phases, ICANN and ISOC basically opposed the concept of Internet governance, preferring to insist on the idea of coordination between different non-governmental entities. The ISOC leaflet distributed during the WSIS in Geneva in 2003 was entitled, developing the potential of the Internet through coordination, not governments. So much has changed since then.

Phase two in Tunis, 2005, the road to Tunis, entail the process of monitoring and evaluation of the progress of feasible actions in the Geneva plan. And a concrete set of deliverables that have to be achieved by the time of the Tunis meeting. Working groups were set up to find solutions and reach agreements in the fields of Internet governance and financing mechanisms. Also, measures were proposed to bridge the digital divide and hasten the achievement of the millennial development goals with the help of ICTs. The Tunis commitment document reiterated the unequivocal support for the Geneva declaration of principles and plan of action adopted at the first phase of WSIS. This is the basic history of the process until Tunis.

Since the '80s, civil society organizations in several countries in all regions have been--

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: You are cut. We can't hear you anymore, Carlos.

DEVAN REED: Carlos, your line has been muted.

CARLOS AFONSO: Okay. Can you hear me now?

DEVAN REED: Yes.

CARLOS AFONSO: Okay. Sorry. Since the '80s civil society organizations in several countries in all regions have been active in seeking new mode to communicate. Using means such as BBSs through phone lines or national package switching networks. In May 1999, the Association for Progressive Communications, the APC was founded. The combination of these early processes which gathered doses of nonprofits motivated by the right to communicate. In late 2000, in response to the UN proposal to launch WSIS, civil society launched the communication rights in the information society campaign, no has decreased campaign.

On the whole around 350 organizations throughout the world participated in several ways in these processes. In parallel,

there was the complicated process of defining roles and the structure of governance of ICANN itself. An attempt to create council membership of individuals chosen in each region by the Internet users failed for several reasons. But civil society and academic presence ended up finding a niche in the ICANN structure.

In July 2003, the first NCUC charter was discussed and the presence of noncommercial entities within the organization was established with NCUC, NPOC and both later forming the NCSG as well as the elusive At-Large membership. I called [00:12:43 -inaudible] harsh but truth for words. ICANN organizational reform in 2002 put an end to the original idea of fair equal participation of individual users in ICANN. A majority of stakeholders chose to get rid of the weakest stakeholder in the game. As a result, representation of individual users on the board has been reduced to one liaison person without voting rights. This [00:13:13 -inaudible] talking. Seeing from this perspective, ICANN reform constitutes a backlash for Internet governance in particular and for the notion of democratization of global politics in general.

Okay. There is a whole rich and complex history of the establishment of the Internet Governance Forum as proposed in paragraph 72 of the Tunis agenda. Perhaps one of the

most relevant initiatives led by the UN, which disseminated an awareness of the challenges of Internet governance. Dozens of national IGFs were formed in many countries in consequence. Broadly standing discussions and proposals.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Carlos, I'm sorry, but you need to conclude because we will.

CARLOS AFONSO: Yes, I am concluding. Wolfgang will complete this history and picture. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Wolfgang, please take the floor. Thank you. Thank you, Carlos. We can't hear you Wolfgang. I see that you are speaking, but your mic might be mute. Thank you. Let's go.

WOLFGANG KLEINWÄCHTER: Can you hear me now?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes.

WOLFGANG KLEINWÄCHTER: Okay, thank you very much, and thank you, Carlos, for outlining the history from Minneapolis to Tunis. But since

Tunis, the world has changed dramatically. While the multistakeholder approach was a big innovation in 2005, in particular for governments who had originally the idea, at least some governments that say can manage the Internet as a governmental affair, they had to acknowledge that the Internet is too big to be managed by one stakeholder alone. I think this was the main outcome from the WGIG. That it needs involvement of all stakeholders if you want to manage the Internet.

On more or less equal footing, this was to question mark, but in their respective roles. And there are certainly differences between the roles of stakeholders in managing the Internet. And so the big battle after the Tunis agenda was, how is the relationship between the stakeholders? Everybody agreed that Multistakeholder is very good, but some had different ideas. And this was a battle suddenly between the multilateralist who said multilateralism is bigger than multistakeholderism, and the other group argued that the multilateral intergovernmental system is embedded in a multistakeholder environment.

So this battle between multilateralism and multistakeholderism continued a couple of years. But even this is now history because today we are confronted with a much more complex situation. Because while we have

recognized that there is no real conflict between multilateral and intergovernmental cooperation and multistakeholder cooperation on the others side. What we see now is that on the multilateral level, we have a huge conflict between an autocratic version of the Internet, of the governance of the Internet and the democratic version of the governance of the Internet. While on the ground layer, we have still this one world one internet philosophy where everybody participates. Though the conflict is now between the application layers where we have one Internet and 193 national jurisdictions with governments and different ideas, more democratic or more autocratic. And on the ground layer, we have still this more or less, one world one Internet philosophy, which worked with us from the very early days of the Internet.

And while we recognized also in the WGIG definition, which Carlos mentioned, there is interrelationship between the application layer and the transport layer, there are also differences. So in the definition, you have these two different languages, which speaks about the development of the Internet and the use of the Internet. While the user is more on the application layer, the development is more on the technical side. So taking these new realities into consideration what are the lessons for WSIS+20? So we can learn, certainly something from the debate between Geneva and Tunis which was covered by Carlos.

And one of the main conclusion is, the Internet cannot be managed by one stakeholder alone. It need the collaboration of all sides, even if the collaboration gets more complex than it was probably in the year 2005. So you have to be innovative and to create new models of enhanced collaboration. I think this is the first lesson. The second lesson is the non-stake actors have to do their homework while the governments at the moment dominate debate in their autocracy versus democracy battle. So you remember the declaration on the future of the Internet on the one hand and the Shanghai Corporation organization on the other hand with China, Russia, and Iran model of the Internet. So what the non-stake actors can do, and in particular, ICANN is a platform where all the non-stake actors are very active.

