
ICANN83 | PF – Europe Space
Wednesday, June 11, 2025 – 15:30 to 17:00 CEST

MAGALI JEAN

Hello and welcome to the Europe space. My name is Magali Jean, and I am a participation manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN expected standards of behavior and ICANN community anti-harassment policy. During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted within the Q&A pod. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. If you would like to speak during this session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, virtual participants will be given permission to unmute in Zoom. On-site participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record, the language you will speak if speaking a language other than English, and speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Chris Mondini.

CHRIS MONDINI

Thank you. Hello. My name is Chris Mondini. I'm not in the Zoom room yet, but I will be shortly. Please let me know if there's anything I should react to in the Zoom room. My title is managing director for Europe. I sit in the Brussels office. And I'm delighted to welcome you all to Europe Space here in Prague in our wonderful region. The purpose of Europe Space is really to do a couple of

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.

things. To give us some opportunity to discuss and learn about some of the top issues of the day, what's on the minds of your fellow stakeholders. And really a big part of it is to highlight all of the talent we have that's very diverse across our region. And so even looking around the room, I know there are people from the private sector. I know there are people with government roles. We have people who are from the At-Large community, people from the staff, people that are in all the different sectors and stakeholder groups that are here at ICANN. And many of the European issues are cross-cutting across everything that we do. And so whether we sit in a particular sector or whether we sit in a particular structure of the ICANN community, I think it's nice to have this opportunity as a region to discuss them in a multi-stakeholder format.

Now, the idea is to be conversational and be short and punchy and keep the conversation going. Hopefully, it won't feel like the average ICANN listening to lots of reports. Hopefully, you'll have some good questions, some strong opinions, controversial points of view. But we're here to learn. And we're here to learn about each other. So be sure, when you take a microphone, to introduce yourself and even what part of the community or what stakeholder group you're from. And speaking of the talent that we have in the region, I just want to go down the list of the names of the people who are participating. So we don't need lengthy introductions. But we'll kick off right away. And I would call them like fire starters. So they're not presenters. They're getting the conversation going. We have Romain Bosc from RIPE NCC. I think online, we have Dimitris

Zacharias. And we'll have David Frautschy, Chris Buckridge, Wolfgang Kleinwaechter. Is he here? Wolfgang will be coming shortly. And Alishah Sharif. Hi. So I'm really glad that you're here. They're the fire starters. But all of us are the participants. And we have some great moderators with us today. I want to thank Magali, who's sitting there in the middle as a remote participant. Thank you very much. And she is flanked by our really able moderators and great colleagues in the region, Elena Plexida of our government and IGO engagement team, and Adam Peake, who is working in the stakeholder engagement team and has put all of this program together for us. So please take it away, Adam, and enjoy the conversation, everybody.

ADAM PEAKE

Thank you, Chris. I think there's something I should probably make clear at the beginning. By the way, Adam Peake, Global Stakeholder Engagement ICANN. Dimitris does not work for Center. I should have put the word ICANN after his name. My apologies, Dimitris, but we know you and love you, so that's fine. In addition to some speakers, I should have mentioned Nati and Emilia, who are ALAC members from the region and have promised to jump in and speak. Could you go forward a slide, please? Trying to remember the order. So it's busy. We wanted to talk about European initiatives, which are broadly regulatory issues. And with quick, because each one of these topics could probably go on for 60 or 90 minutes, quick interventions to explain what the topic is and then seek your response. Because it's about you and having a

discussion on your opinions. If we could, I'd like to go over to you, Elena, and if you'd like to jump right in with the first agenda item, which is NIS2 updates, implementation, and let's see where we go from here. Hope it works. It needs your help. So please jump in and discuss with us.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Thank you. Thank you, Adam. Hello, everyone. Yep. We have a dense agenda, and not all the agenda items that we could put in the agenda are actually up there. So the discussion is open to anything that we feel like should be included. We thought we should start with NIS2. It's something that's ongoing, and the implementation is ongoing. Not all the EU member states have adopted, transposed, that is, in the international law, the NIS2 directive just yet. If I'm not mistaken, it's around 9 or 10 that have fully transposed. The rest are under infringement procedure by the European Commission. When it comes to article about the registration data, we do see some deviations. Like, for example, in Belgium, you have in the national law that urgent requests should be served within 24 hours, which is something that the original directive doesn't have at all. In other member states, we see that they name the legitimate access seekers more specifically. But really, I think that the most important bit to concentrate on when it comes to the NIS2 implementation is not this time around, as a surprise, the registration data. It's rather the implementing act, so secondary legislation that was adopted by the European Commission to specify further the measures. And there, we have

the suggestion. So the suggestion is already there now for a multi-stakeholder forum on internet standards, which I find fascinating, to be honest. And I think I will turn over to Romain for more on that.

ROMAIN BOSC

Thank you, Elena. Hello, everyone. I am from the RIPE NCC, Romain Bosc. So we are part of the naming part of ICANN as original internet registries based in Amsterdam. We are indeed very much interested in this new multi-stakeholder forum initiative that the European Commission presented. And why I was invited to talk about it is because we had a RIPE meeting last month in May in Lisbon. And we invited the European Commission to present on this topic. It's quite new. I mean, we knew it was coming. It's the recital aid of the implementing act. But something that is a bit less known is the very provisions that are actually anchored in this initiative. And this is the network security requirements that are very granularly given in the annexed document to the implementing act. So the overall approach is interesting. I mean, the commission was mindful of keeping technology-neutral language, which is very much welcome. And here we are specifically looking at the last three provisions, again, of this network security item, which is the point 6, point 7, point 1 of the implementing acts. And the first one relates to actually requirements for relevant entities, meaning I'm not going to give the whole list, but some people would refer to as the digital infrastructure providers. First one relates to the implementation plan to, I mean, for the full transition towards latest generation

network layer communication protocol, and of course here we immediately think about IPv6. The second provision is about email security standards. And the third one relates to DNS security and routing security. So these topics are, of course, very much relevant to our respective communities, and the whole plan of the commission is to build a forum to help them identify the relevant standards that relates to these work streams and the deployment techniques and give them guidance on how best to implement these standards. So it should be organized across four main work streams. Again, the first one relates to the internet protocol layer, email security, DNS, and routing security. There will be a coordination group being set up, and while we appreciate the need to inform the commission on the best implementing and deployment techniques, one of the main concerns from the community that was also expressed to the commission at RIPE meeting is why creating yet another layer of forum and governance forum. So we hope that we find the right format, and we also invite commission representatives to attend the existing, the well-established technical community events. And I think for now I will stop here, but there is much more to say about the implementation of NIS2. But this is really the inception phase, and in the coming weeks and months, the commission will detail the plans which it should organize a call in Q3 of this year, basically. So stay tuned, and I will stop here.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Thank you, Romain. So yes, it's very interesting to note what Romain mentioned. There are going to be four work streams of this multi-stakeholder forum, IPv6, email security, DNS security, and internet routing security, which as Romain said, and I find that the comment that came out of your community, very on the point, like there are existing fora at the global level that are discussing these issues already, and as you said, how do we find the right balance?

