
ICANN78 | AGM – At-Large Plenary 2: WSIS+20 Towards an engagement strategy
Wednesday, October 25, 2023 – 10:30 to 12:00 HAM

YESIM SAGLAM:

Hello, and welcome to the At-Large Plenary 2: WSIS+20 Towards an Engagement Strategy session. My name is Yesim Saglam and I'm the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will only be read aloud if put in the proper form as I've noted in the chat. I will read questions and comments aloud during the time set by the chair or moderator of this session. Interpretation for this session will include English, French and Spanish. Click on the interpretation icon in Zoom and select the language you will listen to during this session.

To ensure transparency of participation in ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, we ask that you sign into Zoom sessions using your full name. For example, a first name and last name or surname. You may be removed from the session if you do not sign in using your full name. With that, I will hand the floor over to Olivier Crepin-Leblond, At-Large Consolidated Policy Working Group co-chair. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

And thank you very much. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking and welcome everyone to this not consolidated policy working group call,

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.

but it's actually a face-to-face meeting At-Large plenary on the WSIS+20 towards an engagement strategy. Why are we meeting today? Well, because WSIS+20 is just around the corner. The WSIS itself, the World Summit on the Information Society, that's the word now, Information Society, had a sort of starting point during a Tunis meeting in 2005 and a paper that was produced then that effectively defined the multi-stakeholder model in a UN context and recognized the multi-stakeholder nature of governance in some parts of the Internet. And that process was then reviewed 10 years later in the WSIS+10. That included the Internet Governance Forum being reviewed.

That included a whole number of recommendations that we might, will probably be touching on during this session. And that also said that the WSIS itself was going to be extended for another 10 years and this is where 10 years later the WSIS+20 will be probably asking the same sort of questions. And of course one of the questions is whether it will have to continue or not, whether this is the end or whether there is a future in the WSIS process. Anyway, we have a number of amazing experts around the table today. I am happy to see so many people around.

The way that we'll go is to first maybe have a quick look from the inside about the UN processes relating to the WSIS with a few people that know their way very well. And then we'll have panelists that will be looking from different perspectives, government perspective, different stakeholder perspective, different members perspective as to where we're going with the WSIS. Marita is the person who organized this thing. There's this whole process. Is there anything else at this point that you'd like to add as a starting point?

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Olivier. Marita Moll speaking and I'd just like to add thank you very much for everyone for coming. We were really hoping to have a good crowd here and I see that's indeed happened. I'm sure that everybody's got some input on where we as individuals in different countries and members of the ICANN community can be helping to work through this process because there's just kind of two different paths here. We all have potential to do work on the outside. We all have potential to do work on the inside and they both really matter because this the message is that we want to send need a lot of different ways of getting through so that'll be it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marita, and one more thing I'd like to add is I've been told to speak slowly which you've noticed I'm already speaking quickly. We have a lot of energy on this part of the table. If you think we're going too fast please just slow us down a little bit and that's valid for all of us and the table because the interpreters are having a hard time. Sébastien you wanted to say something quickly.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Yes, Olivier, thank you very much. Just to really be careful Lucien Castex what it's written after it's completely false. I ask that to be changed because he's not anymore, for a long time, secretary-general of ISOC France; he's a policy advisor to AFNIC so .fr, and he can't be giving a ccNSO perspective because there is no ccNSO perspective. He will be able to give a CC perspective as he's working for ccTLD. I guess in the

program it was changed I hope, but not in the slide here. Sorry for that.
Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this precision, Sebastien, and perhaps staff will be able to change it before we reach Lucien. So as a starting point, we have the luck of actually having someone who's been part of the process for quite some time in the inside track of the process and I'm speaking about Peter Major, if you could please introduce yourself and give us a little bit of the not even the stakeholder perspective but the inside the UN perspective what this WSIS process was all about.

PETER MAJOR: Thank you, Olivier. I'm Peter Major I'm the vice chair of the United Nations Commission on Science and Technology for Development which may mean nothing to you. It is one of the commissions which has in its mandate the system-wide overview. I'm not going to start from the beginning. So we have the task of the system-wide overview of the WSIS within the UN system. So it means that during the review of the WSIS+10 we prepared a short report of 300 pages about what has happened during the 30 out during the 10 years and it is a very rich report. I recently read again the report and I found out that we had a lot of very interesting new emerging technologies at that time including AI including IoT including social networks.

So basically, we had everything and as usual the United Nations in New York had negotiations at the end of which fortunately it renewed the mandate of the IGF renewed the mandate of the WSIS forum but if you

look into the resolution you find nothing about the new emerging technologies. So I hope that this time when we have again the instructions from the General Assembly to conduct the review of the WSIS+20 I hope that these new technologies will appear in the final resolution of the United Nations. As you may know, if you are not in the resolution you don't exist. I'm being blunt here but that's how it is. And referring to the IGF which happened last week in Kyoto, which was a great event, basically about the IGF if you talk to some diplomats, they would say what is it. I haven't heard about it, or in the best case, they say, I've heard about it but there's nothing in the resolution about it.

I had a proposal during the IGF and we had our first open consultation of the CSTD to include some of the messages of the IGF in the resolution or to include the list of messages as an annex to the resolution at least to show that the IGF does exist and it is prospering to my mind it has been a very rich IGF what we had last week.

I would like to call your attention to the questioner we have for the CSTD referring to the WSIS+20; you may find it of the UNCTAD page, probably it will appear in some of the -- panelists will mention it, will put it into the chat, and I hope that you will contribute to this review process because it's extremely important to have your voice. It is very important to have the voice of the technical community and as we know the technical community in some negotiations doesn't exist it is being part of the civil society if I understand correctly but I'm not really sure so I don't really want to deal with that problem. I encourage you to contribute as much as you can, thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And thank you very much Peter and thank you I think that serves as good opening words get involved. Let's get the first as a stakeholder perspective and we have Veni Mankovski who has joined us and he is the VP on government engagement he's at the United Nations in New York and he follows this process very closely so I should say over to you Veni. I'm not quite sure why the microphone is far away but hopefully that's the right one.

VENI MARKOVSKI: Thanks, thank you. That works. Olivier, the microphone property is in front of the two people who have who are the most important people in the room I was told by someone I'm not mentioning names Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Are you looking for a raise or something?

VENI MARKOVSKI: But I'm thankful for the invitation this is one of my favorite groups because I know so many of you and we've worked in the past for many years and in fact some of the people here have been around the WSIS in 2003 and 2005. So for those of you and you said there is interpretation so I should speak slower. By the way to use the opportunity I'm really thankful to all the interpreters and I hope to be able to say that also in the somewhere in the public forum because they are doing an amazing job in understanding our abbreviations in different languages and being able to keep everyone in the loop of the discussions so thank you guys really appreciate it.