So they have to raise their voice, as Nigel as encouraged us. They have to raise their voice and not to leave it in the hands of the governments represented in the United Nations general assembly. So that means we have to deliver some constructive input into this intergovernmental process and we have to have an equal seat on the table. And to do this, so we have to reorganize ourselves. One big component for the success of the WGIG and the Geneva outcome was that the civil society organizations came together and had their own platform. The technical community created a platform which was called a high ISTAR organization. And also the private

sector organized themselves. Without such an organizational platform, the input of the non-state actors will be minimal.

In so far, my pledge is to the technical community, to the civil society, and the business community, get organized and play your role in collaboration with the governments in your respective role. Thank you very much, and I wish you a good meeting.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much Wolfgang. And now Anriette, what is the value of WSIS+20, please?

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thanks, Sebastian. It's fantastic to see so many people in the room. And it's quite nice that you put all the old people to speak first. I'm not complaining. I think it's appropriate. Look, I want to start with the value of WSIS before I talk about the value of WSIS+20. WSIS is about digital inclusion. It's basically about the substructure that we all need, all of us who care about the Internet industry or the tech industry, whether you are in DNS or an Internet service providers, a local internet service provider or a content creator. If we don't have digital equality, if people in the world are not connected, then what we do will not generate the necessary return on

investment or achieve the social goals that we want to achieve.

And that's why WSIS is important. Because it is about creating digital inclusion. It's about people centered developments through the use of technology. And it has a holistic approach, I think, which is very important. It talks about inclusive information society, not just about digitalization. So it talks about the use of ICTs, information and communications, which is fairly tech neutral. You know, it's not just about the internet. So it has quite a long term application.

But I think to jump now to what is important about versus WSIS+20. And just to go back to WSIS itself, WSIS reflects the voices of global self. That was a process, as Wolfgang and Carlos explained, that involved member states and other non-state actors, perhaps not to the extent that we wanted to, but we were involved. So the WSIS goals do reflect a fairly unified vision of states, technical community, civil society, business, and academic actors, not perfectly, but relatively. And from the global self-perspective, it contains and it's very much an agenda that was felt was needed for the world to take seriously to create more of a level playing field through the use of technology between rich and poor countries.

And that's why WSIS+20 is so important. Because it's an opportunity to take stock, to go back to basics at a big picture level. How are we doing with access? How are we progressing with connecting the unconnected, with creating more digital equality, more inclusion, more opportunity for people, especially those that are disenfranchised? And it's also a big picture opportunity to look at the idea of multistakeholder collaboration, the WSIS principles of participation. Is it working? How is it not working? Human rights? Another WSIS goal. Are we building or using technology as we now go into new tech like AI. It human rights at the center of how we work with this, and our people's interests at the center.

But I think then the strength of WSIS is that it doesn't just have these big picture fairly visionary ambitious goals. It has action lines. And these action lines are fairly specific. They have areas such as free and independent media, enabling policy environment for innovation, for business opportunity, education, public health. So I won't go to all of them, but WSIS is actually quite a sophisticated document in that it has cross cuts and it has specific action areas. And WSIS+20, again, is for us to look at those action lines and it says, how are we doing? And for anyone who has an interest in the internet that is important.

But I think there are more sort of softer, but I think quite important values of WSIS, which I would like us to really reflect on in this session. And that I think it's an opportunity for us to come back together as different stakeholder groups and work towards a common vision or at least identify what it is that we do have in common. If you look at multistakeholder processes over the last 10-20 years, they've become very bureaucratized. You have different stakeholder groups lobbying, doing advocacy for their own interests. ICANN is a perfect example of an organization that has very elaborate bureaucratic processes for being multistakeholder.

And I think it's time to actually come back and look at how do we work together, how do we get the technical community into the public policy space? You know, how do we get ICANN's voice in the global digital compact, for example? And I think that's why this opportunity is so important. Because we can come back, we can look at progress on WSIS, but we can also come back and look at how do we work together as different stakeholder groups, different countries with different realities to find solutions for contemporary problems? Not just the WSIS unmet goals, but problems that we are having to face today.

I think I'll end on that. I know you wanted me to discuss enhanced cooperation, Sébastien. I think as has been

mentioned, the IGF mandate is up for renewal by WSIS+20. UN member states will decide what they do with the IGF. They will also decide whether enhanced cooperation has been achieved. Enhanced cooperation is a term in the Tunis agenda, one of the WSIS outcome documents, but it's essentially code for the role of governments in Internet governance.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Anriette, thank you. We need to move because--

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I'll stop there. And I think just to say, Sébastien, if we don't address ultimately the role of governments, we will actually never be able to achieve the kind of thriving multistakeholder participation that we would like to achieve. Back to you Sébastien.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Anriette. My feeling is that we are already late, but I will give the floor to Desiree and maybe you can tell us how to improve the multistakeholder participation. Desiree, please.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you, Sébastien. Good afternoon. I think it's very valuable that we have heard from Afonso and from Carlos as well as Anriette, a little bit about the past, but I think I'd like to talk a little bit about challenges that we have faced in Phase 1 and Phase 2 and also looking forward how we can improve the participation.

I think it's valuable also to remind us about the structure of the UN system. The key guiding principle that informs the work of the UN are actually conferences and summits that they convene. And the very body was born in 1945 out on a conference for international organization. And saying that, I would also have to stress that there is a constant reform going within the UN structures, within its bodies. And maybe one trend that we have to pay attention to is within these reforms. The key question of who decides, the key question in Internet or in any kind of governance has actually been a little bit slowly reshaped within the UN system. So it's moving from who decides in terms of a number of votes and rights to vote and the decision making mechanisms to a question of who has been consulted along the way.

And I think that really can explain a little bit about WSIS phase 1 and phase 2 because I participated as private sector in both of these phases. And we could not be in the room where this important tenants of Internet governors have been discussed.

As private sector, we did coordinate and as well as civil society and technical community was there putting in various input, but there are enormous challenges. ICANN'S CEO was not let into the room. So the big breakthrough I think really happened perhaps between Phase 1 and Phase 2 through this working group on Internet governance, which had a multistakeholder structure, which has asked people to participate jointly to see the problem from many aspects sides and different stakeholders' point of view.

