
ICANN83 | PF – ICANN Community Discussion on the WSIS+20 Review
Monday, June 09, 2025 – 15:30 to 17:00 CEST

DAN GLUCK

Hello and welcome to the ICANN Community Discussion on the WSIS+20 Review. My name is Dan Gluck, 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 the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy. During this session, questions or comments will only be read aloud if submitted in the proper format. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, Spanish, Russian, Arabic, Chinese, and Portuguese. 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, either at one of the tables up front or by gaining the attention of one of the roving handheld mics. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak in a language other than English, and please speak at a reasonable pace. I will now hand the floor over to Chris Disspain.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you very much. Good afternoon, everybody. For those of you just arriving, there are some seats up here at the front, two or three rows. They have desks and all sorts of wonderful extras that you don't get sitting in the back row in a chair.

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.

Good afternoon. I am Chris Disspain, and for those of you who are... Everyone knows who Elena is. Of course they do. We're here to discuss WSIS. It might look as if we're about to burst into song, given that we're sitting here on two high bar stools, but that's not going to happen. We're going to run a session about WSIS+20 review.

The objectives of this session are basically to understand the review and the points where input can be made in the UN process, to understand common messages that are emerging from various groups and parts of the ICANN community, in other words, where there is agreement, to understand what actions can be taken in the places where you all live, what actions can you take where you live, to inform what governments are saying in the WSIS+20 review. And we're going to do this by having some people who have already agreed to say a few things about what their organisations or bodies are doing in respect to WSIS. But I want everyone to be involved. I want us to have an open and full and frank discussion. So even though we're going to be calling on a number of people, the floor is also going to be open for everyone else. If you're sitting in front of a microphone or near a microphone, you can use that. But if you need a roaming microphone, if you raise your hand and we call you, someone will bring one to you, and I guess Carlos is managing the room. So you need to get, probably best if you get in the Zoom room, so that if you need to, if you want to raise your hand to say something, Carlos can see you in the Zoom room.

So we're going to start with the timeframe. Elena, it's all yours.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Thank you, Chris. Thank you, everyone, for being here. I hope we're having a good discussion over the session. Just to begin with some basics, the timeline. Where's the timeline? It should be on the screen, the timeline. Yeah, here it is. Important thing that is happening here now. We finally have a timeline. We finally know how the process is going to look like. We also know that the co-facilitators, the ambassadors from Kenya and Albania, seem to welcome engagements with the technical community. They are both committed to the modalities of the WSIS+20 resolution, including to have all stakeholders participate in the review process.

According to the roadmap that we now have, there will be four stakeholder consultations throughout the process, including both before and after the drafting of the elements paper, the zero draft and the first draft. Those consultations are important. I'm highlighting them. We had the process, let's say, kicking off with a preparatory and stakeholder session on 30 May. This session was meant for UN member states only, but we heard what the member states expressed because it was broadcasted through the UN TV. The next consultative session is taking place today, if I'm not mistaken, and tomorrow. Thank you, Sally, for noting. This session is open to non-government stakeholders. You might recall that the UN DESA had proactively shared information for the registration league on the WSIS+20 network outreach mailing list. By mid-June,

the co-facilitators are planning to release the key elements paper. The key elements reflected, we have to bear in mind, might become the skeleton of the WSIS+20 outcome documents. Therefore, it's important to be involved in the shaping of this outcome.

So, it's important to take opportunities to provide technical input to the negotiators, definitely take advantage of the upcoming stakeholder consultations that I mentioned, and, of course, later this month, we have the IGF and the WSIS Forum next month, where our messages should be propagated. All in all, we do now have the process, we have the where to go with our messages. As Chris said, this session is meant to discuss the what. What are, what should be our messages?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you. So, we're going to have a discussion. Let us start with some work that the GNSO has been doing, and Desiree is sitting up here to present some slides on the GNSO Council Action Lines. We're going to deal with that first, and we'll take any questions or comments about that, and then we're going to call on a number of people to talk about what their organizations are doing. So, if we could get Des's first slide up, and that's the examples of messaging. There we go. Des, over to you.

DESIREE MILOSEVIC

Thank you, Chris. My name is Desiree Milosevic. I'm very happy to be here with you in the Prague to present the work that GNSO has

done with regards of its work and how it relates to the WSIS Action Lines. This work has been done with my co-fellows at Council, Anne Aikman-Scalese and Farzaneh Badii, Jennifer Chung and Sebastien Ducos, and it's a work in progress, and I'll give you some highlights of what we've done so far.

So, you surely know that the WSIS has been a UN two-phase conference and it has generated some important foundational documents like the Geneva Declaration of Principles, a plan of action, the Tunis agenda and the Tunis commitment 20 years ago. So now, at this important moment, we are really looking to assess how the ICTs or the Internet information and telecommunication technologies have really helped shape the society and what economic and development impact they have had. So it is important, then, to see what ICANN is doing, and I will try to take you through this mapping document to see how the GNSO and ICANN contribute to the global digital agenda and development. Next slide, please.

You have seen this, probably. These are the WSIS action lines, which is the framework, how the work is organized, and it's a useful framework still today and relevant, and I'm sure you know that the process will review them, they're technology neutral, and really stand the time.

Next slide. So the very first one is about ICT for development. This action line is really vital because it says that the work for the development is really done by all stakeholders, governments, the

private sector, the technical community, and civil society, and really the GNSO embeds this principle in its work in the multi-stakeholder fora. So as you know, they developed domain name policies for top-level domain names, like .identity, .museum, and so on, but throughout this work it really contributes with the help from other stakeholders, the government advisory committee input, ALAC, and other supporting organizations to shape these policies. One of the examples is the applicant support program that is really focused on development because you can see one example is that it aims to reduce the fee as well for under-resourced applicants, especially coming from the developing country. Next slide, please.

C2 is the action line that really tries to connect and solve the connectivity gaps. So you would think, what is ICANN and GNSO doing here? But ICANN and GNSO are developing policies of the DNS, which is part of the core technical infrastructure, and therefore it shapes and provides better access to people that need to get their own applicant support program, for example, that I mentioned earlier is here as well. You can see there's some serious reduction in program fees, so that's one of the focus of what we're doing, and that will help the underserved groups to enter the digital economy and the DNS on this logical layer, which is part of the foundation.

Moving on quickly to C3, which is the access to information and knowledge. It's not news to you that ICANN works on enabling access to information by working on promotion and

implementation of language scripts in Arabic, Cyrillic, other languages, which are a really important part of the puzzle when trying to access information online. So this advances the linguistic diversity, which is also connected to another action line, C8, and this work does support national frameworks, and we work closely with ccNSO, for example, on this matter too. Next slide.