So I'll give you a very quick overview of where we are standing so the WSIS which had two phases in 2003 and 2005 had also produced a document called the WSIS Tunis Agenda in 2005 which was updated in ten years later in 2015 at the WSIS+10 review at the United Nations General Assembly and as you mentioned Olivier in two years it will be updated yet again in the WSIS+20 negotiations so chances are there might be a WSIS+20 outcome document and one of the questions that is very relevant to the broader ICANN community is whether there will be some updates on the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance.

Those of you who have followed these processes know that between 2003 and 2005 there was a working group on internet governance created by the Secretary General of the UN in which actually some of the people probably in this room or at least those online have participated which came with a report in which there was an explanation what is this thing internet governance. 20 years or 18 years later today almost nobody is asking what is internet governance but there are a lot of people who are asking how many models of multi-stakeholder models of internet governance there are and what the United Nations is planning to do.

Now, before the UN gets to the WSIS+20 Review, there is another process which is happening at the UN called the Global Digital Compact, which is starting its negotiations in January after having informal consultations in December, the first few days of December. After these informal consultations, there will be a zero-draft document published by the co-facilitators of the GDC, so we'll be able to see that document sometime before Christmas. Then they will start negotiating, and this

is where the difficult part of the whole process comes into full light, which is this is an intergovernmental process and only governments are allowed to negotiate within the UN General Assembly.

So, yes, we are talking about WSIS+20, we are talking about the Global Digital Compact, but when the negotiations start, the other stakeholders are not part of the negotiations. And that's, by the way, these are the rules of procedure of the UN General Assembly. They are not going to change for this particular meeting or this particular discussion.

So, the natural question that comes to mind is how do we participate? If we want to participate. I talked to the CECs yesterday, I talked to everybody who has invited us to talk, and to you guys. There is a way to actually help national governments by reaching out to them and offering your expertise. You come from different backgrounds and with a lot of history and knowledge about internet governance and how the internet functions.

So, I can make an educated guess that probably every government would be happy to hear from you if you approach them, the respective foreign ministries, and tell them you're there, you can provide them with anything they need on the question of how the internet functions, what is the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance, how ICANN functions, how the technical underpinnings of the internet are coordinated, et cetera., et cetera.

We, from the government engagement side, we are more than happy to work with you, to partner with you, and to hear you, and to not only just hear you, but listen to you if you have any suggestions or advice. I want

to make sure that my colleagues and the At-Large community around the world is working in coordination and cooperation because we have now people in Brussels, Geneva, New York, Washington, L.A, Singapore, and India, and Delhi.

So, we are practically available to you 24 hours every day, except the holidays, which are not that many, by the way. But it is important, I think, to hear your voice on those negotiations in some way or form, whatever it's possible, however it's possible to do. I know that certain countries have organized reaching out to community, like asking the community what the position should be.

In some other cases, for example, the European Union has issued, at the end of June, a document which was accepted by all the ministers of foreign affairs of the European member states, describing the digital policy in the international arena that the EU will have. And this is actually supportive of ICANN and supportive of the multi-stakeholder model of internet governance. And then, of course, you have probably, and I'll finish with that, that I think Peter mentioned the role of the technical community, which is really distinguished and important. However, within the UN language that we hear from the top of the UN, the Secretary-General, he does not mention the technical community as part of the global digital compact. He mentioned businesses, civil society and governments.

He did mention us as part of the WSIS and the IGF, which is, for some of you who may not make the difference, may seem the same, but it's not. Because this quote-unquote tripartite system that was also advertised by the Tech Envoy during EuroDIG, I think, there was a statement by

ICANN, APNIC and ARIN about it, because we think that diminishing or undermining, if you will, the role of the technical community within the GDC is actually the first step towards kind of changing the narrative that has existed since WSIS in 2005, and especially since the WSIS+10 outcome document. Those of you who may be willing to take a search in the WSIS outcome document, the WSIS+10, will see that multistakeholder, the word is mentioned several times. The word multilateral is mentioned only once in the context of internet governance.

So take a look, it's an interesting document. And also, please visit the government engagement publication page, which contains several documents, including one on the WSIS+20 process, with a lot of links to the documents at the UN, which otherwise are difficult to find. So with that, I'll finish, and I'm happy to answer your questions if you have any.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this extensive outlook of what ICANN is working on in this topic. So we'll have questions after each one of our panelists speak, so we don't run out of time before everyone has a say. The next person on our list is Wolfgang Kleinwächter. He's a professor emeritus for Internet Policy and Regulation at the University of Aarhus, has been a pillar of the WSIS process for many, many, well, ever since its inception and before. So I'll hand the floor over to him for a civil society perspective.

WOLFGANG KLEINWÄCHTER: Thank you. Thank you very much, Olivier. And the title of the session is an engagement strategy for the WSIS+20, and I can only support many, many, so I ask it for a button-up process to organize this engagement. Marcus Kumari always argued that good Internet governance starts at home, and the best recommendation is contact as an At-Large structure or part of the At-Large community or civil society, contact your governmental delegate who is involved in the summit on the future or in the WSIS+20 process, and explain what has been achieved and what should be on the agenda for the next five or ten years. So I will reduce my intervention to three issues. I think the first thing is we have to protect what we have. The second point is we have to identify gaps and weaknesses where we have to be better in the future, and then we have to develop key objectives, what we want to achieve in this process.

So the first thing is what we have to protect. I think the Tunis Agenda adopted 18 years ago in the retrospective was a big success because it introduced more or less the multi-stakeholder model. It established the IGF as a multi-stakeholder discussion platform. It recognized the technical community and the I-Star organizations as the main organizers for the day-to-day operation of the Internet management, and it supported a broad process for enhanced cooperation among all stakeholders. I think these are big achievements which are not so in the traditional design or DNA of the United Nations because it went beyond the traditional intergovernmental functioning. And I think this was an important achievement. It has proved that it is successful, but it's challenged today again because some people say a multilateral system is much better than a multi-stakeholder system.

From the very early days, there was never a contradiction between multilateralism and multistakeholderism. Multilateralism takes place in a multi-stakeholder environment today. And certainly, the multi-stakeholder cooperation, if it comes to concrete arrangements, has to be stemmed by governments because they have the only capacity to negotiate treaties. But the question is whether there is a need for a treaty or not or whether we can live with other arrangements. This is part of the process in a multi-stakeholder environment and to identify this. I think this is important and we have to protect this, that we have the multi-stakeholder model, we have the IGF and we have the recognition of the technical community. What are the weaknesses and the gaps?