ROMAIN BOSC

That being said, I mean, the commission has been monitoring the deployment of these standards for quite a while now. They have the joint research center that produced a couple of interesting studies and reports. It's also an opportunity to feed the commission with the latest data, the insights, and the expertise of the community. So this is where we can actually build a collaborative platform and make the best use of it.

ELENA PLEXIDA

I suppose it all depends on the agenda and how you handle these meetings. Anyone would like to come in on this particular point? Adam, do you want to move to the next one?

ADAM PEAKE

Something that will run through what we're discussing today, these are all individually important issues, so as Romain just introduced, and we, as ICANN, of course, are interested in this. If there are topics that you would like further investigation, if we can

organize webinars on these things so we can drill down deeper, then that's one of the points of the session today, is to identify issues that you, as the European community, may wish to know more about, although it is the summer coming up, so let's be careful about scheduling. So the next intervention, David, I'm hoping you're online.

DAVID FRAUTSCHY

I am. I am online. Sorry that I'm not able to be with you in Prague. Can I have, may I have presenting rights? Okay. Thank you for that. So I will share my screen, because I have just a few slides to share in order to trigger the debate, as Chris said at the beginning. So you have asked me to make some comments on this thing called Web 4.0 and virtual worlds that the European Commission is working on. What is this? This is something they have been working on for a few months already. The main event was a two-day conference on the end of March, 1st of April, that happened in Brussels. If you are interested, you have the link to all the information related to this topic. The thing is that the European Commission is working on a set of recommendations on how to deal with Web 4.0 and virtual worlds. Now, what is Web 4.0? Well, the Commission themselves, they made a definition that you can see on the screen. It's about what happens to the Internet when you add artificial intelligence, when you add blockchain, when extended reality is there. Well, I would say Internet of Things. All the buzzwords that you can think of when you've mixed it, when you add them up, and they claim that the Internet is going to be a different one. Well, we don't know

about that thing, Web 3.0, 4.0. The thing is that they have been asking stakeholders what is their opinion on the impacts of all these new technologies into the Internet. Of course, one of the things that must be clear for stakeholders is the huge difference between what the Internet is, the infrastructure that allows for all these services to happen, and this different layer where all these applications are running. But nevertheless, the European Commission has been working on this initiative, and the intention was to gather input for the WSIS Plus 20. The outcomes of that conference, and I'm not going to go through all of this, are six policy principles and six technology principles. And I think most stakeholders can align with what is on the screen. But of course, as sometimes it's said, the devil is on the detail. Of course, I guess most of us can agree on the importance of security, of accessibility, of ensuring privacy and data protection, and ensuring that all this is done with a multi-stakeholder approach. And we can all probably have the views that the messages here on the screen are the right messages. But the importance is, of course, what is behind these messages.

Now, when the EuroDIG conference happened just a few weeks ago, the European Commission organized a discussion about the conference. And one of the things they disclosed was the three topics that they want to have in the WSIS resolution. And they came up with these three ideas. The objective of ensuring digital inclusion and emerging divides. Of course, very much aligned with the visions of stakeholders that want to maximize the usage of the

Internet. The importance of ensuring how human rights interact with these new emerging technologies with an approach of ensuring that rights are respected. And then they came with this concept that it's governance sandboxes, multi-stakeholder governance sandboxes. Now, if we want to start up a discussion, and I think it's important because this can be worrisome, let's go to the details here. Because when asked about what are governance sandboxes, the issue can be very tricky. We've all heard about regulatory sandboxes as a concept where in a closed environment a set of rules can be disregarded so that there is some kind of experimentation, as I said, in a closed environment, perhaps with real customers, but in a setting where the experiment would not go much further. But that is regulatory sandboxes, where regulators want to experiment or give the freedom to companies or corporations to experiment with new services without intervention. Now what is a governance sandbox? Is that something that needs to be discussed in detail? What are the implications of that? And then we have two different documents. One is on the left of the screen, the outcome document from the conference, where we see a footnote where it talks about diverse and appropriate stakeholders. And then there is on the right, on the green color, a better, I would say, better approach. And there's no, well, the word appropriate has been changed for existing governance institutions. Why it is worrisome? For me, the word appropriate, the expression appropriate stakeholders, can lead to a strange place. Who determines who is appropriate? What I read here is a subset of stakeholders taking decisions. Now the second

version, existing governance institutions, seems much, much closer to an open multi-stakeholder reality, which is what we defend. And then European Commission official said in public, and I'm quoting here, the intention of these sandboxes to stimulate or encourage, to encourage the real discussion about the future of the Internet. So if we, if this is taken to WSIS+20, then we have to be careful. I think I have, in my mind, I think it, I have clear what the European Commission wants or what the European member states want from this. But I am not sure what other governments would read when they see this expression. And I think there is a lot to be done to explain or to define. Otherwise we can find ourselves in a tricky situation with this governance sandboxes.

Now the web 4.0 thing has not finished. The Commission and the consultants continue talking to stakeholders and a couple of weeks ago on May 21st or three weeks ago, they organized another workshop about identity. And I was very worrisome again with this workshop because they put participants into four different rooms, let's say virtual rooms, of course, so it was a virtual workshop, into four virtual rooms to discuss four different scenarios related to identity in virtual worlds. But there was no, there was no scenario where identity was not required. Now do we want to go to a reality on the Internet where everyone has to be identified just for web browsing? Well, my fear is that this is not in the mind of the Commission. They were putting stakeholders to discuss only scenarios where identity at different levels, but identity to some extent was required. So this is something that we, as stakeholders,

we need to have an eye on because I am not really sure that we want an Internet where everyone has to be identified for using the services. And the next discussion around this will take place next week or June 18th, so I'm not sure. So this is just to share with you that these actions related to Web 4.0 are ongoing. And yeah, I'm stopping here my presentation and happy to start the discussion if someone has a question.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE

In the last slide you said that you want to go to decentralized data storage and more privacy. How does it work with the proposed WHOIS replacement where all the data from all people of all over the world are stored in one centralized location?