The next action line is the capacity building action line, and it's no news to you that GNSO contributes through outreach and education. GNSO members work in the next generation and fellowship programs and serve as mentors to newcomers to ICANN, but also around the other forms and ICANN parts throughout the world, not just at the ICANN meeting. So another example is probably the ICANN grant program, which works to improve the internet identifier system, but many others. So there are many, many things where GNSO is involved in capacity building, including education and other forms of capacity building. Next slide, please.

This is also an important part of GNSO work, and you know that this is a work in progress when it comes to GNSO work with the government advisory committee to address some of the pertinent issues such as DNS abuse or domain abuse, malware phishing, and it's a work in progress with LEAs as well. So we are developing policies that are enabling more security and confidence in the system because we know that trust in the system is very important. So there is also another initiative we have just formed back, the DNS abuse small team, and we will be working further on improving this side of the DNS. Next slide, please.

When it comes to enabling environment, we really try to create a balanced policy environment at the GNSO, and I think the multi-stakeholder model helps with that. So we need a model that supports both innovation but also protect the consumers, so we again work closely with other parts of the community to develop important policies such as domain name transfers and dispute policies such as UDRP, but also to make the gTLD policies align with some national and regional frameworks like privacy compliance and GDPR. We have developed in the past the land rush and sunrise policies when it comes to new gTLDs and DNS and mitigation policies as well, reinforcing consumer protection and accountability. Next slide. Diversity and local content I already mentioned, and IDN again, the international domain names again play a very major role in cultural and linguistic inclusion, so they are a priority for our next 2026 new gTLD round, and as mentioned before, we work closely with the ccNSO to ensure consistency along the line of the IDN policies between gTLDs and ccTLDs. Next slide, please.

Well, our part here is really we have ethics embedded in our process. You can think of the public interest, but really the GNSO uses the Human Rights Impact Assessment Checklist and that's now been added to all PDPs or the policy development process. So we have started implementing that to ensure that all these proposals will uphold not just equity but dignity and freedom.

C11 is the last one, which is regarding the international and regional cooperation and we engage actively with other parts of

the ICANN community, but also in other multi-stakeholder platforms and processes at the World Summit of Information Society, but the IGF, national regional IGF members of the GNSO actively contribute. So through these regional activities, we also help strengthen this cooperation. So with that, I will close now just to make room, but really the point of this mapping document, which is a living document, is that the GNSO work actually does more than just align to the business lines. We are bringing, we're living this and we are bringing this vision of the people-centered, inclusive and development-orientated information society to life. So we don't need to be going out and defending the multi-stakeholder model. I think we should really take pride in that we are actively building a more open, equitable information society. I'll stop here.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Des. That's great. We're on time. Anybody got any comments or questions about that, about what the GNSO is doing, about what Des presented, about the action items? No?

ELENA PLEXIDA

Can I comment?

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Yes, of course.

ELENA PLEXIDA

I think it's a very interesting document, report, I don't know how to call it, that the GNSO put down there, mapping how the GNSO work relates to the WSIS action lines. So the thing that has been discussed a lot so far, if you will, is that we need tangible examples. That's something to bear in mind. And this answers these questions, if you will. And I would encourage you all to take a look at that document, it's a very interesting document. Oh, there is a comment.

DAN GLUCK

Thanks. We have a hand raise from Jordan Carter.

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks. Jordan Carter, .au. And in this case, Vice Chair of the ccNSO Council. It was nice to see the GNSO initiative in pulling together that analysis. I'd be interested of whether people think that it would be helpful to flesh that out into a full sort of ICANN analysis, in other words, to look at what the other SOs and ACs are doing mapped against the action lines in that fashion that this report from the GNSO has done, because as Desiree ran through it, it's obvious there are other pieces of work that have been contributing across the ICANN community to what the WSIS action lines set out. Is that something that people think we should do? I'm kind of posing that as a question for the room to ruminate on as we continue through the discussion.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

That's a great question. Could you address briefly what you'd do with it once you've written it?

JORDAN CARTER

That invites an interesting question about what the GNSO is doing with this one, but I think it's a bit axiomatic that as we move into the review, it's quite helpful for ICANN, the ICANN system, to be able to show that it is practically through its work contributing to the substance of the development vision that is at the heart of the WSIS.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

So when would that need to be ready by, then?

JORDAN CARTER

So I would have thought if it was going to be the kind of input that could be lodged, it would be at one of those consultation points that was in Elena's timeline before, certainly before December. So that's something that maybe in the ccNSO we could ask the Internet Governance Liaison Committee to look at. I don't know what other SOs and ACs might be able to do. I don't know if there would be any staff support to flesh out such a document, but I just wanted to register that the idea had come to me.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I think that's a great idea, and I think the CCs could certainly contribute to that side of a document. Is there anyone from At-

Large who wants to just briefly see if At-Large would be interested in coming to play in that sandpit? Do we have... Ah, sorry, Amrita, my apologies.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Thank you. I'm happy to be part of it.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Okay, cool. So that's three, and I've no doubt we can build from there. Why have I got... I can't read that. You can hold it up as much as you like. It doesn't help. Hand raised. Hand raised. Now, that was a sign, not a hand. Go ahead.

DAN GLUCK

We do have a hand from Gopal Tadepalli. Go ahead.

GOPAL TADEPALLI

Yes, thank you. This is Gopal from Anna University, Chennai, India. Since WSIS+20 is organized with the ITU, International Telecommunication Union, is there any specific plan to collaborate with ITU so that the GNSO will have a better end-to-end control from application layer to the physical layer?

ELENA PLEXIDA

If the question was about cooperation with the ITU, we will call on my colleague Elizabeth a little bit later in the conversation to offer

comments on this and contribute to this discussion. So I would ask her to include that too. But overall, we do cooperate with the ITU.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

And we'll get to that when we get there. Thanks, Liz. OK. There's another hand.

DAN GLUCK

Another hand. Jorge Cancio.

JORGE CANCIO

Hello. That's me. Jorge Cancio, Swiss government. Here I am. So thank you, Chris. Thank you, Elena. And thanks, Desiree. I just want to welcome this work from the GNSO. I think it reflects this ambition to show what the ICANN community at large is doing not only on the very specifics of the technical Internet governance of the critical resources, but in all the other fields of WSIS. Because after all, WSIS is much more than just technical resources. It's much more than the IGF, although it's very important. And it's good that this community shows how much it is contributing to the different action lines.