I think what we have is a definition from the Tunis Agenda. We have principles for the multi-stakeholder approach in the Sao Paulo Net Mundial Declaration 10 years ago, but we do not have our procedures for the interaction. So that means today everybody uses the term multi-stakeholderism, but if it comes to the real policy making, then very often the input for non-state actors in governmental actions is ignored.

I have called this several times governmental arrogance or governmental ignorance because there are no procedures in place and we do have procedures. If a consensus advice goes to the board, so the board has the right to reject a GAC consensus advice, but in this case if the board rejects this, there are procedures in place that then the board has to consult with the governmental advisory committee and they have to find a way how to take this advice into consideration for final decision making. There are no procedures in place.

How advice from the civil society, from the technical community, from business to governments are taken into account when governments make certain decisions. This is a weak point and we have to use the WSIS+20 process and also now the negotiations for the global digital compact to push for the development of procedures for the interaction among stakeholders. This is a big issue. The global digital compact and also the WSIS+20 is not only a meeting where they just have to discuss substantial issues. We have to have on the agenda also these procedural issues. I think this is really important.

My final point is what has to be achieved. So I think one achievement would be if we could stop stupid proposals for alternative approaches. I think this would be a big achievement. We have seen proposals for a new digital cooperation forum. We have seen proposals that the global digital compact could lead to the establishment of a new organizations as we have the global compact of the United Nations from the year 2000. I think this would lead to a waste of resources, to senseless competition between different institutions, all this new language which is introduced by some people on internet governance, digital governance, AI governance, cyber governance. This is confusing because the basic definition from the Tunis Agenda is a broad definition which includes all these elements. It includes the evolution and the use of the internet.

And the use of the internet is related to internet related public policy issue. I cannot see any issue on the digital governance which is not internet related. That means why to establish new bodies and new processes which are related to the internet and to say this is different from the internet governance forum. This is nonsense. We should stop

this at an early stage and concentrate everything to make the IGF stronger. I think the Secretary General of the United Nations, Guterres himself, in his roadmap was in favor of an IGF plus. And if the global digital compact will decide that the implementation of this compact should be done by the IGF, this would lead to the IGF plus. And this would be the implementation of the roadmap of the Secretary General of the United Nations, Guterres. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Wolfgang, and thank you for your energy in delivering these messages, very important messages. Now, next we have Nigel Hickson who is a UK representative in the Governmental Advisory Committee in ICANN. And governments are traditionally the ones preferring multilateral models to multi-stakeholder models. Let's hear from Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Well, thanks very much, Olivier, for that. Nigel Hickson. So, first of all it's really excellent to take part in this session. Thank you for organizing it. And it takes me back to the sessions that we had in something we called the Cross Community Working Group on internet governance, which was set up in the early days of -- well, I said the early days was set up nearly 10 years ago and fostered a cooperation and a discussion forum on internet governance.

And I do hope that, through the multi-stakeholder community here in ICANN, we can perhaps re-establish that as we go before, as we work towards the Global Digital Compact, which will be agreed at the Summit

of the Future in September 2024, and, of course, the WSIS+20 review process, as many have said, would be negotiated ultimately by governments in late 2025. I think it's just so important, as Veni said as well, that we understand and we reach out to everyone in our countries.

But I just wanted to focus on four points, if I may. The first one, in relation to the Global Digital Compact, because the Global Digital Compact is a fairly broad set of proposals that were put forward by the UN. There's been a number of consultations called deep dives on the various elements, including artificial intelligence, including connectivity, including cyber security. And, as Vinnie said, obviously, discussions are going to start early next year.

Now, we still hope, as a government in New York, and our representative in New York, is still confident that there can be a multi-stakeholder component to this. Now, obviously, the actual negotiations are between governments, but building on some other models that have taken place in New York recently, we do hope there can be some element of multi-stakeholder cooperation, perhaps on the days that the text is negotiated, that part of that day can be set aside for stakeholders to collaborate. But that's all to be decided. But that is important.

And, of course, what we are hoping that will come out of the Global Digital Compact is at least supportive of the WSIS+20 process. Now, it might not mention it at all, but that's unlikely. We want it to be supportive. We want the internet governance component of the Global Digital Compact to not only be supportive of the WSIS+20 process itself,

but also supportive of the UN IGF and the national and regional initiatives.

And this is where Wolfgang's point is so important, that perhaps, hopefully, we can lose some of this language of this digital cooperation forum. When we spoke to the tech envoy in London just a week or so ago, he is backpedalled slightly on the digital cooperation forum. He doesn't see it, and as he said at the UN IGF, he doesn't see it as a replacement for the IGF at all. He sees it as more as a sort of monitoring mechanism for the elements in the Global Digital Compact. But we have to see, because the proof is in the pudding at all. So that's the first point.

The second point is the process on WSIS+20. The process is important. The lead-up is important. At the end of the day, the people sitting round the table in New York can ignore everything, as has been said before. They can pretend the consultations, the deep dives, the work of the multi-stakeholder community in putting in papers is -- They can, as Peter Major just said, they can ignore all that. But what we need to do as a global multi-stakeholder community is ensure that through the preparation processes, and these preparation processes include the UN Commission on Science and Technology for Development, that we'll be having plenary sessions in April, May next year, and in 2025, where it will approve, hopefully, a fairly substantial report that will go as a background document for the WSIS+20 review processes.

The WSIS Forum in May next year has a high-level component where ministers are going to be invited to discuss the WSIS+20 process. So hopefully, through those processes, and perhaps through a global

conference that UNESCO will organize in 2025 as well, it will bring countries together with other stakeholders to really recognize the importance of the WSIS process. It's not perfect. The action lines, in many cases, were perhaps too timid. They weren't timid between 2003 and 2005, but perhaps they're timid now. And the process of action lines, the process needs to evolve.

But clearly, there is a lot of, I think, support in many countries for it. But the importance is that in this consultation process, in this preparation process, that stakeholders make sure that their government representatives are at least aware of the feeling in their communities.

Thirdly, and I'll finish soon, thirdly, the IGF. No, the IGF. Too many people, and we have this in the UK government as well, so none of us are perfect. And I wanted to also agree with Wolfgang, this nonsense of cyber governance, this absolute nonsense that this term has developed as a term of art that includes some of internet governance issues and not others. And the UK are just as guilty as other governments in peddling this sort of weird term. If we're worried about cyber security, why don't we say cyber security? If we're worried about cyber crime, why don't we say cybercrime? Why don't we say cyber governance, which just confuses everyone? But I'll probably be sacked for that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Nigel, and goodbye.