DAVID FRAUTSCHY

Sorry, I didn't understand the question. This is not something that I am proposing. This is what the European Commission wants stakeholders to discuss.

LUTZ DONNAGER

Okay, understood. Now we have discussed it and [inaudible].

DAVID FRAUTSCHY

So if you see on the left, this is what the discussion was about a couple of weeks ago on digital identity. They wanted stakeholders to discuss a reality of future Internet where everyone was identified using the UID, of course, but everyone identified. Four different

scenarios with four different levels of identification and I said why aren't you designing a fifth scenario where there's no identification and there was no response for that and there will be an outcome document, I guess, with recommendations with a limited set of scenarios to discuss where there were only the only possibility was being identified and that's the future they see. Now the discussion in a couple of weeks on June 18th or next week, sorry, it's about decentralized data, service architectures, what they want stakeholders to discuss. I don't know. I will join the conversation and I will report it internally at the Internet Society to see if we have concerns. I know we might have concerns with a reality where digital identity is required. I don't know what will be the realities that the European Commission wants us to discuss in the upcoming workshop. But I encourage you all to attend. It's an open session.

EMILIA
CZAJCZYŃSKA

ZALEWSKA- Thank you very much. It's Emilia Zalewska-Czajczyńska, ALAC for the record. As somebody who has been following the topic of virtual worlds, which was also called Metaverse since Mark Zuckerberg renamed his company to Meta. I have and also I was observing the rise when, I don't know if you remember, but we're all supposed to live in Metaverse by then. I don't think we are. So, I have quite strong opinions about this whole process, but I know it is not your proposal, it is the European Commission's one, so I won't address the comments to you. I have a question, which is, because I am interested, maybe you catch the Commission's

proposal on how to address the topic of sandboxes. What I mean is that we already have the legal obligations for each member country to set up regulatory sandboxes for AI. It is like they have to do this, it is in the AI Act. We have also European sandboxes. There was this idea of regulatory sandboxes for health data, regulatory sandboxes for virtual worlds. Now we have governance sandboxes. This is pretty a lot of sandboxes. And my question is, what is the Commission's approach to this? How do they plan to somehow maybe merge those efforts of setting up sandboxes, like having, for example, sandbox for more than one thing? Or maybe the plan is the other one, like a lot of different sandboxes. So this is the question.

DAVID FRAUTSCHY

So I cannot speak for the European Commission. What I want to raise is my concern that there is a qualitative gap between a regulatory sandbox and a governance sandbox. We have experience in what a regulatory sandbox is. This has been going on for a number of years. But a governance sandbox, it's something new. It's something that is not defined. And if I bring the definition of regulatory sandbox to a governance sandbox, I think it is incompatible with the open multi-stakeholder architecture. I think. For this reason, I require a more detailed explanation of what they want. I don't know. And I also have my concerns that despite good intentions of the European Commission, which I fully trust, I think other governments in other jurisdictions might have a different reading of this concept. And if this is something that is not well

defined, and it's written in the WSIS outcome, then it can be misused. And this is the concern I'm bringing to this room for discussion and for evaluation and having in mind for the next weeks.

EMILIA
CZAJCZYŃSKA

ZALEWSKA- Thank you so much. If I may, just a quick follow-up. My question was, of course, I know you are not the European Commission, so I was just wondering maybe if while following the discussion you somehow caught what's their plan for this. I haven't, so that's why I wonder if it is just me or maybe it's just not very clear. One thing I would disagree. I don't know if we are all well set up with regulatory sandboxes, like we know better what it is, but I would say that in practice it is still very, very challenging to what extent, because a lot of people, I think, still imagine sandboxes like, I don't know, taking a company and putting it on a desert and it can experiment with their solutions there, so nobody is affected. This is not how it works. And, in fact, users can be affected by something that may happen in the regulatory sandbox. So, yeah, it is, I would say, still very complicated and adding the governance sandbox to this discussion is just having a new, undiscovered, unexplored element there, which is very confusing.

DAVID FRAUTSCHY

I agree with you. That's why I think it's important to disclose, not to disclose, because this is not a secret. These are public documents, but I think it's important that we discuss these issues and people

are aware and stakeholders are aware that this is what is on the table right now, and I think these issues require a proper definition. Otherwise, they can bring unintended consequences.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Thank you, David, and thank you, Emilia. I'd also like to echo what both of you were saying. Regulatory sandboxes and governance sandboxes are a completely different thing. Sandboxes, yes, maybe, but same word, but that's a completely different thing. And just to add a little bit more color to this conversation, David informed us about the outcomes of the conference and the continuation of the discussion, which is, of course, something to bear in mind. The extra color I want to bring in the discussion is the preparation leading into the conference. We had some documents that were there out in the lead for the conference where the assumption was made that technological evolutions such as Web 4 or virtual worlds, whatever these are, or are not, to your point, you are right, they will necessitate a change to the network layer of the Internet, the network layer of the Internet, not the application layer of the Internet, and they will necessitate changes in the governance of organizations like ICANN and the IETF. And now couple that with the governance sandboxes that are in the outcome of this. So something to bear in mind also, bring in extra color. And I think Adam has a comment.

ADAM PEAKE

Oh, my comment is really a question for David. We have on the agenda the European Union and the councils agreed suggested lines to take for WSIS. Suggested lines to take means the lines that the member states should be taking as part of their messages into the WSIS+20 review process. David, is it correct that the sandboxes are part of that process? I know they were earlier. I haven't read the most recent, so it would be interesting to know if sandboxes are going forward in the lines to take. And then as a suggestion, you have now met Emilia and David Emilia. It would be very nice if you got together in the At-Large European Rallo, perhaps held a workshop on this topic. I think it would be very helpful. And Callum, you already know the people involved. I think that would be really helpful to take this forward. Particularly after we hear about the outcomes of next week. But the question, David, did it go forward in the lines to take or where are we with it?