And I would also like to support Jordan's idea, because it's very different from country to country. But the ccTLDs most of the times are a cornerstone of the local or national communities that deals with Internet governance. Sometimes they run certs. They are involved into cybersecurity. They are involved in capacity

development. And many other issues. So it's very worthwhile working on that, complementing the report from the GNSO, the mapping from the GNSO. Thank you.

ELENA PLEXIDA

And on to more food for thought in this discussion. We're very honored to have with us in the room the CEO of ISOC, Sally Wentworth. And we would kindly invite her to share with us her thoughts on what sort of messages we should carry forward as this process is unfolding. Thank you, Sally.

SALLY WENTWORTH

Thank you very much. And thank you, Chris and Elena, for organizing this. I think it's really important. It's really good to see that the technical community is coming together over these past several months and in the run-up to WSIS+20. And really important that our voice is heard by governments and the decision makers that will ultimately be in the room to negotiate the WSIS+20. So for us, we are also engaging in this discussion. We are working, we've set up a community group for our chapters and our organization members and others to share information and to prepare for the WSIS. And I would just offer up that the Internet Society chapters are an excellent resource to get information and messages out into UN member states as they prepare for the WSIS+20.

One of the pieces of feedback that we hear is that we can't rely on the arguments of the past. We need to provide evidence that the

multi-stakeholder model is working and delivering today. So I was really pleased to see what the GNSO is doing and Desiree's outline. I think that's important work that we should all be doing to demonstrate that the multi-stakeholder model is in fact delivering on the commitments that were made in WSIS years ago.

One thing that I would share is that tomorrow, the Internet Society and ICANN will release a report that we've developed together on the critical role that the Internet Governance Forum has played to bring people together and create change in the world. This report is part of how we attempt to explain the value of this way of working and demonstrate that the IGF has in fact contributed to concrete impact. And we hope that that is a useful contribution to the messages that people are preparing to defend the IGF and to make the case that this important forum should continue into the future.

It's really important, and I think this is what we're hearing today, that we offer a positive vision of where we want the Internet to go. That we in the technical community are champions of the future of the Internet. We need to offer a vision of the Internet where there are no Internet shutdowns, where people everywhere have affordable, reliable, and resilient Internet. Where there aren't 2.6 billion people without connectivity. Where everyone can get the benefits and opportunities of new technologies that depend upon basic connectivity. Where people can feel secure and safe in their online interactions. And that's the role that we hope the Internet Society can help play in the messaging. And we will do our part and

we look forward to collaborating with everyone in this room and people beyond it as we move into the WSIS+20. We can't lose the voice of the technical community in this process. So it's really heartening to see this event happening here. We've seen similar things happen at the IETF and those kinds of conversations are happening across the technical community. So where we can participate and be helpful, we are happy to do that. Thank you for having me speak.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Sally. Does anybody want to make a comment or ask a question about anything that Sally has just said? No? Okay. Cool. Thank you, Sally. We may come back a bit later on when we get around to the sort of full discussion. We're going to move on now to TCCM and I'm going to ask Beth. Beth, could you put your hand up so that Dan could... Oh, you can come. Can we get a microphone? Oh, you have a microphone. Well done. I'm going to ask Beth to start and then Jordan to follow up as well. Beth, go ahead.

BETH BACON

Yeah, thank you very much. We really appreciate this time that you've given us in this session, but I think it's also just really important that ICANN has given so much time to this discussion in general. As DNS technical operators, Sally just highlighted the importance of developing that voice, especially this year within the WSIS process. As technical operators, we rely on the

multistakeholder model of Internet governance grounded in ICANN as well as other multistakeholder processes to establish policies and coordinate the implementation of that work. Government support of the multistakeholder model is critical to the continued function, and we recognize that.

As part of that, engagement in this process is important because, again, without that government support for the multistakeholder model, technical operators and others are then open to individual jurisdictional regulation, fragmentation. It's just more difficult to operate in an interconnected manner. To that end, the TCCM, which is a Technical Community Coalition for Multistakeholderism, that's why we use the acronym, it's a lot, is focused on gathering technical operators that provide the foundations of Internet operation and also believe in and rely upon the multistakeholder model in order to provide that coordinated voice and engagement within the WSIS process. Again, we're a technical coalition. We made that choice deliberately. We're not every technical operator, though you're very welcome, but we are trying to provide a coordinated voice.

Being that WSIS is not everyday fair for a lot of our technical operators, one of the things that we've been focused on is outreach to encourage really robust global engagement of our participants, as well as providing resources and expertise for those participants so that they can understand not only how to promote the importance of WSIS within their organizations so that they are supported to engage, but then also supporting engagement in the

actual process, again, in a coordinated way. We continue to be supportive of the multistakeholder model. I think I could say that 12 more times. I hope everyone's just, like, getting a quarter every time I say multistakeholder model. And we also support a permanent commitment to the IGF as an important venue for discussion in a broad range of emerging issues, as well as the coordination between IGF, ICANN, and others to make sure that we are taking learnings from IGF and understanding those discussions in our policymaking as well. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Beth. Jordan, would you like to follow up on that and talk a little bit more about what TCCM is doing?

JORDAN CARTER

Okay, I can do that. Jordan Carter, .AU, now apparently in the TCCM hat to support everything that Beth just said. One of the things about a new coalition is you need to work out the way that you work. And a significant proportion of the members of the coalition have been working to pull together some positions in relation to this with this review. And they've been kind of socialized among the 40 or so members of the coalition. They're going to be tied down in the next couple of weeks. And I think, if I remember the timeframes rightly, they'll be ready to sort of input into the process of the consultations that the [COFACs] are doing around the IGF. And the whole point is to be quite a member-driven approach. It's a bunch of technical operators who have a variety of different experiences

based on where they are in the regions, based on the kinds of organizations they are, whether RIRs or ccTLDs or geo registries or geo registrars. So it's a slice of ICANN's multi-stakeholder model, right? It's just some operators. It isn't a multi-stakeholder coalition itself. But the members are united by a common support of this model. And there will be concrete sort of comments and advice coming for the WSIS review out of the group. So I hope that doesn't contradict anything Beth said as our nominated spokesperson. It just gives you a bit more of a flavor of what the coalition has been doing.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Not at all. I just wanted to give us an opportunity when we come around to an open discussion to build on all of the different things that are going on and see if we can pull some threads together so that we can deliver some cross-organizational, cross-community messages.