And they have come with some concrete recommendations, one of them being to create the internet governance forum, a discussion forum with nonbinding results, and the second one to remove the U.S. government oversight of ICANN which has happened after Phase 2, as we know, in 2014 until 2016. So we really do have something here that we all fought for as a community in terms of, how do we see participation model working in Internet governance structure.

I would also say in addition to these challenges that we have foreseen and these breakthroughs that have led us to have the Tunis agenda, it is true that some of these things will be challenged because the world is in crisis of leadership and it's so called poly crisis on many aspects. And so it may reflect on Internet governance as well. And we'll sum it on information society 20+ will review this agenda. So I think it's

really our duty as a community to really have a call to participate in all the venues and in all the events leading up to WSIS 20+ to engage and to show our interest and that we work in a multistakeholder model. It's a different model and differently. It's not a unique model, but it means that it has to be inclusive and that stakeholders can say what they want and that they express their thing and which could be to maintain one single and globally interoperable Internet. So we really have as a community, I think, a real reason to participate.

And another call would be there would be no closed rooms. Because otherwise, the participation will have not consulted all the stakeholders along the way, which is this new trend where the UN is heading to. So the ICANN communities should be involved. And in all preparatory processes, not just in WSIS 20+. And I'm sure that Government Advisory Committee members are working on CSTD process here, which is part of UN ECOSOC. And there's many other values. And I would hope that we would also have a cross community working group to further discuss the input. So anyhow, in my closing points, I would also like to echo what Anriette said. I believe that if we want to embrace the future and we have to make it, we have to go back on the ground and get it. So, I leave you with those words for a moment. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Desiree. As you can see, we are already late, but that's my fault. I will take questions from the floor. And I would like to take one question. We will start with one online as there is no yet question from the floor. Just raise your hand and somebody will come with a mic. Go ahead please.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. We have a question from Gopal Tadepalli. What is at stake with the Information Society?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Is there somebody willing to answer? Maybe what I will do, yes. I suggest that I will do these three questions and then we will come back. Please, number 2.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening for those who are listening to the discussion virtually? It is a proverb to say that in order to know the future of plan in the future, we should have full knowledge of the past. And full knowledge of past started in 1998, when the first resolution from the Tunisian administration in plenipotentiary conference Minneapolis proposed an action which end up to the WSIS under the United Nation Secretary role. In the first phase, there were 11000 participants. And the second phase is

19000 participants. Only 3000 were government and 16000 were others, private sector and so on and so forth. So there has been full participation of everybody. Nobody was excluded. I don't really understand the closed door. There was no closed door.

Sometimes in order to prepare something, the people getting together to prepare some elements to come to the open meeting and that came to the open meeting. Unfortunately, in the last two days, there was no agreement on the governance. And the European Commission or European country came with a proposal that lets us create the Internet governance forum. The first meeting of that took place in Greece 2006, if I'm not mistaken, and every year we have this one. Good discussions, good exchange of views. It is a forum that is not expected to have an output, nothing to bind, and it was expected that the result of this discussion would bring some ideas to other meeting.

Now we have this WIS WSIS+20. I heard that the people want--

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sir, you need to conclude this.

KAVOUSS ARASTEH: Yes. I've heard that people want to be included. There is no way to exclude anybody. We have a WSIS forum every year in ITU. It is not ITU, but it is anchored, it is UNESCO and others. And everybody are invited are welcome. And in fact, in 2010 in Guadalajara, ICANN community was recognized as one of the active participants in any meeting and it was included in the outcome of that conference. Therefore, you are or we are most welcoming any meeting and any activities. So I think we should work together rather than creating something in parallel. The result is not be productive

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Kavouss. Thank you very much. Well, since the mic was-- Okay.

FARZANEH BADIEI: Hi, my name is Farzaneh Badiei, Non-Commercial Stakeholder Group. I just wanted to ask the panel to give me examples of where a key internet governance issues actually were discussed at WSIS and heard. if Internet governance is not really happening at forums like WSIS, and unfortunately, these forums have not resulted in any kind of change or informing the laws that the European Union comes up with, and they come up with NIS2 and GDPR. And I don't think that forums like WSIS has really informed these laws and regulations and the governments in general. So in effect, I'm

arguing that decision makers are really not in these forums dealing with Internet governance. And maybe you can prove me wrong.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess, we are discussing about the first part here. It's question, we will move with the second part of our discussion. But therefore, I would like you when you answer I urge you not to take what will be discussed at the second part of the session. And shortly, can you take the floor.

LORI SCHULMAN: Yes. This is Lori Schulman for the transcript. Thank you for your question, Farzi. And also, I want to address the question that was asked to not answered about what's at stake for the Information Society. I think it's important. In terms of a specific example, Farzi, I can't give you one off the top of my head. I'm only going to attempt. But I will give you what is my view about WSIS+20 versus prior WSIS. WSIS+20 is about a recognition of implementation needs to happen. You know, WSIS prior to WSIS +20, in my view, has been about talking, influencing governments, but not necessarily pushing government to outcomes. Whereas today, WSIS+20 is part of a bigger UN effort in fabric. That includes the employment of the technical envoy, that includes the global digital compact, that includes IGF, so that WSIS itself is looked at as

part of a greater UN effort to do exactly what you're criticizing WSIS of not doing in the past. It's to actually come up with moving forward with implementation.

But I would remind the group that implementation in this case means international treaties. And how do those international treaties were they to be developed to fit in with ICANN and ICANN's remit? And that's the tricky balance that we have inside the ICANN community. I'm going to be addressing at the end what we think the best outcomes for ICANN are. So I'll save more of my answer for later, but I will give you a brief clip and say the best outcome for ICANN is to recognize ICANN as part of that fabric and to recognize ICANN as a trusted technical and agnostic adviser. And with that, I'm going to--

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Laurie. Desiree, please. You wanted to add something?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC: Maybe I could have a shorter reply at what's at stake. I think we have an agreement by all governments in the Tunis agenda, they will respect the multistakeholder approach to Internet governance. So what's at stake is possibly undoing that at WSIS 20+. But as an answer to Farzaneh's question

in terms of where do this discussion happen and were they actually met, and what are national governments doing with the national legislations, all these governments that are coming upward legislation have actually made the commitment to do their decisions back home also in a multistakeholder way. And they should be consulting with all stakeholders when making national legislations. Now it's a question of enforceability. If they're going to apply that or not, but that's what's been agreed.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Desiree. I think it's time to go to the second part of the session. We will talk about the WSIS+20 review process. And Emily, can you tell us what are the opportunities and risk for multistakeholder governance going into WSIS+20, please?