DAVID FRAUTSCHY

Yes. So on screen, if I don't know, well, I think I'm sharing my screen. We have the three issues that the European Commission is asking member states to bring into WSIS. As you know, the European Commission is not a player in WSIS. It's the member states. But the European Commission has a coordination role so that the European Union speaks one voice, one same voice. And they are pushing to have these three issues on screen. And one of them is the governance sandboxes, as you can see here. So, yes, this is what the European Commission is pushing for. When the European Commission is asked about a definition, then I've heard

them say in public, and you can go to the EuroDIG, you know, the EuroDIG sessions were recorded. And there's a transcript that has been published. You can go there and say, and you can read what the European Commission says is we don't need a very detailed definition of this concept. And I'm worried. I'm worried if this is the real intention, to go to a UN resolution where issues are not well defined and where interpretations can diverge depending on the intentions of the stakeholder or the government that is reading the paper. So, for me, this is a concern that I want to bring to you. And, yeah.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Very good point. I think the one that David is raising, it's one thing to have a discussion at the European level about something, and it's a completely different thing to have a discussion at the global level, let alone at the UN processes.

DAVID FRAUTSCHY

Yes, because we, sorry to interrupt, Elena, I have no doubt that the European Commission has the best of intentions. They believe in the multi-stakeholder process. They believe in the open Internet. But when other governments read this document with this language, if this language is not well defined in a proper context or with limits, then the outcomes can not be, may not be, the multi-stakeholder processes.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Yeah, thanks. I'm Chris Buckridge here. I'm not speaking as an ICANN board member. I've been having this discussion for a few weeks now about sandboxes and regulatory sandboxes and operational sandboxes and governance sandboxes. And I acknowledge the concerns that people have, and people certainly who know a lot more about sandboxes than I do. I think what I worry a little bit about here is I'm hearing a lot of concern, but I'm not hearing how to engage with this in a productive or positive way. Because what is the underlying, and maybe David, you have a perspective on this, the underlying motivation for this sandbox idea in the European Commission context? And I mean, I assume it's in relation to the much broader discussion we have about with the development of new technologies with, you know, what we're seeing with AI, what we may see with quantum, even, you know, if the metaverse or those kinds of technologies become more prevalent in coming years, are the governance structures that we have up to the task or even just suited to the task? And what are the processes that we would have for evolving those? I think ICANN, you know, needs to be open to that conversation. We always need to be open to the conversation of how we evolve our multi-stakeholder model to address the changing technological and sociological environment. The sandboxes idea to a relatively layperson in that context sounds like a very sensible approach in terms of, yes, we want to try and have the flexibility to experiment and try things in a context where it's not going to necessarily impact. I think the point that it's not that is a very important one to make, and if it's going to impact the broader net. But I think making

that point to the Commission, but also, as you say, to the member states that are being invited to take these lines into the WSIS negotiation, there needs to be a positive engagement with that idea of, you know, how do we as technical community foresee this adaptation, evolution, moving forward? And how can that fit into the WSIS discussion? So I don't know if others have sort of responses or thoughts on that.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Thank you, Chris, for adding more color to the discussion. I will speak as ICANN staff and say that at least I think that we engaged, and I think David will say the same, and others here in the room positively, in the sense that we did wholeheartedly participate in that conference, actually at the level of the CEO, who was repeatedly trying to make the comment, the point that those are brilliant discussions to be made because we have to look ahead. But when you're having them, without the but, he was much better into phrasing it than I am, bear in mind that this thing we call the Internet has different layers, and it's another thing to talk about the network layer, it's another thing to talk about the application layer. We should make sure we don't mix the two, particularly to David's point, when we're going into other fora where other interests are playing in. But yeah, thanks. Anyone else? Okay, no. Maybe we could jump to something that is more positive or sounds more positive, which is the international strategy that was published recently in Brussels. Who are we over to?

DIMITRIS ZACHARIAS

It's Dimitri from ICANN, not CENTR, but it's all good, Adam, it's all love from here to you and to CENTR, of course. On another subject, moving on, that is relevant for ICANN and the community, and also for European stakeholders, as it's rooted in EU institutions making a proposal. Last week, the European Commission, the Directorate General for Network and Communications, communications networks, and the European External Action Service published a joint communication on an international digital strategy for Europe. Joint communication is a non-legislative proposal from the European Commission. It essentially lays out plans that the European Commission is going to pursue going forward in engaging with international partners in the digital sphere. The proposal is rooted in essentially two things. First of all, is a set of council conclusions that came out in 2024, essentially inviting the European Commission to consider and work on the external aspects of digital policy, as well as the digital aspects of foreign policy when engaging with international partners. And the second one is something that European stakeholders are quite aware of, the Draghi report, which was a report laying out some of the gaps identified in terms of innovation, investment, and the future of the European digital economy, but also economy at large. So based on those two foundations, the European Commission published the reports late last week. Yes, late last week, sorry, on the 6th of June, if I'm not mistaken, Thursday. It's a document that contains some of the strategic objectives for reinstating Europe as a key leader in

digital affairs. It's founded on three pillars, if I may say that, striking and building on and leveraging international partnerships with other digital partners, not only the traditional ones that Europe has been working on, transatlantic only, but also engaging with countries of the global south. The second one, which is building within its strategies, the emerging technologies, so ranging from stuff that we discussed before, like virtual worlds and AI, all the way to quantum cyber, 5G, 6G, etc. And then the third big pillar, which is the annex of that communication, are the specific action points that the European Commission is communicating to the member states and will be working on policy initiatives in the future. And within those action themes, one of them is dedicated on internet governance. What is important and relevant for us to mention to you and we can have a conversation on is that it's great that internet governance is recognized as a distinct field within which the European Commission wants to leverage its international voice and build partnerships. And within that theme, there are sub-actions that the European Commission is pursuing. Of course, on paper, with the adopted communication, defending the multi-stakeholder model, which is a great foundation of the action lines on internet governance, and then also some other relevant actions, such as ensuring proper follow-up and review of the implementation of the GDC, and ensuring a suitable outcome of the WSIS+20 review negotiations, and then also supporting an international extension and broadening of the open internet stack, referring to foundational structure of protocols that enable communication information sharing on the internet. And then

lastly, to build into the previous conversation that we were having, the European Commission is calling for or will be working on extensive mapping of how the EU could potentially contribute to improved or new networking protocols and solutions to enable positive impacts of new technologies like AI, extended reality, virtual reality, blockchain, Web 4.0, and others. The European Commission, prior to adopting the international digital strategy, launched a call for evidence, which lasted up until May. ICANN also notified the community of it. As ICANN Org, we also participated in that call for evidence and provided our contribution to the Commission. As we're aware, Center did as well, ISOC did as well. It's great to know that several organizations within the space took the opportunity to participate. I'm not going to get into more specific details. We can share the documents with you. They are available also on the ICANN website, how we contributed as an organization, but also the relevant links that you can find through the consultation. I'm happy to take any questions after also Filip from actually CENTR takes the floor.