ELENA PLEXIDA

And speaking of which, another organization that we are honored to have here with us is our friends and colleagues from RIPE. RIPE also has been active in this space. So I will call on Hisham now to share with us views on, again, what sort of messages should we carry going into the process. Thank you.

HISHAM IBRAHIM

Sure. Happy to do that. First of all, thank you for the kind invitation and thank you for organizing this session. I do think it's an important one for us to have, especially in this time. My name is Hisham Ibrahim and I work for the RIPE NCC, which is the Regional Internet Registry for Europe, Middle East and Central Asia. So we do numbers, not names. I won't repeat a lot of what was said, but maybe giving a little bit of the take of how we see things. The Internet was built as this brilliant, transparent layer from all the technologies that were built beneath it, that it depends on the physical stuff, and all the stuff that was built on top of it, all the platforms, all the new stuff that's there. The Internet had one simple function and it continues to do that 40 years later, which is moving packets from point A to point B. That is what the Internet is. And it continues to do that brilliantly.

Tying this to the topic of the discussion here, for the Internet to continue to do its role, then it needs to continue to be interoperable. It needs to continue to be resilient. It needs to continue to be global. And this is the work that the technical community works hard to continue to try to maintain. So going into the WSIS process, making sure that it continues to be interoperable, secure, stable, resilient, all the words that we techies like to use and have been very well defined within Internet governance processes, is something that is very important. Now, part of the role of making sure that it continues to be a global system that works, you have to have organizations that actually work on regional levels and global levels that can aggregate that.

Obviously on a national level as well, there's obviously on a network level, but that globality, that global interoperability, that happens through different organizations. So again, going into what the Internet is and core functions of the Internet, the Internet in its essence is built on two core functions. Interoperability, so the open standards, right, and we heard Sally talking about the IETF that develops these standards on the Internet that allow anybody to use any technology, any vendor, anywhere, and be able to connect. There's also the registration services, so whether it's numbers, so the RIRs, whether it's names, so, you know, ICANN and the work that's being done there in the naming industry, that needs to be recognized and understood so that any policymaking moving forward does not touch on foundational elements that would change the Internet or take away from that globality or interoperability.

Now, all this is done through work of the technical community. The organizations that I mentioned do not operate the Internet, it's actually the technical community that does. And we've done a lot of work in trying to make sure that the technical community works closely with governments and that both sides understand the challenges that each one has and can continue to work. So one of the things that the RIPE NCC did is we produced fact sheets that also had similar timelines and descriptions there, but also the points that we would like to put across, which I'm trying to touch on here now. So it's available on the website and we can share that if there is some communication that will go out. Now two weeks

ago we also organized what we call an open house, which is an online session where we invited the community and different stakeholders to come together and discuss. We actually also had Desiree chairing that as the, with a different hat on, the co-chair of the cooperation working group at RIPE. And we had representatives, we had the CEO of [inaudible], we had representatives from IGOs, Arab and Russian speaking, RCC and League of Arab States. We had, well, one of the speakers coming up, representative from government, Paul. We had independent consultants. We had people talking a lot about this. And I think that's a big thing that we're doing, trying to make sure that the dialogue continues and people discuss, because it's important for us to, well, come together and converge on these points, especially with the timeline that we're seeing moving forward.

Now there's been also a lot of work that we've been doing with governments in our service region and you might have seen and heard some governments having very different opinions towards internet governance and multi-stakeholderism than what we would have heard them say, well, not a few years ago. We believe working together has brought together these perspectives and everybody now is interested because the internet is the backbone for all the digital transformation and all the digital agenda discussions that people are talking about, all the stuff that gets built on top of it. So it is getting, I believe, the attention that it needs and deserves. Now to do that, also capacity building, and that was mentioned as well. Capacity building is very important in making

sure that the decision makers, the policy makers and the technical community are all on the same line and understand what the topics are. They don't have to all have the same level of depth of technicality, but they need to understand what best practices are and what is important for them to continue to run a secure, interoperable, resilient internet.

Now the word multi-stakeholder was mentioned once or twice, I believe, and it's an interesting one because it's a model that is not without its critics. There are people out there that are critiquing the model. But the interesting thing about a lot of the critiques, and they are valid, there are critiques about how representation isn't necessarily equal, about Global South, about bigger players maybe dominating the space, but the interesting thing about all these critiques is it's not critiques about multi-stakeholderism itself. It's more critiques about the inequalities of the world that it's operating in, right?

So the interesting thing for me, at least tying it back to WSIS and the Sustainable Development Goals, is that WSIS talks about how we can come together and achieve these Sustainable Development Goals to address the inequalities that would then help the multi-stakeholder model be more efficient in the work that it's trying to do. So there's a very circle of dependence here that requires everybody to actively work towards achieving these goals, and well, we have set dates and timelines for us to come together and work on this. So that for me is one of the interesting takes here about, well, bringing more focus and attention to bridging that

digital divide, to make sure that the multi-stakeholder model works and everything that we would like to see, well, we were discussing seeing 20 years ago, is being achieved.

The internet is a catalyst for innovation, so one of the invariants of the internet, this is work that ISOC did years back, was looking into some of the invariants, and one of the key ones is the permissionless innovation element of it, allowing anybody to be able to put their ideas on there without having to ask permission from anybody, and allowing ideas to compete and people then going to their favorite app, favorite application, favorite digital whatever, this is a key thing for the internet to continue to evolve. So allowing for that and not bringing it down through any kind of positioning or digital agendas is very key moving forward to the future of the internet and, well, everything it touches.

The last point I'm going to say here is that recognizing the layered aspect of all of this is important. There's technical coordination that keeps the internet running. That's the organizations that I mentioned, but level beyond that is the internet governance element of this. This is where technical community meets civil society, meets governments, meets all the discussions that we have, whether it's around putting policies or putting norms or other stuff. If we don't have, blow that up a little bit, and then all the lovely discussions that we're having now about the digital governance space, understanding where to bring the different issues is key so that we do not discuss all these issues in all the forums and then fragment the discussion because nobody can

keep up with the alphabet soup of meetings that we're trying to do now. With that, I'm done. Thank you very much.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you. We're going to go to ICANN in a second for the stuff that ICANN is doing, but I just want, just following up on what Hisham and Beth and Jordan and Sally and Des have said, while you're listening, think about, there's been some really interesting points made. How do we make sure that these points are not just being made to everyone who already knows them and agrees with them? How do we make sure that all the stuff that's being said here, which is relevant and important, gets out to where it needs to be gotten out to? We're going to come back and talk about that when we finish doing the rounds of the people who are talking to us.