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you very much for giving me the floor, Sébastien. And if there's time at the end, I might also address the questions from Farza and other speakers as well. So opportunities, threats going into the WSIS+20, plus I think maybe an idea for what action could be taken in anticipation of WSIS +20 to prepare the ICANN community in the best way possible. So I think opportunities look, this is 20 years on and it's a moment to reflect on the successes of the multistakeholder

process. And I think you know, to communicate and to reflect on good news stories. And the best news story from the ICANN environment is the IANA transition, not only that it happened, but that the multistakeholder process really delivered in a very, very aggressive time frame and provided a really solid basis for that transition. And you know what? It happened and we're all still here. So it's showing that multistakeholder governance can work in solving complex and contentious issues in a timely way.

So that's the opportunity side. There are many more, but just in the interest of time. What are the threats going into the WSIS+20 for the ICANN community and for multistakeholder governance? Well, I probably start by saying, I don't anticipate that internet governance or the role of one government in naming an address is going to have such a sharp focus as it did in the original WSIS process, which I participated in back in 2003 to 2005. However, if we're taking a step back and looking at the general governance landscape, what we're seeing at the moment is a huge amount of process entrepreneurship from the United Nations. So whether it's the establishment and renewal of the open ended working group on responsible state behavior in cyberspace, whether it's the establishment of the ad hoc committee that is moving forward with negotiations right now on a global cybercrime treaty. And there are many other multilateral processes from the

extension of the Budapest Convention to the OECD principles relating to cross border data flows.

If we're looking at what the multistakeholder community has brought forward in the last 10-20 years, how has it stepped up to solve new and emerging governance issues. I think there is the example, very good example of leadership in NETmundial, which was got up very quickly in response to the snowden revelations. There are the various global commissions which happened which are multistakeholder. But otherwise, my reflection is that most of the entrepreneurship and the stepping forward and showing leadership to solve emerging cyber or internet governance issues is not coming at the moment from the multistakeholder community. So I think that that should be a call to action for all of us. I know it's not ICANN's role. But a lot of the people who believe in multistakeholder governance do participate in ICANN. And therefore, it is up to those people as individuals or within groupings to think forward, what are the emerging issues that demand multistakeholder solutions.

And then finally, I think if we look at what ICANN could do in order to put itself in the best possible position as a sort of poster child for successful multistakeholder coordination, I would encourage the ICANN community to focus on good enough rather than perfection. To echo what Anriette was

saying, to perhaps focus less on bureaucratic processes and more on outcomes that are balanced and timely in the way that they are put forward. I think in between now in WSIS+20, we've got a few really solid outcomes on difficult issues that have sort of satisfies, if you like, reasonably satisfy a wide range of stakeholders while not fully reflecting the interest of one stakeholder group, then I think we will be in the best possible position. And I do have some remarks in response to the question, Sébastien but we can come back

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Sorry, Emily, but we are already out of the time. So I would like to ask Raul if he can tell us whether there are risk associated with IGF.

RAUL ECHEBERIA: Thank you, Sebastian. And I think that my point will be very aligned with Emily's one. And thank you for the invitation to speak in this forum. I'm happy to be in this ICANN meeting even remotely. I think, let's say, in one meeting that we had for preparing this decision, somebody say, people have to understand that there will be decisions involved within WSIS+20 process. And this is very important. One thing that's obviously that will be analyzed and discussed and negotiated in the process of WSIS +20 is they need or not to renew the mandate of IGF. So we have to accept that this is

one possible scenario. One possible scenario is that the IGF mandate is not renewed. So the question is, how that scenario will look like? In my view, this would be a very negative scenario. So many people is paying less attention to IGF in the last few years than in the past. And by the way, that was very good to see and was very happy to see a very relevant and good participation of ICANN in the last IGF in Ethiopia in last December.

But it's true that many people is losing interest in IGF. And so we could think that the scenario in which IGF mandate is not renewed, is not that bad if people is losing interest in IGF. But yes, it will be very bad in my view. Many discussions are already be already moving to other forums in which the multistakeholder participation is more difficult or it doesn't exist at all in some cases. So without IGF, the participation for stakeholders in relevant discussions will be much more difficult. So what we can do to avoid that scenario. I think the issue, the most clear answer is that we have to continue working on improving the IGF. And as Emily said, one of the things we have to achieve is the production outcomes in more valuable outcomes in a way that feed the expectations wider ranges of stakeholders.

The UNESCO process on platform regulation is one example. That discussion should have happened at IGF rather than in

UNESCO. But many people still resist to the evolution of IGF. It compromises in some way the original characteristics of IGF with limited roles in producing relevant guidelines. So if governments or rather stakeholders are looking for some more concrete outcomes, they will go to other places. And as I said before, we don't have warranties of the equal possibilities of and opportunities of participation in other forums then.

So IGF is not for granted. We have to be creative and innovative in improving the IGF. As I said before, to feed the expectations of broader branch range of stakeholders and also learned some lessons from the past. Wolfgang, and me, and also Emily, as I see, that's having sitted very much in the need to learn positive lessons from what we did in the Mundial. So we can bring some of those lessons to IGF for sure. And we have also to innovate in the creation of new tools and [00:51:00 -inaudible]. We have to innovate new tools of international public policies. Agreed the best practices, volunteer standards and improving the links between the discussions and international programs like IGF policy makers.