FILIP LUKAS

Hello everyone. My name is Filip Lukáš. I'm from Center. It's a bit, well, you Dimitris, you said pretty much everything. You summarized very well. I think what I would add is that the Commission explicitly mentions the central role of ICANN, so that's positive.

ELENA PLEXIDA

That was the positiveness I was referring to before, I guess.

FILIP LUKAS

So that's positive. And then what happened actually before the publication of the strategy itself and before the public consultation was open, was that the leaked version was available. And it specifically said that the EU tech decoupling is not realistic. However, in this final version of the document of the strategy, this has been changed. And rather, the strategy really intends to strengthen the sovereignty. And even so, includes a reference to the fact that the EU faces risks of weaponization of its technological and economic dependencies and the risk of critical technology leakage. So I think I would leave it with that.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Thank you, Filip. Very interesting. And I read some articles as well, going back to what you were saying, saying that the funds of the so-called Euro stack initiative were not pleased at all with the strategy. They felt that it is not bold enough. But then again, others were saying, we've got a reality check on whether we can be completely decoupling from the US. Any other comment on this? Yes, please.

SUNCICA ROSIC

I'm NextGen. I have background in data science and economics from CEU in Vienna. So I would like to point out to something that was brought up by Dimitris, which is the open internet and digital foreign policy. And I think that this is very important because it has

the potential to address the declining digital autonomy. And I have a follow-up question for this, which is how to design European foreign policy space in a way that it allows shifting us towards a more decentralized ownership of the internet, such that it also tackles the issues of declining digital autonomy. Thank you.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Thank you so much. I can attempt an answer, but anyone please help out. I'm looking at you both. I guess it depends on what we defined as, you said, create a more decentralized internet. So how do we create a more decentralized internet, right?

SUNCICA ROSIC

Not creation in a technical sense, but more in a policy space, because I think that we have available policy space, which is great. And we should use this space to also have more distributed ownership, such that it allows more autonomy to governments. So I was wondering, OK, what is the policy environment we need to create in order to allow for this change?

ELENA PLEXIDA

I think I will say this is out of ICANN scope, as such. The point I would make is, when it comes to the internet and the technical area of the internet, how more decentralized can it be? It, as a thing working, and its governance. You're talking about the policy layer, or the big techs that are, you know, everyone's top of mind. That's a completely different thing. And I'm not sure I would want to be in

the shoes of the policymakers and make the decision. So I don't think I can answer that, as ICANN staff, at least. Do you have a comment?

DIMITRIS ZACHARIAS

Well, I think a simple answer to this is to actually entrust and straighten the multistakeholder model and the organizations that are running the core functions of the global internet, given what the geopolitical outlook is. And especially now, the EU is facing a complex security environment. And if there is one thing that I believe stands out from the strategy is maybe the tone and the kind of attempt to reframe the sovereignty narrative in a different way, which is more focused on building competitiveness and building partnerships. So it's more of a positive agenda. And that is breaking path, maybe from a previous attempt to cut ties or, I mean, managing interdependencies and building resilience through value chains is still a big priority for the Commission. But I think it's more of a positive framing of how to equip and build the market conditions for the EU to develop an attractive technology offer. This is what the whole strategy is about. So I find it interesting. And it's also doubling down on the cyber norms, on the attempt to protect the integrity and the availability of the internet. So in that sense, I think the strategy is positive. It's falling a bit short in terms of concrete steps and on the execution of the strategy. But I think that the main purpose was to give a broad direction and especially line-to-takes on WSIS+20 and the GDC implementation. So in that, I think it's a positive step. And even the part on the Eurostack is, I

mean, they had it open Eurostack to kind of signal that openness is still something that the EU is valuing. And, yeah, realizing that self-sufficiency and isolation is probably not the way to go. Yeah, so that's quite positive as well.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Should we go back to the agenda item that I skipped?

MICHELE NEYLON

I find this push for Eurostack and everything else fascinating and hilariously hypocritical of the Commission. They are regulating us out of existence and then wondering why we can't compete. So either you regulate the bejesus out of us and we can't compete, or you go get a bit more light touch and we can compete. You can't have both.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Yeah, but they're talking about so much simplification regulations and everything else. GDPR, by the way—

MICHELE NEYLON

Elena, you know I love you dearly. But the reality is, as the owner of a small business, my team get these notifications about various bits of legislation, be it at a national level or a European level. Our clients come to us going, what are you doing about, insert the latest acronym here. And then we have to run off and try and work out, one, what the hell is the damn thing? Two, has it actually been

transposed into Irish law? Three, is it in any way related to what we're actually doing? Often it isn't. And then try to work out how on earth we navigate it in a fashion so that, A, my client doesn't get upset with me. B, I don't breach any rules. C, nobody's yelling at me. And D, I can still make a profit and pay my staff. Now, you tell me how on earth I can do that and still remain competitive against companies who basically breach all the regulations left, right, and center and get away with it. At the IGF in Dublin the other week, Adam was there. And thank you, Adam, for your help with that. We had a very interesting keynote from Dr. Johnny Ryan. And one of the things he pointed out was that you can have all the regulations in the world, but if there's no enforcement, they're pointless. And the problem is that for a lot of us, those of us who actually take the regulation seriously are putting ourselves at a competitive disadvantage, which I find kind of comical and really frustrating.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Thank you, Michele. I think there is some realization. Jokes aside, there is realization that SMEs are suffering. Supposedly, there's going to be movement in that direction. Please.

LUTZ DONNAGER

As people from the technical community, I do understand sandbox, governmental sandbox, or something like this, completely different than it's handled in this discussion here. The best approach I found during this discussion about the term sandbox is real sandbox where some children are playing. The problem we

have is that we have only one internet. And you cannot go out and try out the regulation in part of this and another regulation in another part. And then do some interesting things you have from some minister of internal. They want to find out who is speaking what on which website. And the other one saying, no, you are not allowed to know anything about your customers. So we have contradictory regulations. We have the problem that we do not understand how it ever can be done in the same technical environment. And the simple answer is, it can't be done. And unless somebody in the regulation body understands that there is only one internet and it can be only one regulation, then we have only two alternatives. And the most probable outcome would be that we have a lot of national networks which are interconnected by regulated interconnections which are there to control the traffic which is going through and everything else is only local law, end of the Internet as we know.