ELENA PLEXIDA

A very good point. I wanted to make the same point, actually, in thinking about RIPE. They serve a very interesting region, so Hisham, not to put you on the spot, but we might put you on the spot later on again. Over to Elizabeth to share from ICANN.

ELIZABETH OLUOCH

Thank you, Chris, and thank you, Elena. First, I would just like to respond to Gopal Tadepalli's question about the ITU just before I proceed on what ICANN is doing. It was a very good question about ICANN's cooperation with the ITU. We have a very strong collaborative relationship with the ITU. We are ITU sector

members. Earlier this year, you may have heard during the geopolitical plenary session at ICANN 82, the briefings that we had with the ITU, for example, in February. It was a joint briefing for UN diplomats in UN Geneva and in UN New York. ICANN was hosted at the ITU office in Geneva, where Doreen Bogdan-Martin, the Secretary General, participated. It was a session on demystifying WSIS. We are partners for the ITU's partner to connect digital coalition. We are a partner for the Coalition for Digital Africa, and we are a sponsor, a contributing partner sponsor for the WSIS+20 high level event. I'm very excited to be partnering with the ITU for this WSIS event. So in response to your question, Gopal, I know you're not online, but hopefully you'll go back to the recording. We continuously work with the ITU, particularly on areas of mutual interest.

Now just going back to this particular discussion on what we're doing and on messaging, I really appreciate the session we're having, because the Internet is a global resources and everyone has a role to play in shaping its future. And WSIS+20, the global community, has a choice, reinforce the proven multi-stakeholder model of Internet governance or risk fragmentation, slowed progress, and reduced trust. So we're really at a juncture, for lack of a better word. I'm going to use a very Western analogy. We're really where the rubber meets the road. We are six months away from the WSIS high level meeting at the U.N. And the process to develop the elements papers for the outcome document is underway as of last week with the stocktaking consultation with

member states and observers. And then, of course, today and tomorrow there is the stakeholder consultation where we are planning to speak. My colleague, Alexei, based in New York, is going to be speaking.

So an important part of the WSIS process for us is really defining what are our objectives here. And we have been emphasizing what our three goals are for the WSIS+20. Some of them have been highlighted by some of the former colleagues that spoke. The preservation of the multistakeholder model of Internet governance, as we believe that this model has kept the Internet stable and interoperable for over three decades. Recognition of the unique role of the technical community in the Internet. I'm sure many of you were aware that the technical community initially was left out of the GDC last year. So it's very important that we emphasize the technical community in this process. But also the extension of the Internet governance for a mandate. So these are the three goals and objectives that we are emphasizing in this process. My colleague, Alexei, will highlight them in his intervention tomorrow.

At the same time, we're also developing messaging. We have some messaging already with proof points that reinforce our three goals. I know Sally Wentworth earlier mentioned a paper that we've been working together with ISOC on the impact of the IGF as one example of proof points on what the IGF has delivered. We have a knowledge hub on the WSIS+20 outreach network. If you haven't joined the WSIS+20 outreach network or if you're hearing this for

the first time, please do Google it. I'm sorry, I don't have a QR code ready. But it's open to anyone that supports sort of our goals for WSIS. And on the WSIS+20 outreach network website, there is a knowledge hub with fact sheets, for example, of Internet governance and the IGF. And we're going to continue to share papers. Recently we shared in the WSIS+20 outreach network a draft paper of the Internet We Want, which outlined several proposals for a strengthened IGF. So I encourage you to take a look at that, and we welcome your feedback on that. So our engagement will continue throughout the year. With the WSIS+20 outreach network, as the elements papers come out, we are going to be organizing webinars just to share and exchange information. So I encourage you to be part of that. We will have strong presence at the IGF 2025 and the WSIS+20 high-level event. By strong presence, I mean we'll have our leadership there, we'll have Curtis heading the two delegations there and several board members, and we plan to deliver WSIS+20 messages that are there as well. I'll stop there and welcome any questions.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Thank you, Elizabeth. While I was hearing you speak, of course, on things that I know quite well, I was reminded or we were all reminded of the objectives that we have. Of course, we're talking about the messages that are linked to the objectives. It's also important just to bear in mind that there is a lot of material, like RIPE has a lot of material, ISOC has a lot of material, the TCCM is developing material that is useful for all of us to bring to the

attention of the negotiators of the WSIS, right? So, there is work down there already. I will turn online. We have a participant from Global Partnership Digital, Rose. Rose, I hope you can hear us. If you can hear us, can you also please briefly share with us from your perspective, which is a little bit different if you will from technical organizations as such, on the messaging that we should carry forward?

ROSE PAYNE

Great. Thank you. This is actually my first ICANN meeting. I'm absolutely delighted to attend. I wish I could be there in person, but schedules didn't allow it, perhaps in Oman. So yes, I work for Global Partners Digital. We are a human rights organization focused on ensuring that human rights underpin the development, use, and governance of digital technologies. So I'd like to share a few reflections and messages, which first of all GPD is focusing on, but then also to share some messages and activities from two coalitions which we're a part of.

So to start by outlining GPD's positions during the WSIS, or priorities, I should say. We are advocating, first of all, for any update to the WSIS framework to center human rights and development and to reinforce a multi-stakeholder approach across digital governance processes. So multi-stakeholder approach comes up again. We're focused particularly on how WSIS interacts with other processes, and I'm talking here particularly about the Global Digital Compact. We want to make sure that the WSIS isn't subsumed by

the GDC, which practically means that we're advocating for the Global Digital Compact to be implemented through existing WSIS structures while calling for WSIS to be enriched by the GDC's emphasis on human rights. We're also calling for a process that is open, inclusive, and transparent, particularly in how it brings in perspectives from underrepresented communities. So to this end, we're coordinating a cross-stakeholder coalition to share information and take joint action on the WSIS+20 process. This coalition is made up of civil society, the private sector, academia, and of course, the technical community. Together, that group has developed two key resources, which I'd like to talk to you about briefly. One is the five-point plan, and then a follow-up with eight practical recommendations. So these documents were created jointly by different stakeholder groups, and they represent broad cross-stakeholder consensus on how to create an enabling environment for multi-stakeholder engagement throughout the process, so really thinking practically, what does that mean? So the five-point plan outlines key measures to ensure transparency, inclusivity, and accountability, including clear timelines, public documentation, broad and diverse participation, and meaningful consultations. The eight practical recommendations build on this, offering concrete actions such as appointing a stakeholder liaison, setting up a centralized online platform for announcements and documents, designing accessible consultation formats, and safeguarding stakeholder input into each stage of the negotiations. So these two documents have actually been shared with the co-facilitators, various governments, relevant UN agencies, and we

recently received feedback saying that some of the suggestions are already being incorporated. I'm going to share some of the links in the chat shortly, so you can learn a bit more about those.