NIGEL HICKSON:

It won't be the first time. So, sorry, just on the UN IGF very quickly. So, the real importance of the UN IGF is not the conference that takes place every year. It's the 150, 170, and people around the room know much better than I do, the national and regional initiatives. This is where the spirit of the IGF lives. This is where stakeholders come together, sometimes in countries which have oppressive governments or governments which are not naturally open to stakeholders, where people have come together, civil society, the technical community business, and discuss policy issues.

This is where the spirit of the IGF lives. And when we get to those negotiations, when government representatives get to those negotiations in New York in late 2025, they need ringing in their ears that actually we hosted an IGF. We hosted an IGF, we had stakeholders together. So, for God's sake, if we hosted an IGF, we shouldn't be voting against the renewal of the mandate. So, I think that's so important. And I'll finish there. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Nigel, for this calm intervention. We shall now go for, hopefully, a more energetic presentation from Marita Moll sitting next to me. And, of course, Marita, as you all know, is an At-Large member, and she's going to speak to us about the end-user perspective. Over to you, Marita.

MARITA MOLL:

Oh, my, really. I don't know, Nigel. I was hoping I wasn't going to have to follow something like that. And we're not really in a position to offer

you a position if you do get sacked for what you just said. But our sympathies are with you, and we totally agree that it's great to get passionate about this stuff. It's so complicated. I'm at the bottom of the feeding chain here, really. I'm not in government. I don't actually work for ICANN. I don't have the resources a business would have. I'm part of a small ALS in North America, in Canada, and just trying to figure out how do you get involved in the process. Now, I was. The only reason I'm really that interested in this is because I was actually involved in a process in Canada 20 years ago.

And it was a time when our government -- that was a very optimistic time, and everybody had a lot of positive feelings about the internet and how it was going to bring us democracy and peace all around the world, which it did, didn't it? But, no, we really wanted to be involved. We really wanted to have our stake in the ground. And many -- Our government in Canada did put together, with the help of, I think it was the Canadian Commission for UNESCO, a three-day conference, brought in all kinds of community groups and networking groups and business groups and produced a statement, which then they took to the talks in New York. So that worked out really well. We don't see that kind of stuff happening or coming forward very easily right now.

And the motivation, or maybe not the motivation, but the ability to get it moving forward, the optimism, that our groups are not as well organized as they were at the time, there's less money available, there's less resources at all levels, including governments, don't really have as many resources to spend on this these days, budgets are tight. So it is hard to get anything going. I know, talking about Canada, maybe most of you are also feeling that. The EU has done something. And I hope

that through this particular session, we can get a database of all the documents that we've been talking about so we can all look at them if we're interested and try to work up some common visions. But this is it for me.

We're just trying to figure out how to navigate through this process. And I'm hearing so many really exciting things, and it's really helpful. As far as national IGFs are concerned, we did have a national IGF just in late October. And I did manage to get a discussion of WSIS+20 on the table there. Of course, a lot of people were in Kyoto, our government people were in Kyoto, so they weren't there. But I'm hoping to be able to put something together and present it to them in order to get them to recognize that there are people in Canada who want to work on this stuff and who are interested and want to help. So also one of the problems is that governments are so diversified these days, the people who are here at ICANN, in our case anyways, are not the people who are talking about WSIS.

That's a completely different government department. And so you have to somehow get in touch with them or have your ICANN representatives here help you get in touch with them. So it is complex and difficult and takes resources for small ALSs, I'm sure, in every country. But it's a very important time for us to work together. And I hope that just by having these sessions, we'll find a road forward and be able to do what we need to do, as Wolfgang and Nigel have said, get our word in to our governments and make sure that they actually present it. I'll leave it at there.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Marita. Now, the business sector has also been very much involved in the whole process, and joining us is Désirée Miloshevic, who is an international affairs and policy advisor. I think many of us know her. She's been advising many organizations and companies on these issues, and she's going to be providing us with a private sector perspective. Désirée, over to you.

DÉSIRÉE MILOSHEVIC: Thank you, Olivier, and thank you for inviting me here today. As you have said, one of my previous employers affiliates was the one who was really ice-breaking, the participation of private sector during the WSIS Phase 1 and Phase 2. It was a difficult time for private sector, but also everybody else, non-for-profits, and to really engage in that process, because, as we know, the rules are different, that you cannot participate on an equal footing with the government. So, with that in mind, I also like to thank everyone who spoke and already explained why WSIS is important and why does it matter. I think it does matter because the outcome of the World Summit of Information Society, Phase 1 and Phase 2, brought this document that Nigel has mentioned called the Tunis Agenda, where there has been a recognition of non-state actors and the role.

And when we look at what's at stake, it's really this stake that we will lose the voice and the governments will lose the expertise. And this is really what we'd like to contribute to the process. And when we look inside our tent here at ICANN, the registries, the registrars, the government advisory committee, the ccNSO, so we are all active in these processes of making global policies, at least for the DNS, and we

deal with all these issues that have shaped and are still being discussed and are very difficult, complex issues that are hard to resolve, such as privacy, the misinformation that comes with the use of DNS, the artificial intelligence, newly created content.

And these are some headaches for the governments and those who are not involved in the process of ICANN who understand the way how we work together as a community try to come to a consensus is something I think that is quite important that we as a community, either private sector or other stakeholders, that we have a vision what we want to achieve in this WSIS+20 review.

So I would agree here with what Wolfgang has put on the table in terms of protecting the IGF, but I also want to say that we need to evolve some of these processes so that therefore the so-called IGF plus, because if we lose that venue, we will create additional venue for the discussion and there will be a proliferation of venues that we will not be able to cover. There will be no resources of having multiple tracks and there also won't be any coherent understanding of what are the policies that are being discussed.

I think it's important that when we engage that we want to keep this track or to keep the venues that we are contributing to. Just now at the IGF in Kyoto, there are over 5,000 participants and way too many workshops and governments got their bilaterals and private sector had their discussion and civil society had their discussions. Academia also contributed with GigaNet.

So we are used to that kind of environment that we need to protect where expertise and knowledge is exchanged on a more informal

footing so that everyone could be informed. And so with that vision, I think it's quite important that we are supportive of the WSIS+20 review and I can see a long 24 months hangover of internet governance being here, hanging over us. But I think we have no choice but to engage in these social successful national IGFs.

I have witnessed at least in my region which is the Southeastern Europe, the sprung of so many national IGFs in the UK as well but also around the world. So I think we have a point where we can interact but we also here at ICANN have a point of talking to MAGAC representative, to Nigel, Jorge, others and really trying to align our vision of what is important to be kept in terms of processes.