BRUNA SANTOS

Thanks. Hi. Bruna Santos, NCSG here, GNSO council, but also working for an organization called WITNESS and doing a fair amount on content-related policies, platform regulation and so on. I just feel that this conversation is kind of existing in a vacuum because a lot of the changes you just noted in the conversation from the Eurostack and to the simplification talks, they're mostly led by content-related policies. So it's basically fighting back big tech, providing alternatives to the dominance of like those main actors and so on. The simplification conversation, which seems to

be the GDPR one at least, that seems to be led by an attempt of making the compliance easier for smaller companies is also kind of an answer towards the pressure from big tech companies and not just that, but private businesses. And should I also mention the AI Act implementation, who's been on a back and forth with many, many delays on the timeline. The code of practice for general purpose AI has been announced, unannounced and unannounced again. Maybe just a call, and I'm sorry if I'm sounding a little bit as a bad guy or unpolite by any means, but just that we look into this in a broader kind of landscape and also connected to content-related policies because that is the main motivation of a lot of the things we are mentioning, not just the compactiveness kind of lookout or something like that. Thanks.

ELENA PLEXIDA

No, Bruna, that's a very important point and thank you for bringing in the context for all of us. Just to add to that, I would say indeed while there's something else that they're looking at, if you look at the Eurostack report that academics put out in February, which was the first one, it does have reference into the DNS, although it's really about other things. It says in there, nevertheless, DNS might also be a problem. And also, on that same note, on sovereignty and Eurostack, the very recent blueprint of that cybersecurity proposal, which was a very general thing, talking about readiness and exercises and information sharing, in there, then it got very specific again about the DNS and was talking about failover plans, which is not part of the blueprint anymore. But just to keep in mind that

Bruna is very much right, it's a different context, but nevertheless here and there, we see DNS being targeted. Thank you, Brunna. Yes.

HISHAM IBRAHIM

Yes. Hisham Ibrahim, RIPE NCC for the record. I'll try to be brief because we have other agenda points. Since we were talking about sandboxes and the governance one, and maybe going back to the point that Chris was making, in all fairness, I only started hearing about governance sandboxes at the ICANN meetings. I do not have experiences with that. But I think there is something worth maybe pausing and thinking about maybe for other sessions or other discussions. The Internet today is run and powered by IP, as we know it, right? And then it connects to the DNS for the naming side of it. And we consider anything that has IP to it to be part of the Internet, but that wasn't always the case. There were other numbering schemes before that and other protocols before that, predecessors that TCP IP just became better at. Now, the reason why I'm saying this in relationship to the governance thing, and again, I've only given this short amount of thought, is if we're talking about the evolution of the Internet, there are organizations like ICANN, like the RIRs and others that actually operate the current version of the Internet and the governance model of it. How open are we to the evolving technologies and governing that, and are our processes built and fit for that? I can think of a few from the naming part of the world, throwing around some acronyms may not be useful, but there was Enom, for example, that the RIPE NCC ran for a while. Maybe if it was given to a different governance body,

maybe it would have given it more love and care. It died, as you can see from the gestures next to me. But it's also something that happened. There are other things, Scion and others, that they actually came to our community saying, could we run that? And we were saying, we're running the Internet. There should be a pause and a discussion about these emerging technologies, and are we actually fit to govern them and experiment with them, and do we have the time for that? Or maybe they would benefit from actually having their own governance thing, like kind of the Internet had when they went to the teleco people and they said, we have our own thing figured out. You go away. This isn't a thing. Just putting that out there for maybe future discussion. Thank you.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Great. We're dinosaurs. Evolution is coming. We're not realizing it.

HISHAM IBRAHIM

We're younger than dinosaurs, but we're getting there.

JOSE

I would actually like to see if they have more information on the partnerships on, like, for instance, high-performance computer with countries in the global south. I don't know if this will be too much outside of the scope of our discussion, or if it's okay for them to receive just a little bit more of information, if you guys have it. Because that particularly interests me, and I mean, to some degree, the Brazilian government is interested in that as well. I find some

directions in that sense. But yeah, anyway, just to get more information.

ELENA PLEXIDA

I at least don't have the information handy. We can look into that, probably. But one of the things that's – you're referring to the strategy, right, international strategy? Yes. One of the basic ideas that seems to be there is that they want to build more cooperation with more partners beyond the U.S., so it's basically exactly what you're saying, supposedly. Okay. No, I get it.

JOSE

Yeah, a little bit more if you have, like, backstage stories, because, like, I see good – potential good, potential not-so-good intentions, but yeah, great to hear.

FILIP LUKAS

Yeah, I can reply to that. There is actually an EU LAC supercomputing network [inaudible] with a possible kickoff at the CELAC EU Summit in 2025.

DIMITRIS ZACHARIAS

I think it's what Filip just covered, but it's part of the strategy for the Latin America and the Caribbean to enhance interoperability with the HPC ecosystem, but there is not a concrete action on it yet. We shared the link to the document in the chat, and I'm pretty sure

you're sitting next to Filip, so you can get all the information directly from him. Thank you so much.

JOSE

No, yeah. I knew that. I was just referencing if that was – if you guys, by any chance, had more information about that. But all good. I got the point. Thank you very much.

ADAM PEAKE

So thank you. I know that Filip has to leave, and I don't know if you want to quickly jump through a review. We're jumping ahead of the agenda a little bit. A quick review of what happened at the CENTR Jamboree, and then we can perhaps jump back again to Chris talking about the sounding board and then link that into the WSIS and IGF with Bruna and Desiree jumping in. If that sounds okay, let's see how we go. So if you'd like to say a few quick words about that, and then we'll move on to – back into the agenda again.

FILIP LUKAS

Thank you. Thank you, Adam, for accommodating me. Unfortunately, I have to leave, so thank you. So three weeks ago, we had a Jamboree, CENTR Jamboree, which was the largest CENTR meeting ever. We hosted approximately 250 people on the spot and 80 online. The Jamboree is, of course, a meeting for the European ccTLD community, but it is open to all if the people submit a proposal, which is then accepted. So we also had a session from ICANN. And, of course, it's also a space for not only, let's say,

the participants to discuss topics, but also for the working groups of CENTR to meet. So in the end, it was quite a very fruitful session, which turned some ideas into specific task forces where our members will continue to work on throughout the year and hopefully will reach a very successful end. I might hint at Registry Lock, for example. So for next year, if you'd be interested in coming, please file your proposal and we'll see how it goes. Thank you, Adam.