I will say that within this coalition, so far, our joint efforts have focused more on the process, but as substantive discussions begin to take shape, there is growing scope for us to engage more directly on the content of the review and the future direction of digital cooperation. So there will be more updates. And then secondly, I'd like to share another project, which I'm delighted and honored to say is actually supported by the inaugural ICANN grant program. This is a joint effort between GPD, my organization, and the Global Network Initiative. It's named Shaping the WSIS+20 Review for a Unified Internet Multistakeholderism, and we're delivering that in partnership with Civil Society in eight different countries. So, through research and multi-stakeholder dialogues in partnership with the civil society organisations across eight global majority countries. We're aiming to uphold and protect a rights-respecting multi-stakeholder model of Internet governance. We've already delivered national workshops in Chile, India, Bangladesh, and in addition regional work at the Africa IGF. We will, the next stage will be that we are launching a joint report together with our partners at the IGF, which covers the priorities, actors and opportunities for engagement across these countries. It will also include chapters which are more reflective of trying to support civil society all around the world, but particularly in global majority countries. So, we will outline the, again, the priorities, actors and opportunities

for engagement in countries which are likely to be influential in the process. So, that includes China, the EU, the US, Russia, Saudi Arabia, Indonesia and Switzerland. And we hope that that will really help to improve understanding of likely to be influential in the process. So, the key messages from this project are still emerging, I would say, but we have a really strong cohort of national actors who are advocating to their governments that WSIS outcomes should be inclusive, rights-based, informed by diverse local realities, and most importantly reinforce the multi-stakeholder approach to Internet governance. That has happened through ICANN support and we really are deeply grateful. So I'm going to drop the link to the documents produced by the cross-stakeholder group which I spoke about earlier into the chat so you can learn more, and I hope to see some of you at the IGF to tell you more about the project which is support by ICANN. Thank you so much.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Rose, that's really interesting. I'm going to come back to some of the things you said when we've finished with our last scheduled speaker, who's Paul Blaker from the UK government. Paul.

PAUL BLAKER

Thank you very much. My name is Paul Blaker. I'm from the UK government. Thanks so much for organizing this session. It's been really great to hear about the work already being done across the

community. I think the WSIS review will be important for all of us and the Internet will be at the heart of it. I think the multi-stakeholder model is better understood than it was 10 years ago when WSIS was last reviewed, but we can't take it for granted. It'll still be important to make sure that the delegates in New York at the UN fully understand how the multi-stakeholder model works and why it's so critical. And it's important that the technical community has a strong voice in the review, explaining the importance of the technical foundations of the Internet, and just as important, demonstrating how the work of the technical community genuinely serves the public interest globally and contributes to sustainable development.

For the UK government, we're taking a positive and future focused approach to the WSIS review. WSIS has achieved a lot. But there's so much more to do. Connecting the unconnected remains a huge challenge with one-third of the population still offline, and this should continue to be the biggest priority for the WSIS process, which will require sustained commitment, public-private partnerships, and innovative solutions to connect the final third of people to the Internet.

We also want to see a focus on areas such as the gender, digital divide, human rights, Internet shutdowns, promoting multilingualism online, the environmental impacts of digital technology, and using the WSIS action lines as a technology-neutral framework to address the wider opportunities and challenges that digital technologies can have for sustainable

development. We also want to secure a permanent mandate for the IGF and also more formal recognition of national and regional IGFs. We think that will help to promote multistakeholder dialogue at local levels and help to make the global conversation more inclusive and more inclusive. We know that multi-stakeholder working does not always come naturally to the United Nations, but many stakeholders and many governments have pressed the UN to make sure that stakeholders can play a meaningful and influential role in the review process, and what we've heard so far has been positive. There is a UN DESA website which has all the information about the review and opportunities to contribute. It might be helpful to share the address with the community. It's very easy to see everything that's going on. The review will be co-facilitated by Albania and Kenya and they plan to attend the IGF and the WSIS forum and take part in stakeholder consultations. And it's really important the community takes these opportunities. We really welcome about all the work that we've heard in this session, raising awareness and making sure that the technical community will have a strong voice. And as a government, the UK is keen to work with the stakeholder community throughout the process.

Just to finish on a positive note, I think that with strong participation across the community we can see the WSIS review as an opportunity to reinforce commitments to multi-stakeholder working, to raise understanding of the critical role the tech community plays, to strengthen the kind of collaboration and cooperation we need to connect the unconnected and to make

sure the internet is driving sustainable development across the globe. Thanks.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Thank you very much Paul. That was a really nice thing to say at the end that it's an opportunity and we heard Sally at the beginning say we have to come with positive messages. I think the two come together. Let me attempt to read if I can read some notes that I took out of what we heard so far in terms of again the question being okay, we now have a process, what sort of messages should we carry forward? We heard it's very important not to lose the voice of the technical community and it's important that the technical community explains the technical foundations of how the internet works to the negotiators. We heard we can't rely on arguments of the past. I guess that means Chris, we cannot just go there and say it works, don't touch it I suppose. We have to explain how the multi-stakeholder model is delivering on the commitments of the WSIS. Here's where the GNSO mapping exercise for example comes in. We got the sneak peek to a paper that's coming tomorrow from ISOC and an ICANN, but I put that aside. Come with positive messages about the potential of the internet, connect the unconnected and highlight the circle dependence as Hissam said, that all that relies on the resilience and global system that we work on. Yeah, and those are I think the most important things that I heard.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thanks, Elena. So we're going to open up if anybody wants to make any comments. But before we do, I just want to ask a couple of questions. I'm going to make an assumption that basically, and I know that there may be some people who don't agree with everything every one of our speakers has said, but I'm going to make the assumption that the basic message is that each one of them is delivered as kind of the areas that we agree with. So who knew about the GNSO work that was going on? Who knew? GNSO folks, right? And a couple of others. Who knows about the TCCM statements and getting ready for all of their stuff? Cool. And ISOC stuff, who knows what ISOC's doing? Great. And global digital partnerships? Some. Some of the RIPE? I'm not going to say who knows what the UK government thinks because that's not necessary. So how would it be, do you think, if we could find a way of getting a central place for all of these documents, all of these papers, all of these reports to actually come and then each of your organisations, your bits of ICANN, At-LÉarge, or the GNSO, or the CCs, or ISOC, or whoever, could endorse those documents or parts of those documents so that the messages are not just coming from the individual organisations, but are also coming from the individual organisations with endorsements from other organisations attached? It seems to me that that may be something we should think about, I'm not suggesting we can make a decision to do it now, but it seems to me that that's something we could think about doing over the next few months. It seems to me that that may be something we should think about, I'm not suggesting we can make a decision to do it now, but it seems to me that's