So just to finalize, WSIS+20 process will lead to discussions, to decisions, sorry. Some of those decisions could not be nice for our community. We need to involve ourselves in the

process and flag our concerns at early stages of the process. And remember, the IGF is not perfect, but undoubtedly the world is much better with IGF than without it. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Raul. And now I will give the floor to Olga Cavalli. And I guess she will talk to us about the role of ICANN in this arena. Please, Olga.

OLGA CAVALLI: I'm profiting from the fantastic translations and translators that we have here. I will speak in my mother tongue, which is Spanish. So maybe you have time to use your earphones. All right. First of all, thank you very much for having invited me to this panel with so many friends and such important reference in this issue that has caught me from the year 2003, 2005, long time ago. And one of the questions that arose during the preparation process in this session was whether ICANN should be in a listening mode only. And my answer I think is no. No way for many reasons. I would like to take what Wolfgang said a few minutes ago when he said, we need to find new ways to enhanced collaboration. This, I think, is an important point that is relevant for ICANN to take as a challenge. And why do I think ICANN should not be in listening mode only, but actually in an acting mode. And let

me take what Emily said about not being so perfect and creates outcomes.

ICANN has everything it needs to be a relevant stakeholder in this process. And why so? Because it has a large structure, it has fantastic staff, not only in Los Angeles, but also distributed around the world. We do see what the people that are in the United Nations do, what those that are in Geneva do, also those in my region, in Latin America and the Caribbean. It's a very large structure distributed all around the world that all the community knows. So it has a fantastic community. It has all the stakeholders involved. It has as many governments as the United States at the Governmental Advisory Committee, at the GAC. It has a civil society. It has businesses. It has the technical community. But I do believe there's something we can do to strengthen it and it is the role of academia. I belong to the university sector. I have been there for a long time. And I think this is where we can become stronger, but still there is a very good representation.

So with all of these resources, ICANN has all the necessary conditions to become a relevant stakeholder, not only in listening mode, but also in acting mode. If the process is only multilateral and only government participates, this is what happens in some spaces. Well, then governments are represented in an ICANN. We can work collaboratively in this

community as has been shown, and Emily said this, by the IANA process. We have also been engaged in other cross community processes to generate results, documents. If the process is opened as is the case of that global digital compact, then we should have a document among all of us.

Here at ICANN, we can't create the document. And this is a very humble example that comes from our work at the South School of Internal Governance. We have called for the participation of fellows. And we are creating a document among 120 fellows. We worked virtually and now we will send it as a contribution to the global digital compact. ICANN should use all the channels available, whether they are multistakeholder or multilateral, through the governments to bring the voice of our community. I have my notes here in English, so this is a challenge. I have to translate everything.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, but your time is up.

OLGA CAVALLI: Okay. So I'm going to answer more questions later. Thank you for listening to me.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: And thank you, Olga, for your participation. I will give the floor to Jothan. I guess that next two speakers will talk about the Internet technical community. Jothan, please.

JOTHAN: Thank you, Sébastien. Good morning or evening, everyone. Great to be on the panel with such luminaries of the internet community. I want to make two points. One is about the need for us to help lead these discussions at WSIS+20. And the other is some pointers of things we can actually do to help do that. I really do think that Internet community needs to step up with a leading voice in these negotiations for the very simple reason, that if we don't, we're just going to be off the field and other people will make decisions on the range of topics at WSIS, including the Internet governance structures that we work in. So we cannot bury our heads in the sand and pretend that these discussions are not going to be meaningful. We need to be there both to defend the multistakeholder model as it works well in the ICANN example. And also to evolve and develop it. We can't just be sitting there saying everything is perfect, leave us alone. Because it isn't. The internet is throwing up broader challenges than ever before. And if we think multistakeholderism is a good approach, we should be advocating the development of forums and institutions that can solve and tackle those broader problems of the Internet, those broader technology problems some that

have been mentioned already, cybersecurity, one that I've been involved with the crisis call on countering terrorist and violent extremist content. ICANN shouldn't have to do those things. ICANN and the Internet community shouldn't get up and say, that's not in the multistakeholder model. Don't bring it to us. We need to take responsibility as part of the broader internet and technology policy environment to solve the challenges that the internet is throwing up.

So what can we do here? Every organization here, each individual, read the WSIS+20 processes as they come. Read the global digital compact preparations as they begin. Submissions for that is just been extended to the end of April. Make a submission, decide what your stance is. Work in your national communities to share news about these processes. Work in multistakeholder ways to develop and broaden your positions. Advocate and engage with your governments. The foreign ministries, ministers, people in the ICANN environment, to plug into these multistakeholder things. We need to understand what's going on and broaden the dialogue. If you're here as a GAC member, try encouraging your government to engage in a multistakeholder way with the communities to build your country's position as you go into these negotiations.

And I'll quickly close because I'm on a time limit here, which is to say, this thing is being talked about in 2025. You might think, oh, well, it's 2023. Got lots of time. We don't have lots of time at all. The global digital compact and summit of the future is next year. And if we're going to get enhanced cooperation going even among our own communities, the time to be acting is now. You know, ICANN, ISOC, the ISTAR groupings, we need to be getting together to lead this discussion, otherwise, it will happen to us. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Jothan. And now I would like to give the floor, and I am very pleased that she was able to participate. Lynn St Amour, please.

LYNN ST AMOR: Thank you, Sebastian. And thank you, Jothan, actually, for such a great intro. For those who don't know me, I was the CEO of the Internet Society, and then I served on the IGF MAG and most recently as the IGF MAG chair in 2019 followed beautifully by Anriette.

So, as we've heard many times this morning, collaboration is extremely important across the internet technical community organizations. And in that, I appropriately include the ccTLD organizations, IEEE, W3C, etc. And of course, collaboration

with the other stakeholder groups in the Internet governance ecosystem is also extremely important. I believe that a significant part of the Internet technical community's success during WSIS 1 and 2 was due to the sharing of knowledge, concerns, positions, also a collaborative process. For the most part, we weren't focused on joint statements. The month of the DEO statement is an exception. But we used it to inform each other's positions. We all came to our positions individually from our unique perspectives and responsibilities, and that independently informed each organization's activities making for more compelling positions and more strategic activities.