How do we stay or become a part of delegation that will be at the summit of the future that is taking place next year in New York. New York is also a different venue than Geneva, something that we're used to, maybe less approachable or easy to get access to. So it's really important that we get organized at our local level primarily and then also use the opportunity of all the gatherings and have almost a calendar of events. How are we going to cooperate and whether this cross-working group, cross community working group on internet governance could serve also as one of the steering committees for these engagements. I have other thoughts but I think it's best that we hear from others and open to questions.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Désirée. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. So just one thing, the cross community working group and internet governance no longer exists but I'm sure there'd be some kind of a

group of people in ICANN, interested people in ICANN that could take part in this. But anyway, let's continue through our panelists. We still have Lucien Castex who is joining us remotely but after that we'll have Q&A which means that I can see people start putting your cards up and putting your hands up to get in the queue as early as you can so we have a better idea. And there are also some questions that have been asked online. If you prefer to ask your questions online you can ask them in the Q&A box or on the chat.

I note there's already a couple of questions on the chat. So anyway, Lucien is joining us speaking in French. I hope the system works so that we'll hear him through the interpreters or in French if we want to speak French, of course, for those people that know how to speak French or that wish to learn a new language. Lucien, representative for the public policy at AFNIC, the French country code top-level domain operator .fr. And so he's going to be speaking and providing perspective from a country code top-level domain registry. Over to you, Lucien.

LUCIEN CASTEX:

Thank you, thank you, Olivier, for giving me the floor. Hello everyone from Paris. Indeed, I'll be speaking in French, taking this opportunity since we have interpretation and thanks a lot to the translators. It's the first step of diversity to actually try speaking in a bunch of different languages. So switching to French. We have talked about it a lot already, but the processes at the UN level are many. Since the first SMSE 20 years ago, the Global Digital Compact, since WSIS, and since 2005, the recognitions by the WSIS, the role of the technical community in the internet governance is an essential part. We reside in the DNS,

and we acknowledge at that point that the DNS was allowing the distribution of names.

In this framework, the need here is to have this diversity of voices, diversity of stakeholders, stakeholders having the governments, the private sector, academia, and also making sure that all the specificities of these stakeholders are taken into account, especially in the model, in the ICANN model. The ccTLDs, the registries, registrars, intellectual properties, experts in cyber security, et cetera, needs to be listened to. Of course, the law depends on the countries. We were talking about French law, about Japanese law. We talked about the IGF in Kyoto a week ago. There are texts at the level of the European level, or a judicial text at the level of the international level. So we need to make sure that there is a diversity, a cultural diversity, a language diversity.

And to come back to the ccTLDs, and that's what I really want to talk about today, as the RFC 1591 describes the ccTLDs. And describes the philosophy of the way that it works, how we allocate names, and how it works in terms of administration. The ccTLDs work in a direct link with the international level. With the national level, sorry. IANA does not work in the definition of a country. And here we see the importance of that question in a geopolitical context that is very tense at the moment. If we speak about the ISO 3166, there is the definition of what is a country. And therefore, we have the definition of who has the right to have a ccTLD. So each ccTLD, just like the .fr that it's dealt with, with the AFNIC, is organized in a specific manner.

And it's really interesting to see that in the AFNIC, we have a public service concession that follows this governance model that is based on

neutrality and on a multi-stakeholder model that is created, just like what Wolfgang and Veni said before, to have a dialogue between the stakeholders. The AFNIC, for example, just in the way that it works, has a scientific council, a board that is formed of pioneers and of representative of the state and of representative that have been elected that represent the community. There is a committee that represents the diversity in the national level. And the idea here is to rely on the local community to make sure that the voice of a ccTLD for the AFNIC, for example, it's been 25 years that we deal with the national level. And having this diversity of local actors is key here. We can talk at the national level on a technical topic to an international level.

And this idea of leveling up, because knowing that ccTLD is a warrant of the functioning of the internet in a national level, we have protocols at the technical level, but we also deal with the functioning of the DNS. So when it comes to WSIS+20 and the strategy to adopt in this framework, the message here is key. We want you to take part to the conversation, take part to the conversation in the UN in the CSTD. Make sure to have a conversation with the different national level. Make sure to have a conversation with your government. And adding all of this, it will create an expertise that will make sure that what made the internet successful is kept. This is the interactive model that we have and that we have here in Hamburg, for example. We've heard in Kyoto the promotion of standards that are open and that can be operated by different levels.

And we need to guarantee this in the review, but also in the global digital compact. At the national level, the forum on governance of the internet, like the one that happens in France, are pillars and are the backbones of the multi-stakeholder model of the governance of the

internet. So please protect what works. Make sure to hear all of the voices that exist, first at the national level, then at the international level. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this. So now we're going to be moving to the questions and answers section. I know there are some questions online, which some are responding to online as well. There are also links online to some of the processes and publications that were referred by the various panelists that have spoken thus far, including the CSTD questionnaire that Peter Major had mentioned earlier, the CSTD submissions process. Now, we do have a queue, so if you are online, solely online, you can raise your hand up. If you are in the room, if you're sitting at the table, you can raise your card, and if you are sitting elsewhere in the room, you can raise your hand, and I'll be trying to find, with the help of staff, who wants to speak next.

At the moment, I have a queue of just three people, starting with Jorge Cancio, who's sitting behind me, Tijani Ben Jemaa ahead, and Jim Prendergast in the corner. But we'll start with Jorge, and I believe that there is a flying mic that is flying towards Jorge at the moment, and hopefully has landed. Over to you, Jorge. And a mic with batteries would help as well. It flew, but it didn't speak. So maybe a second one is coming. Oh, there is the second flying mic.

JORGE CANCIO: This is flying. So hello, everyone. Jorge Cancio, Swiss Government, and thank you, first of all, for this discussion. I think it's very important that

this community is aware of what is going on, and more than being aware that this community really takes an active role in the discussions. There are many layers, and you have received some explanations. We, from the Swiss Government, try to follow with all of them. For instance, we are having, right now, negotiations in New York in the General Assembly, discussing, amongst other things, about the process for the Global Digital Compact. So it's not waiting for January. It's ongoing all the time. So it's important to be there to engage.

I think one of the most important messages, probably, is not to adopt just a defensive point of view, but really be positive about what the internet governance, multi-stakeholder ecosystem is delivering, is innovating along all these years, be it at the national, the regional, or the international level, with the IGF, with other processes, with other institutions, and to continue innovating, as also Wolfgang said. There are things where we can continue improving things, like, for instance, developing a kind of multi-stakeholder protocol of doing things that may be applied to develop non-negotiated outcomes, something that we still have sometimes a hard time in places like the IGF. Another point I want to make, and this is not very diplomatic, but, well, I'm from a technical ministry, so who cares?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You might be standing next to Nigel looking for a job after this.