something we could think about doing over the next few months. It seems to me that that may be something we should think about, I'm not suggesting we can make a decision to do it now, but it seems to me that that's something we could think about doing over the next few months. It seems to me that that may be something we should think about, I'm not suggesting we can make a decision to do it now, but it seems to me that that's something we could think about doing over the next few months so that the messages that come up from the, if you take the example of the ccNSO and the GNSO and At-Large and others in ICANN, coming together to work on what the GNSO's already done, could equally then become endorsed by ISOC if ISOC's prepared to do that. And then can be endorsed by the Global Digital Partnership if they're prepared to do that, and so on and so on. Because there's power in that, I think. So that's just a thought to throw out to the room as a result of what we've heard right now. So the floor is open for anyone who'd like to say anything. If you've spoken before, it doesn't matter, you can speak now. And if you'd like to say something, please raise your hand. Amrita.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Thank you, Chris. Amrita for the record. And while it's a great idea, it's kind of difficult to implement. That's a challenge, I would say. Because, or rather, there could be a standard, an open document where if people feel they bring in the parts which they endorse of someone else, and may attribute it to them. And if you see majority coming from certain things, the document could have that. But

when you're expecting a document to come out by the 20th of June, it's difficult. Rather, when you're responding to it, attributing you are agreeing to certain things may be useful. Because time is pretty low now. But while speaking, et cetera, like you have the WSIS+20 stakeholder discussions tomorrow and day after, referencing these points could be good. Yeah, I would say that. Because as Jorge was mentioning, WSIS is pretty huge. ICANN's mandate is limited in this entire thing. But yeah, whatever suits anyone can be referenced by the others.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

So thank you. If I may just respond to those, a couple of points I'd like to make. First of all, so I agree with you. If you're trying to do something by June the 20th, that's pretty challenging. But I think it's a kind of long, there's a slightly longer timeframe. If input is possible right up until just before the December UNGA, or as I like to call it, the UNGA games, it would be useful to be able to find ways of doing that. I acknowledge completely that the idea of signing on to other people's documents is quite challenging, but at least having a repository for them where everyone knows where they all are, and you'd be able to go to one place and find them all amongst ourselves, right, amongst the community would be useful, I think. And then people can choose to sign on to whatever it is they choose to sign on to.

ELENA PLEXIDA But it's definitely doable to pick up the messages from other people's documents and put them in the contributions to the consultation.

CHRIS DISSPAIN Exactly.

ELENA PLEXIDA I think we'll go back to Dan.

DAN GLUCK Yes, we have the aforementioned Jorge Cancio with a hand in chat.

JORGE CANCIO just wanted to share with you. Sometimes we are talking about those people in New York or those people in the capitals. Actually, some of us are involved in that process as well, and I'm not the only one in this room, in the GAC room. So happy to exchange, happy to drink a cup of coffee or a beer or whatever, and to have some discussions on these issues, because now it's really the high time to frame the discussion which will be forthcoming in New York. We still have maybe two weeks or a bit less to do so, so it's very timely to do that.

I just wanted to thank, amongst others, Rose for her intervention. It reflects a lot of the positions we have been having as Switzerland. As many of you might know, the original WSIS was held in Geneva

in 2003 with a second phase in Tunis in 2005, so we are deeply committed to this process, to this architecture, to the mandate and the vision of WSIS, that was to deliver an information society for us all. Information society, now that sounds a little bit obsolete, at least to my Generation Y and Generation Z colleagues and those generations that come afterwards, but after all, this is about a digital world that works for all of us, and today we have issues like AI, like data governance, like platforms, like connectivity still, the ever-evolving digital divides, human rights online, so we have to take all of those on board, and all of this in as much of an open and inclusive process as possible. The multistakeholder community delivered good guidance one year ago with the Sao Paulo Multistakeholder Guidelines. We can use that. I know UN DESA that is supporting the process in New York and the co-facilitators are taking it into account, but of course, the more the community calls for it, the better they will listen to really implementing those steps to make the process open and inclusive. The community not only has to call for it, they have to, we have to, you have to use those channels to really make your voice heard, and as Switzerland, we are really deeply committed to building bridges, helping building bridges so that we avoid those dichotomies between global north, global south, multilateral and multistakeholder, because each and every part has its role and what we want to do is really making this UN system fit for the challenges and the opportunities we have in the digital world we are living in. Thank you.

DAN GLUCK

Yep, thanks, Chris. We have two in the queue right now. First, we're gonna go to the stage left to Devan with the handheld microphone, and then afterwards, I have Peter Koch after that.

LUTZ DONNERHACKE

Lutz Donnerhacke, At-Large. I wonder why also confident that it will work out in the way you are presenting here. Let me remind you to a different version of the history. In 1990, we are not sure if internet, as we know, get track or not, but with the rise of the globalization, the world interconnections worked and we're allowed to grow. That's not natural. That's not a given fact. It's a good luck for the world, nothing more. The alternative would be to have an ITU-controlled number system like the phone number system. We do not need DNS servers because we have phone books. We do not have the problem with address allocation because every country has their own numbering scheme and can use addresses that they want to have and want to distribute. Of course, you have to go for an email address to your local government office, of course, but you get used to. And with the decrease of the globalization and the increase of national interest in the states, I do not see such a bright future as you're here driving in forward. I see a splinter net, a lot of national interconnected networks which controlled content and it will work in the current situation simply because about 80 to 90% of the internet communication is controlled by a handful of companies and they are very well situated in providing local access to local content and I think they would make a good business off. I do not see the need

for ICANN, I do not see the need for multi-stakeholderism in any of these futures, thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you very much. Who's next? Peter.