So I mean, again, this really was a collaborative effort. It wasn't kind of a hierarchical coordinated effort, if you will. That was the so called ISTAR group, which few people have referred to. In subsequent years that evolved to something called the Internet Technical Collaboration Group, the ITCG. At the moment, that includes people that are engaged in the technical organizations, the Internet ecosystem actors and individuals contributing in their individual capacity largely, but not uniquely from the technical community organizations. That group at the moment is really focused on sharing information within the technical community, try to ensure effective and appropriate technical representation in various multistakeholder Internet governance efforts. And one

specific task we fulfill is recommendations to the UN for the IGF MAG candidates for the technical community.

There's obviously a plethora of Internet governance efforts recently. IGF improvements, the GDC, the Leadership Panel, WSIS+20, and they've all introduced complexity and I think significant risks. It could lead to significantly less multistakeholder engagement, much more multilateral or UN centralized efforts. And as an Internet technical community, we have unique perspectives to share. Not just knowledge, but frankly our values and our processes. Yet in many cases, we either don't participate in any significant manner or sometimes from those other efforts denigrated as being too technical.

So the question I would pose to the participants across the Internet and technical community, not just the ICANN community, is what collaborative effort across this community be helpful? And how? Because, frankly, interest from the leaders of many of these organizations, but not all of them, to mount a substantive collaborative effort seems to be quite weak. Even within the ITCG, I think frankly, we often feel like we're more of an informal low level sharing effort across all those organizations. Which the individuals who participate find useful, but I'm not sure it's actually supporting the individual organization's strategic objectives.

And again, I think that's because we haven't had kind of the support participation or interest from top level leaders in those activities. So I will equally stop there given the time and thank everybody for the opportunity to participate.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Lynn. And now I would like to open the floor. I will start with one question online and then microphone number two. Please raise your end. We have three rolling microphones. Therefore, it's possible to give you. Go ahead, please.

ANDREA GLANDON: Thank you. I have a question from Javier Rúa. Can non-self-governing territory participate in WSIS as full stakeholders on an equal footing or is their status somehow reduced or limited?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I guess, Javier already asked this question in another forum and how non state actor can participate. And I don't know if we have an answer for that, but maybe somebody. Nigel, please go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you. Nigel Hickson, UK. You know, the jury is out. I mean, we should not, as we're doing in the global digital compact at the moment, the UK and other countries are saying but not just the consultation, but the negotiation as well, has to include non-state actors. As we've seen in the Open-Ended Working Group, and we're seeing in the cybercrime treaty negotiations of Vienna, stakeholders can have a voice, and we believe they should have a voice in the global digital compact, and we believe they should have a voice in the WSIS +10 review process. How that is going to be accomplished will, of course, be down to UN governments and UN missions in New York. But we think it's vital. You bring stakeholders to the trough and you have to engage in both the process of inputting ideas and in the process of putting those ideas into action. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Nigel. Microphone number 2, please.

NAMRA NASSER: Hello. I am Namra Nasser, returning ICANN follow. I just wanted to draw attention towards the rising global inflation and challenging economic environment in the coming times. Which will likely impact the Internet usage and access, but also wide in the digital divide. I really want to know what the forums like WSIS is thinking about these issues. And how it

can it be leveraged to ensure Internet access across all regions and societies? Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Someone want to?

RAUL ECHEBERIA: May I answer?

EMILY TAYLOR: I'd like to ask for the floor when you're ready, Sébastien as well.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Okay, I guess if Raul and Emily, you want to answer. Raul, please take the floor.

RAUL ECHEBERIA: Yes, the answer to the second question is simply, yes. Because WSIS is much more than Internet governance and connectivity, accessibility etc. There are many aspects. And I think that the governments have to work very much on that because there is still a divide to reduce, and is crucial. So yes, that's the forum.

With regard to the first question about the non-governmental stakeholders' participation, there are many things. Nigel remarked some opportunities. We can force the creation of working groups like we had in the past working group on internet governance where many of us participated and also having parallel discussions with the governments, regional forums, with in multistakeholder manner and also participation in the governmental delegations. I had the opportunity to participate represent in my country Uruguay, and we've been part of the negotiations. So there are many things. So Nigel mentioned to claim for participation of non-governmental stakeholders in the negotiations. But beside that, working groups, forums, regional forums, and participating in government obligations. A lot of things to do.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Raul. Please Emily.

EMILY TAYLOR: Thank you. I'd like to address Nigel's comment and also the question on inflation and economic conditions. Nigel, you mentioned the Open-Ended Working Group and the participation of non-state actors in that. I think it was a fairly unsatisfactory process, to be honest, with largely symbolic interventions. And there was also quite a lot of difficulties as I know you're aware for non-accredited civil society actors to

participate. That said, I think there are many, many opportunities for non-state actors to get involved in the WSIS+20. And I would like to highlight the example of the UK government and other democratic governments who bring non-state actors into their delegations and ensure that they are walking the talk with multistakeholder governance and including experts from a variety of backgrounds. So kudos to the UK for what you're doing in that way.

And to the question on inflation and economic conditions and the impact on internet access. Yes, I think to echo and Raul's comment. Yes, absolutely. I imagine that will be very much in focusing in WSIS+20 as it was in the original WSIS. In fact, I think that the access and the demands from the global south to get online to make that a priority were really one of the major positive outcomes of the original WSIS process and reflected in the action lines that still exist. I would also highlight the really solid impact of the technical community and other grassroots initiatives, particularly in Global South, through the establishment of internet exchange points and other really practical ways to reduce costs and lower latency and improve the access to people to the wonderful resource that is the Internet. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Emily. Lori, please. And I will not be able to give the floor to everybody. I will give floor to Lori. Then number 1, number 2, and we will end up like that for the session.