JORGE CANCIO: Exactly. So the message is, make no mistake. If a new institution is created in New York to follow up the global digital compact, it will suck

up the energy from the IGF and from other really multi-stakeholder institutions. So I've heard many different, let's say, audience bespoken messages coming from those instigating the creation of such an institution, and I don't think we want to go down that rabbit hole. So just a warning, a consumer-beware warning. And, of course, I'm available these days in the gag room where I get out for this session. Fortunately, I have a colleague who is following the DNS abuse discussions, but happy to discuss with you, to chat and everything. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Jorge. Just before you give the mic back, you mentioned if a new multi-stakeholder institution is created in New York, does that mean you would favor a multilateral institution?

JORGE CANCIO: Of course, we want a UN agency that controls everything. No, no, to as there are many flavors to multi-stakeholder, and some people sell multi-stakeholder when they mean consulting. And at least to our point of view, to our Swiss position, our tradition, multi-stakeholder is much more than that. It's really a meaningful participation of all stakeholder groups and not just consulting and then being a black box and not knowing what comes out of that black box.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Next in the queue is Tijani Ben Jemaa.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Thank you, Olivier. It's a pleasure to see a lot of friends from the WSIS around the table. First of all, the multi-stakeholder model was adopted by the Millennium Summit, and the first experience was the World Summit and Information Society. It's right that it wasn't perfect. We were given the floor only five minutes at the end of the meeting, but we had the opportunity to give written contribution.

And I can tell you that the result of the summit, Tunis and Geneva, was very much impacted by the work of this free society. So let's take any opportunity to contribute and contribute. Since the global digital compact process preparatory process is multi-stakeholder, we have to work there, and there is a lot of way to work in this.

For example, the regional IGFs. For Africa, we just held the African IGF in Abuja, and we had a session about that. And it was the first session, but we will work on that. We will continue to work on that and give our ideas, our contribution in the preparatory process. I think that we have to use what we have and continue to fight to have better, more. Last word, Wolfgang spoke about enhanced cooperation. Ask Peter Major how it was easy to speak about this issue. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Tijani. And before I give the floor to the next person, I should also mention if any of our panelists would like to react to any of the points that are made, could they please make themselves known, and then they'll be slotted in the queue at the right time. The next person, oh, Peter, did you want to. That's okay, Peter Major.

PETER MAJOR:

Thank you, I'm hearing that participation is very important, and I completely agree with that. And I would like to call your attention that the CSTD is an open commission. So those who have ECOSOC or RISIS accreditation then participate in the meetings of the CSTD, and I invite you to come to Geneva in March next year to attend and to participate in the meeting, and I think it will be a very important meeting. I would like also to mention that, well, in the UN, you have the resolutions. And basically, we start the resolution in the CSTD, which is an ECOSOC resolution, Economic and Social Council.

And at the end of the year, you have the General Assembly Resolution of ICTs, which is based on this resolution, what we are drafting in Geneva. And a last point about multi-stakeholder model. We have had three working groups in the CSTD which were multi-stakeholder, which were really multi-stakeholder. It's not only written contributions. They took part, the participants took part in equal footing, and I made sure it was an equal footing. And as long as I am in the CSTD, it will be an equal footing.

And the final thing, Marita, you mentioned the ministries, the different ministries. Unfortunately, in New York, you have the Ministries of Foreign Affairs. In all other fora, you have the technology ministries, the development ministries, and sometimes they don't talk to each other. They have no idea what's going on. So, probably CSTD is one of the rare fora where you can talk to people who understand and will convey the message. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And thank you, Peter. And just one more thing. The current chair of CSTD is Anna Neves whose of course no stranger to this community since she's been involved as a GAC member and so on at this meeting. Exactly. Fantastic. Now, in the queue, we next have Jim Prendergast who has actually stepped up to the table. Jim, you have the floor.

JIM PRENDERGAST: Thanks, Olivier. I too would welcome the establishment or re-establishment of the CCWG IG or whatever we called it, but this time around, let's not get caught up on process. Let's just get it going. Let's not worry about this charter stuff or whatever it is, it's got to be lightweight and nimble because we need to start this yesterday, not tomorrow. I love the grassroots approach. Bottom up, I think we need talking points for each different segment of the community, whether it be technical, individual users, et cetera, something ICANN can coordinate through the campaign that's part of Sally's goals. I think that's a good deliverable for that.

And then I'm encouraged, Nigel, by your assessment of the tech envoy sort of stepping back a little bit, but I don't trust it. So for Veni or even Elizabeth, there was not a rush by member states to embrace the digital cooperation forum. Are you hearing in the hallways of New York, any nation states, member states that are actually out there pushing forward or supporting it?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Veni Markovski.

VENI MARKOVSKI:

Thank you, Olivia, and thanks for the question, Jim. So first of all, we were at the IGF just last week or two weeks ago. I'm already lost what day is today. And at the IGF, there was a full, I would say, probably even unconditional support for the continuation of the IGF and for the WSIS to be as open as possible to multi-stakeholders. I didn't hear anyone supporting the establishment of a new intergovernmental body under the UN General Assembly, which, of course, doesn't mean that there aren't such. Maybe they were not present at the IGF, which kind of makes sense. If you're supporting a multilateral body, why would you go to a multi-stakeholder session? However, in the process we, and I urge you to try to find, it's public, so it will be easy to find.

There is a letter sent last week by the chair of the MAC and the chair of the IGF leadership panel to the secretary general and to several other recipients. So in this letter, they're basically making the case that the IGF is a good enough forum for discussing all things digital, and they're making the case, which I believe Wolfgang also talked about at the IGF, that there is no digital governance and internet governance. The WSIS Tunis Agenda is wide enough to implement all types of digital governance within the IGF discussions. And the IGF, by the way, can also provide recommendations. It's part of its mandate. It hasn't used it because it's for new technologies, but here is an option, for example, in AI. That would be a good opportunity to reach out to the member states at the UN with some concrete, as an outcome, for example, from the IGF in Kyoto.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But as far, just to follow up, just as far as you're aware, there are no countries that have picked up the mantle and are calling for a digital cooperation forum outside of the...

VENI MARKOVSKI: I said I haven't heard any, but that doesn't mean there isn't one or two.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But specifically, like in New York, I knew they wouldn't be carrying the flag in Kyoto.