PETER KOCH

Yes. I'm a member of the ccNSO Council, and I thought that because we've been talking about what can be done, what are ccTLDs doing, I was going to share something that has been done in one of our committees. So first and foremost, let me say that everybody knows it, but ccTLDs are different from gTLDs, but they are also very much different from each other. And this is a feature, not a bug. Actually it's a strength. And one of the strengths behind this, and the reasons behind this, is that we cooperate and we encourage and support each other in doing things in the registry business, but also beyond that. So the ccNSO has a couple of committees, and one of those is the IGLC, the Internet Governance Liaison Committee, that has a large number of members from all the regions, all the continents. And we talk about Internet governance, and many of us have certain roles, like supporting their NRI, their National Regional Initiative, or as we say, their National IGF. Many of us have a secretariat function or similar things. So that's where we exchange these ideas.

And for those of you who are interested in what the ccNSO has been doing in that direction, I'll point to what has been happening in the

last year. At every ICANN meeting, the IGLC, which is listed under the ccNSO sessions in the calendar, but is of course open for anyone to attend and also ask questions or discuss, has had a meeting at every ICANN meeting last year and this year as well. So we were talking about Internet fragmentation, for example, sustainable development goals, the Global Digital Compact, and the roles that particular ccTLDs have had in their region or in their national community, which is, in the collection, a very good sample of what can be done and what can be achieved. And we've intensified that discussion. Last year it was all about the GDC, the Global Digital Compact, but we've intensified this discussion and the cooperation with looking at the WSIS+20, culminating in the December sessions. So we started as a method of working a heat map and topic clusters, napkin exercise, napkin pitch exercise, as we say, where everybody can contribute from their perspective what the hot topics are in which of the regions, so we can address them and help people identify peers for further discussion and cooperation between the ccTLDs. And a couple of analyses done there. I'll encourage everybody to go back to the archives or talk to our two co-chairs, Marta and Annalisa, or anybody from the ccNSO Council or the ccNSO Secretariat, to learn more about that practical cooperation and to find out what can be done on the WSIS+20 and on the GDC, of course, on the local or national level. Thank you so much.

PAUL TWOMEY

My name's Paul Twomey. I used to be a GAC Chair and a CEO. I was deeply involved with the first round of WSIS. I got asked to go to a meeting last year from the UN University on a request from the secretariat of the UN to talk about alternative models for how the UN works. The model they wanted to talk about was multi-stakeholderism. The lesson I took away potentially for this discussion is the following. The secretariats of the major international organizations are drowning in the face of countries giving them more and more mandates but no resources. So one of the messages that's coming out of the multi-stakeholder model for this part of the Internet is that the GAC, as I well know, is very good at giving instructions to the rest of the community to go away and do things, and the rest of the community, particularly looking at Keith here and others, end up paying for it. This model is self-funding. One of the things that maybe want to be given a bit of a message quietly to members who are attending from the member states in the UN is be careful what you ask for. They do not want to take on a whole new area where governments all want mandates but there won't be anybody to pay for it. So it's just a thing to quietly put in the discussion. Thank you.

FARZANEH BADII

Thank you. First of all, happy birthday, Desiree.

DESIREE MILOSEVIC

The comment we want to make as a group, the GNSO group that works on the mapping document is that we would also welcome

this central repository that's been suggested in the discussion we're having so far and also to thank everyone for the positive reception of our work. It's an inspiration. Thank you.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE

Thank you. I'm Bertrand de la Chapelle from Internet and Jurisdiction Policy Network. Quick reminder of context. This is a process that is taking place in New York with people and representatives from governments who do not have the same level of familiarity with the topics as most of the GAC representatives that are here. Their main objective is to address a discussion at a very high level and to produce a resolution at the end of the year. This resolution will be basically addressing a few high-level topics. I mean high-level. These are the articulation between the WSIS process and the Global Digital Compact. How much are they merged, subsumed in one another or not? What is the role in the respective distribution of responsibilities between the UN in New York and the UN in Geneva? What is going to happen with the Loch Ness Monster of the enhanced cooperation that is coming back into the landscape? This is for the people who have been participating in this process for 20 years. What is the difference between Internet governance and digital governance and where to put AI governance? But the one point that is extremely important implicitly is that it will be dealing with institutional questions regarding the future of the CSTD and the future of the IGF. And that's where I want to make two comments.

One is a preface. In everything that we've been discussing, we need to continue to reiterate that there is a strong distinction between the governance of the Internet and the governance on the Internet. And that the governance of the Internet in a multi-stakeholder fashion with all the institutions that ICANN, ISOC, IETF, RIRs and so on are part of has worked well, thank you very much, for 40 years, including through the tests of the COVID, where everybody was hanging on a thread because of the existence of the Internet. So this topic should be almost left aside, it should be more recognized and acknowledged as a remarkable accomplishment, including the IANA transition that was the bone of contention at the WSIS and that has been solved. The key problem is what do we do with governance on the Internet? And here the core message is the IGF is the only institutional innovation in 20 years with in addition the more than 150 regional and national IGFs. It is a precious tool, not a perfect one, but at the time the goal is not just to protect it, it's not just to defend it, it's not just to reconduct it, even to make it permanent, it's to have more of an ambition, because time has come 20 years in to recognize that it is time to make this a reasonable and full organization with an institutional moment, a new revised mandate and a real structure instead of the constant threatening of its resources, human and financial. So I encourage all of us to focus and put a huge emphasis on this question of the future of the IGF, not to just protect it, not to be on a defensive phase, but to have a vision and an ambition that may not be accomplished by December, but to plant the seed for a real serious

discussion in 2026 on what is the revised mandate and what is and should be the structure of the IGF.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Bertrand. We are pretty much out of time. I want to draw three lines out of this discussion. The first one is I would love to see the CCs, At-Large and GNSO rapidly get together and start working on the stuff that the GNSO has already done. Secondly, I think having some sort of a repository for reports and documents and so on and so forth is incredibly useful, and if we can organize that this week, we should do that. Because what I would like as the third point, is I would like to be able to go to the IGF in Oslo in two weeks' time and be able to talk to governments about every single one of the things that's being talked about here today. In order to do that, I need to have access to the stuff, and I need to be able to see the documents, and I need to be able to at least sound as if I know what I'm talking about. So, rather than having to go to 12 different websites and wade through link after link, it would be brilliant if there was a place to go where we could all look at everything that there is that supports what we believe in.

ELENA PLEXIDA

Yeah, and since we're out of time, I will again say what I said at the beginning. I mean, I have taken really good notes of this session, by the way. We do now have a process, and we do know there are going to be stakeholder consultations, and except from the IGF and the WSIS Forum, where we have to go with these messages, as you

said, Chris, and other people in the room, we have to contribute to these consultations. Time is now. Right? Yeah.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

I think we're going to call it, because we're now standing in the way of networking drinks. So, thank you very much indeed, everybody. Thanks for coming. See you later.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]