LORI SCHULMAN: Thank you very much, Lori Schulman, for the transcript. I want to backup with Emily's intervention by saying, if anyone in this room or online has not been to a WSIS meeting, and you have the opportunity to do so, I encourage you to do so. Because what you'll see there, beside the government ministers and the high-level meetings, there are also demonstrations of developing technologies. There are awards that highlight young entrepreneurs. I remember I was very pleasantly surprised that one of the years that I was at WSIS, I decided maybe I don't focus on the government minister so much here. Let me look at what's going on in the booths on the side. And one of the awards went to a young female African entrepreneur who had developed a mobile app that enabled local villages to basically digitize their marketplaces so that their market vendors didn't have to necessarily deal in cash, so that their market vendors could conduct business with other villages in a way that had never been done before. And it was really a wonderful insight for me as someone who comes from the north in a very privileged nation to see this kind of work being done at that level.

So in terms of inclusion of Global South, I think WSIS is especially good forum for highlighting advances in the area. The issue right now is this year's WSIS is taking place this week. And we have talked to the WSIS planners about this. The UN plans its meeting very far in advance, but I think it would be a very good idea for ICANN to coordinate its own meetings against the WSIS calendar. Because it would eliminate that conflict and perhaps encourage more participation from the ICANN community.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: I am not sure that ICANN didn't have that calendar before the UN. But I would like to give the floor to the microphone number 1. And then to Bertrand, with the microphone number 2, and we will end up this part of the session. Thank you.

SAUL: My name is Saul. I'm representing personal street. Message to learn. You speak about a lot of time of getting technical people involved. Technical people generally get excited by technical challenges. And when things are broken, how do you fix them more, or what you can do. They're not so much interested in how to get about the legal aspect of things. And so they tend to avoid these kind of IGFs. So how do you propose to actually get the technical people involved in these discussions?

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Bertrand, please.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Good morning. My name is Bertrand de La Chapelle.

I'm the Executive Director of the Internet and Jurisdiction Policy Network. Three quick points. First of all, it is not possible to accept with all due respect to the distinguished representative of the Republic of Iran, the revisionist presentation of what WSIS 1 and 2 were. It was closed doors. It was impossible for the society and private sector to participate. Apart from the summits themselves, but the whole preparatory process, I've been personally kicked out of the doors. And it is not possible that the younger generation understand what happened then in their own way. It cannot be the same 20 years later, and that's what the multistakeholder issue is at stake.

Second thing is there were massive prerequisite for this discussing what we are here for is to understand clearly what WSIS+20 will be. Will there be an event? Is it a collection of events? Does it connect with the summit for the future, the global compact? I personally follow all those things and I'm extremely fuzzy in terms of my understanding of what the process is. There should be an event. It is something that we

need to talk about. I know that some countries are thinking about it seriously. It's important.

And the final element, the question was what is at stake. This goes beyond the protection of what has been achieved by ICANN, what has been achieved by the IGF, although it is an important thing. But what is at stake is the future of governance in the digital age. And when the prime minister of India at the opening meeting of the G20 of the ministers of foreign affairs says the multilateral system has failed, now it's time for the discussion about how multistakeholderism can improve with the involvement of states.

And let me be honest, those of us who believe in the multistakeholder approach need to produce more wind. Because at the moment, the scorecard is not sufficient. And the WSIS+20 is the horizon that we need to have our eyes on. And this is when the discussion is going to really take place. And it matters for everyone.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Bertrand. I must apologize. We just have 10 minutes to go and we will not be able to have all the questions. Since the beginning, I was thinking that it can be just one and a half hour meeting, and we need, if the community agrees, to have a second round of discussion at

the next meeting, or the next one of ICANN. But I would like to give, and please take only two minutes even if we were supposed to give you three minutes for the point of your stakeholders. I will give the floor to Barbara, Marita, and Lori. And I hope that I will have two minutes for questions. But for the moment. I know you are all disappointed Barbara, please go ahead.

BARBARA WARNER: Okay. The clock is ticking. My name is Barbara Warner. I am a member of the ICANN business constituency, but I'm speaking today on behalf of my organization called the U.S. Council for International Business, or USCIB. My comments today are quite practical and may even seem dry to some of you, but they are aimed at dealing with the reality of a multilateral organization from the perspective of a business stakeholder. There's been some discussion here and maybe not a common opinion about whether indeed stakeholders will have access to the WSIS+20 process. My organization enjoys [01:17:37 -inaudible] consultative status that enables our participation in various UN discussions, including the Open-Ended Working Group on cybersecurity. But we are not banking on that enabling us to have a microphone intervention as part of the WSIS process.

So as Desiree noted, this likely will be a government's only debate and voting process. I'd like to offer four recommendations for your consideration. Again, these are very practical and aim toward business stakeholders. First, begin your work now. And I would say this plenary is an excellent beginning. It is critical to begin work early and meet regularly with your respective governments to inform and educate them about your stakeholder group's priorities in the Internet governance space. This means producing carefully drafted one-page statement not tomes, but one-page statements and talking points that can be readily shared with your own government as well as with like-minded governments and probably most important that a layperson can understand the text. The permanent mission representatives who will be voting in the general assembly are not experts and internet governments. They tend to be generalists. So your text must be easy to understand. As Mandy said, I believe on Monday, we all have to play the role of translator, interpreter, and advocate in this process.

So this leads to my second suggestion. So we begin our early. Second suggestion, regular consultations. In addition to producing these accessible educational advocacy materials, you must identify your government's point person for Internet governance and then convene regular off the record so everyone's comfortable off the record discussions

with them. It will take more than one meeting to educate and inform them given the complex interplay of both your business and technical needs, national, local and regional approaches, and then the wild card of geopolitical developments. That interplay in fact may compel you to refine or otherwise rethink your message and focus to increase its effectiveness all of the year as the process continues. All of this is best done in close consultation with your government.

Third, I would urge everyone to consider how to effectively leverage other forums. There's been a lot of discussion about the IGF about the WSIS forum, about the global digital compact. These are all important mechanisms to allow you to make your views known.

Finally, and I cannot emphasize this enough, the importance of the UN capital connection. Stakeholders must ascertain first whether your advocacy has indeed influenced your government's view. But secondly, that your government has conveyed appropriate instructions to the UN mission in New York. Your contacts in capital may express support for your positions on various issues, but all of that effort on your part may be for not unless relevant instructions are communicated to the UN mission. So the fourth point, the UN capital connection. And I'll stop there in the interest of time. Thanks.