ALISHAH SHARIFF

So in the UK, we have a crime and policing bill currently going through Parliament, as Adam mentioned. It includes provisions which introduce IP address and domain suspension orders. So these domain name suspension orders in particular apply to both registries and registrars, and a registrar is defined as a person authorized by the registry to act on behalf of end users in connection with the registration of internet domain names. So in terms of kind of why this is in place, we think there's kind of two things. So the UK Home Office has said that they expect kind of voluntary practices, such as the one that Nominet operates, our criminal practices policy, to continue to be the kind of first line of action, but then this is kind of a backstop where those fail, and then it's also helpful in cases where we need a domestic legal basis in order for reciprocal action in kind of overseas jurisdictions, so that seems to be the reason why it's there. There is a non-disclosure duty which can apply when notice of an application for a suspension order is served, and a judge can also vary that non-

disclosure order. So currently, obviously, at Nominet, we would notify registrants if we're suspending their domain or placing their domain in special status, whereas once there is an effect, if there is one of those non-disclosure orders, that won't be possible anymore, which is a little bit tricky, although we think people would probably notice if their domain is suspended. So initially, the specified period for suspension is 12 months, but then that can be extended by a further kind of request from an appropriate officer, which is kind of someone who is a constable, a national crime agency officer, an officer of revenue and customs, a member of staff at the Financial Conduct Authority, or somebody who works at the Gambling Commission. These are the people that can kind of make orders to judges under this legislation. They can kind of then try and extend that by up to further kind of 12 months, and those are the increments in which it can be extended. I think similar provisions might already exist in Germany and Belgium. That's what the Home Office told us anyway. But yeah, it's just kind of an interesting bit of legislation. I think it will probably come into effect next year. This is part of a wider crime and policing bill that includes, I think, probably slightly more controversial measures. This isn't one part of the bill that has had much attention, so I think we're just kind of tracking it, thinking about what it means for registrars, kind of the added kind of potential compliance burden there and the costs of kind of making sure that staff are trained in order to be able to deal with these, thinking through some of the

kind of non-disclosure elements. So it's just something to kind of put on the radar.

And then I think the other bit of kind of upcoming legislation, so this isn't yet in existence, but we expect it this autumn, is the UK Cyber Resilience Bill. So we're obviously a bit slower than the EU now that we've left, but this is our update on 2018 NIS regs. But just to note, there's nothing akin to kind of Article 28, so nothing on the kind of provisions on domain name registration data as you have in NIS 2. But I think similar to NIS 2, it will bring managed service providers into scope, and at the moment that definition is very wide and we're not quite sure how to interpret it. We definitely think that domain hosting providers will be in scope, but we're not really sure about kind of registrars, so that is, and registries like Nominet are already in scope of 2018 NIS as operators of essential services. So in addition to kind of bringing managed service providers into scope, the bill will also enable the government to set stronger supply chain duties for operators of essential services and relevant digital service providers through kind of secondary legislation, so that would be things like contractual requirements, kind of continuity plans, security checks. There'll also be kind of enhanced oversight from regulators, so at the moment we usually have to report an incident within 72 hours, but that now we'll have to report within 24 hours with a kind of initial report and then a fuller report due within 72 hours. There's also kind of enhanced transparency requirements, so if there's been a significant incident, there'll be a reporting requirement on kind of, you know,

for example us letting customers know that that's happened. And the bill will also introduce cost recovery mechanisms for regulators, so we will now pay more money to be regulated, which I think we're all looking forward to. And then also I think there is kind of, I guess, more strategic power for the Secretary of State for the Department for Science, Innovation and Tech in that they can update the legislative framework in some cases without requiring an act of parliament, so that would make it quicker, so that could be to bring new sectors into scope or to make changes to how the regulators kind of operate. And there'll also be executive powers for government to enable action in response to cyber threats, so if there was a kind of national security need, the Secretary of State could direct a regulated entity like the registry to take action, and then the Department for Science, Innovation and Tech would oversee how well we kind of complied with that. So there's quite a lot kind of in there. I think from a kind of nominate perspective, we're always arguing for, I guess, like against duplication really, because we're already regulated by Ofcom as an operator of essential services, but then if we were also regulated as an MSP, we would also have to report into the ICO, the Information Commissioner's Office. I think we're really like trying to think about, I guess, any duplicative elements like that and how we make the case for, you know, if we are keeping a high level of cybersecurity already through other measures, not having to do that twice, and we're just trying to get a bit more clarity on how the bill wording will look. But I think it's all up for grabs, so we'll see in

the autumn. But yeah, I think that was me, and if anyone has any questions, I'm happy to try and answer.

SEBASTIEN DUCOS

just a quick question out of curiosity. The first one, the crime and policing bill, do they have anything, a suspension 12 months or above? You're going to end up in a domain expiry, obviously you don't want the domain to expire because otherwise, so who pays the bills on that? Is there anything there for that? Is it something, or did they leave you high and dry with it and all the costs associated?

ALISHAH SHARIFF

Oh, sorry, we did ask them that when we had our last industry engagement and we couldn't get a clear answer on it, so we were told that they would come back with something.

ELENA PLEXIDA

And I have a question as well, first of all, before the question, Alishah, thank you so much for bringing all this to our attention, this is super useful and I would encourage everyone else who has these kind of things to share, it's important for all of us to know. My question is, as far as you know, is there extra-territoriality in the application of, particularly the first one, which is more advanced than if you know to the second, because we've seen a lot of extra-territoriality in this region.

ALISHAH SHARIFF

Yeah, I think probably not, because I think the way the powers work, so actually criminal rules as opposed to civil rules will apply for these domain suspension orders, and I think they are focused on entities that have a, like a kind of, based in the UK, but then I think the whole reason for having this domestic legal basis is to then be able to require reciprocal action in kind of foreign jurisdictions, so I guess where there are like mutual recognition agreements in place, that would then enable a court order to kind of be mimicked elsewhere and for action to be taken. So, yeah, not that we know of at the moment, I think it applies in England, Wales and Northern Ireland for sure, but yeah, I think.