MARITA MOLL: Jim, if I could just add, there really hasn't been opportunities to discuss the proposals. There was a launch by the secretary general of the policy brief five, and even representatives in the UN missions, they had not received national positions on it, so they offered some preliminary thoughts. So, as Veni said, there really hasn't been sort of much noise around whether there is -- Well, much noise around views on the proposal. There was also the GDC issues paper, which does have a synthesis of inputs in the various consultations. And in the issues paper, it does outline that there is broad support, of course, for the IGF and for the multi-stakeholder model and certainly to avoid duplication. So I think those are some indications of where some of the views are, but as Veni said, we've not heard much.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Elizabeth. Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON:

The sense we're getting or the reports we get from our mission in New York is that there's, well, two things really. One, that there's not a great deal of enthusiasm for the Global Digital Compact at all. I'm not saying, just because there's not -- there's obviously, New York is the same. People that will sit around the negotiating table often negotiate hundreds of different issues. And the pressures and priorities in New York are perhaps not so much on the Global Digital Compact as on other things. And I think it's also worth remembering that the Digital Cooperation Forum was in a policy brief from the UN. Now, I'm not saying policy briefs from the UN aren't important. Clearly they are, and they have an effect.

But they don't necessarily affect what goes into the zero draft. So the co-facilitators came out with an issues report, which was, I think that he mentioned, which was two and a half pages long and which was generally fairly positive. And that will perhaps form the basis of some of the text in the zero draft. And so it's quite possible that the Digital Cooperation Forum won't feature in that.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you for this, Nigel. Let's go back to our queue. And I'm very much aware of time, which, of course, we're running out of, as we always do when we have a good discussion. The next person in the queue is Sébastien Bachollet. And after Sébastien, I have Amrita Choudhury and Pari Esfandiari. And I think we might have to close the queue and let then our panelists do our quick -- Sorry? And there's an online question, but I think the online questions were being answered as they were

answered in the chat and so on. And it's good, because we can have the two discussions in parallel. So, Sébastien, you're next.

SÉBASTIEN BACHOLLET: Thank you very much, Olivier. Sébastien, for the record. In Cancun, thanks to Nigel Hickson, we had a public session on, and I will have to say it in English, looking towards WSIS+p20, how can we improve multi-stakeholder participation in the governance? In this session today, we can see that this is a follow-up, actually, session of the session that we had in Cancun. And I was very lucky to be the moderator of the session in Cancun.

But I think it is a shame that today we could not have a session that was open to everyone and so it wasn't against other activities. I think that the ICANN meetings, if we forget this idea of being able to bring all the parties together, we are going to lose the interest of a multi-stakeholder model. But also, you see that everyone has said the same thing, is that us, final end users, we cannot follow all of these questions.

So, yes, we need to mobilize, to gather. We need to do what we do, what we like to do in France, some sort of riot, some sort of protest. Do we try to have a meeting with a government who is not even here in today's meeting in ICANN? Et cetera. What do we do? What do we plan to do something at the European level? And I am the chair of the EURALO, so we could think of doing something at the level of Europe, but these are all the questions that we need to think of because we can't afford to travel and follow all of the meetings always. So I really hope that we will not question the IGF.

And the final thing I wanted to say, what happened before Wolfgang said it, the wish to create other structures with other actors, things that were not taken into account ten years ago. From what I know, there is one structure that was created. Thank you to Bertrand de la Chapelle on the internet and jurisdiction. I think it would be good that there would be other structures that would be created on this stakeholder model. And thank you again for this session.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Sébastien. There is another question that is online that we'll try and treat. I'll first get Amrita to speak and then we'll ask the question of our panelists and we'll get Pari to speak.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY: Thank you, Olivia. I'll try to speak slowly. Amrita for the record. As has been pointed out, the process though has been marked as multi-stakeholder is not multi-stakeholder in the real manner. The comments have been invited but we don't know how the comments have been used. And at this point of time, it seems that different stakeholders can only take part in this phase but however when negotiations start would the other stakeholders be at least able to provide their views when the zero draft comes out or what the process is still unclear what the outcomes and how the operations of it is also unclear.

I think as different stakeholders and end users rather than protesting, writing and asking that a clear transparent accountable process is adopted is important along with timelines especially for the GDC and also when this is being discussed having the developing countries in the

room because if you look at the documents the papers which have come up they are emphasizing that some governments or some regions have more power than the other and that needs to be balanced. So if there are issues which are being discussed and they state it is not being discussed in the IGF or existing platforms I would be naming it. It is important to link and show that look these are already being done.

Perhaps we may want to do some homework on it but those discussions are happening rather than saying a new platform will take care of the current issues I for example always believe that we do have an existing working IGF platform where with certain modifications those aspects can be taken care of the IGF plus model would work and just as the NRIs which Nigel was talking about the best practice forums dynamic coalitions are coming up with a lot of information reports which are usable, workable.

I think reusing this but again trying to link it to the questions which are raised on different aspects say access or other things similarly in CSTD there are various things like inclusivity etc. which is brought in trying to bring them rather than saying that IGF is the place but try to say why it is and why these are we are talking the same thing trying to bring it in a new way but these are already being discussed I think that may help and we should demand it that the process be open, transparent and we know when what is being discussed so that we also can pass it on to people. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Amrita. Now there were two questions in the chat which still haven't been answered and I'll read them to the record and then pass

the floor to Pari and ask our panelists in their closing statements to perhaps try and address one or the other of those questions. The first one was by Mr. Abdirashid Ibrahim who is an ICANN78 Fellow so welcome coming from the Republic of Somaliland and his question was how can the WSIS address the growing threat of cyber security and disinformation and actually Veni Markovski who unfortunately had to leave us because he had another meeting where they were waiting for him, who was waiting I don't know, but you can suggest that topic to be discussed in the next IGF for example.

And then the second question was from Joanna Kulesza could the speakers share their opinions on the UN Open Ended Working Group potentially becoming a permanent body with a mandate to negotiate a treaty complementarily what would be the impact of the French POA proposal how likely would that permanent UN body scenario be and what impact might it have on the multi-stakeholder model. We are going to ask for a 90 minute extension for this answer. So in the meantime, Pari Esfandiari.

PARI ESFANDIARI:

Pari is speaking for the record. Thank you, Olivier. Within this discussion, I heard several speakers made a comment about new institution and how they're not beneficial, basically. I see the global internet governance ecosystem very fragmented, and I do agree, and often they work in silos. I do agree that any new institution that adds to that fragmentation or duplicates some of the work is unnecessary. However, I think it's essential to find new institution that tightens that situation and bridges some of these silos. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this, Pari. And now we just have a few minutes until the end of this session, so I'm going to ask for our panelists to provide any additional words or answers to the questions that will be asked. Who wishes to start? Oh, Wolfgang, you're pointing, so I'm looking at where you're pointing. I'm not actually looking. Over to you, Wolfgang Kleinwächter.