LORI SCHULMAN: And I can just roll right into my intervention in the interest of time if you'd like. I will. Okay. Hi. I'm Lori Schulman for the transcript. I am wearing two hats today. Inside of ICANN I am president of the Intellectual Property Constituency. Outside of ICANN, I am the senior director for Internet policy for the International Trademark Association, which represents brand owners around the globe. I was asked the question, to wrap up with the question, what would be a good outcome for ICANN? And after hearing all of the discussion-- and adding to it my perspective from the private sector.

With that in mind, we've heard and I won't go into great detail because we've heard it. Of what would be the great outcome? Reaffirmation of the multistakeholder model, but understanding that in the UN world, it may not be quite the same as ICANNs. But the underlying principle is making sure that there's an inclusion of technical expertise in policymaking, which may include using more technologists, engineers, and business specialists as policy advisers to the ministers, which goes to Barbara's point about the UN capital connection. Effective policy is developed with substantive knowledge. But we need to know how things work in order to create smart policy. This was the part point that Jothan made and I think made very well. Thank you.

In terms of the private sector, I want to clarify here how I am referencing private sector today. Although I represent commercial stakeholders, to me, in the UN context, private means not governments, and certainly includes the many NGOs who have a critical stake in the process and foster inclusions. It importantly, Olga includes academics who help set the intellectual frameworks for the discussions at the technical and policy level. As was recently stating at a United States based policy event called State of the Net last two weeks ago, all policy is Internet policy today. There isn't an area of debate or discussion where there isn't a factor that relates to connectivity, digital technology and access.

So with all that, I think it's very important to acknowledge the importance of balancing private sector needs and public policy that enhances consumer access and protection and guarantees essential human rights, which are in the global public interest. WSIS is about inclusion, and ICANN is rightfully, actively included as part of a greater framework. This would be an important affirmation to the ICANN community. It is not about the ICANN bubble. It's about having the technical and nontechnical issues being informed by the same human rights principles and technological understanding to achieve the best outcome for the common good. This includes the private sector, and in our view is the sustainable approach moving forward. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Lori. Last speaker, and sorry to not have given you the floor before, but Marita, please go ahead. And try to be in two minutes, please.

MARITA MOLL: Thank you, Sébastien. We've had so much content here so far. I'm not sure that that people can absorb anymore. Marita Moll speaking from At-Large community. And I was a member of ALAC and a member of the North American Regional At-Large Association, and the Canadian nonprofit called Telecommunities Canada. I had a few other things to say, but I'm just going to focus on some of the things the last couple of speakers have said.

We need to mobilize our resources, especially in the end user community where this is only a small part of what most of us do. We don't have all that information on hand. More fora are needed to inform people about how their organizations and their organizations can be productively involved. And I did have an example of an event in Canada back in 2005, which I did attend, which was a civil society consultation on the Tunis agenda, which was very effective. This is organized through our government and the Canadian Commission for UNESCO. This kind of thing, maybe it happened in other countries but I only know about our case. This kind of thing needs to happen.

But also we need to have ways of informing our community about how to actually participate. Thank you. I'll leave it there.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Marita. We are almost at the top of the hour. I may take two questions and then I will have to wrap up. Okay, go ahead, Nicolas.

NICOLAS FIUMARELLI: Hello. I will try to be very brief. Nicolas Fiumarelli, returning ICANN fellow, LACRALO individual member and part of the Youth Coalition on Internal Governance Steering Committee. Over the years, as Raul and others mentioned, we have witnessed the successful implementation of the multistakeholder model through various initiatives such as ICANN, NETmundial, high level parallel on digital cooperation and global digital compact.

However, there is a need to improve the way the model is implemented to ensure that it's a more inclusive and effective. One way to achieve this is to enhance the bottom-up chain by providing a common platform that can be used for every national, regional and global and youth initiatives. This platform could be in the form of a software platform similar to the IGF review platform with paragraphs and the possibility of having comments, which may use artificial intelligence plus

human review to come up with multistakeholder outcomes and cross community processes.

This platform could allow a variety of topics discussed by different stakeholders. As we look forward to the renewal of the IGF mandate, it's imperative to the youth initiatives to take into account the evolving nature of the multistakeholder model in this set of massive participation right. Therefore, it's important to include all Internet governance ecosystem including an ICANN. So I strongly support to consider this proposal to create such a common platform for every national youth rational and different organization ecosystem at the IGF to ensure that it continues to be an effective platform for the internet governance for the years to come. Thank you so much.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you, Nicolas. Last speaker is number 2.

ANA NEVES: Okay. Thank you very much. My name is Ana Neves. I'm from Portugal, and I'm the GAC delegate. And I'm one of the Vice chairs of the CSTD, the Commission on Science and Technology for Development that will discuss the WSIS resolution at the end of this month in Geneva. I'm here to ask you to engage with your government. You think that the

governments will discuss everything and will approve everything. Governments need you. Governments need to have more information on what is going on. As you can imagine for governments, this is not their priority. So as Barbara rightly said, you have to approach the missions. You have to approach your missions in Geneva, in the New York and at national level. You have to raise your voice, and you have to go to the CSTD and raise your voice. Otherwise, we are listening the same old ones and we want more development. We want to evolve. So please be engaged and engage your government. Thank you.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Ana. Thank you for your participation. I fell in three ways. First to use other language than English, second to be on time, and third to engage with you more closely. The way we organize the meeting was really supposed to be back and forth. But the way this room is set up maybe one of the reasons, not the only one that we are troubled to do that. But I hope that you find it interesting. And maybe the leaders of the different community may decide to have a follow-up on this meeting, on that topic at maybe not the next meeting as is a policy forum, but the one in Hamburg could be a good idea. But it's not in my hands.

I would like very much to thank you for coming. The one who are online, thank you for your participation. Sorry for all the one who wanted to talk and I was not able to give you the floor. Thank you for the speaker here and online. And I wish you a good end of this ICANN meeting 76. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]