ADAM PEAKE

Okay, so let's go back. Chris, if you'd like to say a few words about the thing I'm forgetting the name of at the moment, that would be great, and then a bit, we can jump ahead to the WSIS and IGF, and Bruna and Desiree, please.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Sure. So, there have been a couple of sessions already in the schedule this week on WSIS+20, so I'm assuming everyone's done their homework and knows what a WSIS+20 is, and it's currently in the preparatory phases and gathering input from different stakeholders and governments in the UN, and so last week or a couple of weeks ago, there was one of the initial consultations with member states, and ahead of that, the EU had put in a proposal to the co-facilitators of the WSIS+20 process, which are the

delegations from Kenya and Albania in New York, and one of the things, well, the main thing that they proposed in that was to form a sounding board, a multi-stakeholder sounding board that could assist the co-facilitators in preparing the draft WSIS+20 resolution. So this was interesting for a number of reasons. One, it sounds a little familiar to any of us who were involved with the IGF in the last few years. The IGF MAG and leadership panel had proposed a sounding board to the co-facilitators of the Global Digital Compact as a multi-stakeholder means of developing that document. That wasn't taken up by the co-facilitators at that time. I think it felt to be a multi-stakeholder bridge too far. We don't know whether the co-facilitators for the WSIS-Plus 20 will do this, will take this up. I don't think we've seen any indication that they will, but we can live in hope. And it would certainly give a very multi-stakeholder element to the WSIS-Plus 20. I think the other interesting thing to me is, while we talk about that WSIS is much broader than Internet Governance, and it is, there is Internet Governance forms quite a small part of it, the sounding board idea would give quite a degree of prominence to the Internet Governance Forum, drawing on members of the Internet Governance Forum MAG, for that sounding board. So I think that's an interesting thing to think about. I don't think we've seen any opposition to that idea. I think we've seen opposition, not conflict, but two opposing positions there that come out of that idea. I think we also saw Switzerland and perhaps Brazil, I'm not sure, perhaps some other member states note their support for the idea as well. So it's not just the EU

who is putting this forward. So that's the main thing. I think that's all I have to say. Thank you very much.

ADAM PEAKE

I think we have time for one more about WSIS-Plus 20 and the IGF.

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC

Sure. Thank you, Chris. Desiree, just a MAG member, also RIPE Corporation Working Group Co-Chair, just noting that the RIPE NCC has made a key fact sheet about the WSIS and how it could harness the power of national and regional IGFs, something to combine there. But to further comment on what Chris just said about this multi-stakeholder sounding board, which should be convened by the end of June, should consist in theory, as proposed, of the leadership, high-level leadership team members and some MAG members, and therefore would incorporate these people into the sounding Board which would then further on take input for community and would be a trusted mechanism to ensure that they can reach out to wider community and also that they would be able to report and have at least three virtual meetings with facilitators after being consulted with the community. So I'm still positive about that, because the proposal has been shared with the UN President of the UN General Assembly, and on the May 30th, they also gave a detailed intervention. So let's stay positive about this trusted mechanism that we're trying to build. I'll just, for the sake of time, looking at how to give some time to Bruna as well to make comments. I think this is a perfect way to say that what we'd like to

see is also that at this year's IGF, which is the 20th IGF, there are already over 6,000 participants that have registered. It's a crucial year to demonstrate the power and inclusiveness of the IGF ecosystem, which is not just the global event, it's all the other bodies and dynamic coalitions that take place and best practice forums that are intersessional in their nature, and all these processes really need to be renewed and financially stable. So we have seen a lot of calls for the IGF mandate to be renewed, as well as to gain a really firm financial stability within some of the UN regular budget as well. So I think I will stop here commenting on the sounding proposal, unless there are any immediate questions about the shape and the purpose of the sounding board. Okay, good. Everything's clear. I'll pass it on to Bruna. Thank you.

BRUNA SANTOS

I'm not going to add more on the sounding board, but just to call your guys' attention to two IGF-related sessions that will be taking place at the WSIS high-level event in Geneva, all posted on the chat right now. But one is a celebratory about the 20 years of multi-stakeholder engagement. I'm looking forward as well, so it's about the road ahead. And the second one will be focusing on the Oslo outcomes as well. So one of them is being organized by MAG, and the second one is being organized by IGF Secretariat. So yeah, that's it.

ADAM PEAKE

Anybody have any comments about the WSIS Forum? Are you...sounding board, notions of sounding boards? My personal and definitely not ICANN view is that I would prefer to see something more organic, and we have heard of people who've suggested ideas of coming together as coalitions to form friends of the process, as opposed to a sounding board. So identify who you are, and you can gain legitimacy through your transparency and accountability, and put in your collective, collaborative thoughts on the processes. But that's just going to my history of being involved in these processes. I think an organic thing is sometimes better than the other approach, but we'll see how the co-facilitators go. We are seeing that they're very open to input, and the processes they're running are quite transparent and well-recorded and so on. Sorry, Desiree, you looked like you might want to say...

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC

Well, it's good that you mentioned that coalitions are a good way to also be part of that process, and there are several coalitions that are already taking place. There's the cross community, or they call themselves friends of the IGF and WSIS. So there's also the technical coalition, technical community coalition on multi-stakeholderism. The global partners, Digital, have issued a call on five points, how to improve WSIS processes. There's a lot going on, and I think they're all open for signatories, for participation, for people to join them. But yes, I'm still certain that there should be as many mechanisms, and we'll see how to help really get to some

better ideas about how the WSIS should go forward and how the IGF should go forward beyond this year, I think.

ADAM PEAKE

Okay. Well, we're approaching the end of that time, and Chris, I think you opened the session. It would be lovely if you'd like to close with a couple of comments, and thank you very much, everybody, for my part. Over to you, Chris.

CHRIS MONDINI

Thanks. Thanks, Adam, and thanks, Elena, for leading the discussion. I just want to say how impressive I think we are as a region. You've seen the great collaboration and spirit among the technical community and the technical organizations that keep our work going, and it really is every stakeholder group is represented here, and we have NextGen, we have fellows, and I'll let you in on a secret. We planned this specifically to end at the time of the community networking, and so what that means is if there's anything in this discussion that has struck your fancy, or you'd like to learn more, or you'd like to speak to one of these experts about the issue, please approach them, have a glass of whatever you'd like to have, and learn more and find out how you can become involved. The agenda was very regulatory-centric, but there's a lot of content there. It was very European Union-centric and UK, a bit of UK, but it is a broader region, and we're always very happy to bring those issues into Europe's space. One of my team members, Gabi Schitteck, who sits here next to Wolfgang, runs an excellent

region-wide webinar series, and if you would like to propose any topic of interest such as those that we've discussed today, Gabi would be very pleased to have your ideas. Finally, I just want to ask Ondrej Filip just to receive a round of applause for him as an excellent host. We are here in the Europe region because of your kind hospitality, and give yourselves a round of applause and enjoy your networking. Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]