WOLFGANG KLEINWÄCHTER: Very short final remarks. The first thing is the global digital compact. The best it would be two pages, limited number of principles based on the Tunis Agenda and the Sao Paulo principles, and the mandate for the IGF to report annually about the implementation. This is my proposal for the GDC. Structures, new structures. We need always new structures because new things are happening, but the best thing is to do it within the IGF. We have dynamic collision. We have policy networks. Now on AI, policy networks on fragmentation. Best practice forum on cyber security. If a new issue emerged, you can use the umbrella of the IGF and to establish an important up development process, new structures. So this would lead to a strengthening of the IGF.

I fully agree with Jorge Cancio. We need a constructive approach. So that means we have this community, the multistakeholder community, have to identify the gaps and then to make proposals how to close the gaps. Not to leave it in the hand of others outside critics. We have to be self-critical to identify the gaps and to make constructive proposals how to solve this and enhance cooperation. So thank you for raising

this issue. We had two UNCTAD working groups on multistakeholder groups on equal footing on enhanced cooperation. If I remember correctly in Tunis, the main controversial point was the US oversight over the root server system.

This has triggered this very confusing language on enhanced cooperation. With the IANA transition, this issue is off the table. And the best thing to enhance cooperation now is within the IGF. And enhanced cooperation starts with enhanced communication and then enhanced coordination. And then you can move to informal or formal collaboration and if needed, you can make also arrangements or treaties. But this has to be a button up process and while the UN always said the IGF and enhanced cooperation are two linked but distinct processes, now time is ripe for the WSIS+20 to say this is one unified process. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Wolfgang. Désirée, do you wish to speak next?

DÉSIRÉE MILOSHEVIC: I'd like to add that I think the world now has changed since 2005 and it's more complex and we live in a place where everyone's competing for the management of internet governance spaces and in trying to set these goals that, for example, Wolfgang just outlined, I do think that we need to engage also with the other side that does not think like us, the people that believe in multilateral because so forth, it's one country, one vote. But the devil is in the detail in terms of processes and us really aligning what we need to achieve that is no duplication of venues where

the internet governance issues and global public policy is set like ICANN, for example, and that we need to preserve this thing that we have been building over the last 25 years. So going forward, I think it's important that the technical community must stay involved.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Desiree. Elizabeth, do you wish to say a few words in the absence of any? You are also listed in the agenda. Elizabeth, who'd work?

ELIZABETH OLUOCH: Absolutely, but I'll speak in my own voice. I think the multi-stakeholder model seems very abstract, I think sometimes, but I think that we're all here as a result of the model. I think that there were some excellent comments made by all the panelists around getting engaged, raising awareness, advancing and sharing collective experiences on the positive achievements of the multi-stakeholder model. And additionally, that this is a priority for ICANN.

And I think as either Wolfgang or Nigel mentioned, it is a CEO goal and there is a campaign around that, so there'll be a lot more, I think, coming out from us on that. And just encourage you, as Veni mentioned, to connect with your governments and to raise awareness of what the WSIS is, of what ICANN is, and also the IGF, our collective experiences over the many years. And that's it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Elizabeth. Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Well, I think we're out of time, so just two points. One is that I agree, Parry, we must not be afraid of change. We need to build on the WSIS, it's not perfect. As I said, the action lines can be evolved. We now have the sustainable development goals. So we need to be constructive. We need to ensure that the WSIS as an aspiration meets the needs of all countries. That's the first point. Second point, lightheartedly, in 2003 in Geneva, I attended for the WSIS process for a government, not the UK government, and I wore pink shorts. And if we have a succession in 2025, I'll wear those same shorts again.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Lucien Castex.

LUCIEN CASTEX: I'll try to be brief as well. Basically, breaking silos and showcasing the successes of the internet and its multi-stakeholder model of governance. Build on it, actual technical operation of the internet, I was mentioning the role of CCTLDs in the technical operation and facilitating the dialogue at the national level. But also, if not perfect, the national and regional initiative are an extraordinary example. Strong support in Kyoto for the strengthening of the IGF and to further develop relation between the UN IGF and NRIs to actually have a model. IGF Plus and the international work, international work of the IGF is growing. It's quite interesting. The policy network on artificial intelligence have been mentioned. This is great work to build on. And

most of all, obviously get engaged at the local and at the global levels.
Thank you from Paris.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Lucien. And with my apologies to Choky and Ramdan, who did send a question in the Q&A, but for some reason it didn't appear on my screen. But this is an ongoing thing, so we're going to have a follow-up after this as staff breaks all the equipment here on the corner. Marita Moll.

MARITA MOLL: Thanks, Olivier. No breaking. Thanks, everyone. I'm here talking to end users at the who, well, they've heard about the multi-stakeholder model. They know it's important. They kind of, was this, well, maybe. They've heard of it before. We have to educate people. We have to make sure they understand that we have something to protect and establish why it's important. I'm spinning off Wolfgang here. We have to identify the gaps and weaknesses and the successes and the importance of all this. And we have to make sure we have our objectives and visions in place. We have to establish our principles.

This is a lot of work to do. And we have to make sure that our governments, we're talking to them, and they're the ones, we're talking to the right people, and they are going and willing to communicate our message because I have also heard that that also happens. civil society does all kinds of stuff, and then it never ends up in the final, in the final communique. These are all a lot of things for people on the ground to keep in their heads. But we can do it. But we have to get started now.

And I'm very appreciative of this panel and all of these discussions. And I think we probably won't be at the end of it. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Marita. And Tijani, I can't say no to you, so 20 seconds.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Just to say why they put the technical community inside the civil society. They probably copied what happened in the WSIS, but at that time, I remember the spirit. They call it stakeholders. They call them stakeholders. Every stakeholder has a stake. And for them, there was three stakes. Political stake, financial stake, and public stake, public interest stake. That's why the technical community are supposed to defend the public interest. And that's why they are in the civil society. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Tijani. And thanks to everyone for their wisdom and wise words today. There will be a follow-up. Marita has taken notes. Staff have taken notes. We've of course got a recording. And there are several action items that will be forthcoming out of this. Too long to list at the moment because we've really run out of time. Thanks very much to interpreters and of course to all of the people that have taken part in today's meeting. Have a very good rest of ICANN meeting.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]