
ICANN84 Dublin | AGM – ccNSO: WSIS + 20 and Beyond - A Future Built by ccTLDs
Tuesday, October 28, 2025 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

CLAUDIA RUIZ

Hello and welcome to the ccNSO WSIS+20 and Beyond, a Future Built by ccTLDs. My name is Claudia Ruiz and I, along with my colleague Joke Braeken, are the participation managers for this session. Please note this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. I will also put them in the chat for your reference. During this session, questions or comments submitted in chat will be read aloud if put in the proper form as noted in the chat. Interpretation for this session will include English, Spanish, and French. 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, onsite participants will use a physical microphone to speak. Please state your name for the record and the language you will speak if you are speaking a language other than English and speak at a reasonable pace to allow for accurate

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.

interpretation. Thank you. And with that, I will now hand the floor over to Annaliese Williams. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Claudia. My name is Annaliese Williams. I'm from Australia's Country Code Top Level Domain, and this is a session organized by the Internet Governance Liaison Committee. The purpose of the IGLC is to encourage ccTLD managers to engage and to participate in internet governance processes.

We are a very active committee and regularly meet to share information amongst ourselves, but many of us are also very much engaged in the WSIS+20 conversations that are taking place nationally, and we are discussing those issues together as well. So, ccTLDs are a critical part of their local digital economies, and many of the managers here have good relationships with their local governments, and they're very connected to their local communities.

So today we are honored to be joined by his Excellency, Ambassador Ekitela Lokaale from the Republic of Kenya, the co-facilitator of the WSIS+20 process. And we will also be joined by some other leaders, in the ccTLD community, we have Byron Holland, who is the CEO of Canada's ccTLD and also ICANN Board member, and Olga Cavalli, who is a member of the ccNSO Council and is well known for her advocacy in the Latin American region for internet governance issues.

And joining us online, we will also have Vint Cerf who I think needs no introduction, but he'll be joining us today in his capacity as a member of the IGF Leadership panel.

So we're going to start with the ambassador today. I think most of us have had several opportunities to hear him and engage with him throughout the couple of days we've already had at ICANN. We very much appreciate your willingness to engage with the multi-stakeholder community, and we appreciate you making time in your busy schedule to meet with us today.

So I might start with a question or two, your excellency, and then open it up to our members to see if they have questions based on what they have already heard you saying. And I would just like to invite you to reflect on anything that you would like to share with us about the WSIS process so far or any expectations for the outcome document or any comments on the Zero Draft that you would like to share with us.

EKITELA LOKAALE

Thank you very much. Let me first say I'm grateful to be here again with many of you whom I've met already several times in different rooms, in different capacities, and it's a pleasure to have this opportunity again to engage. If I sound repetitive, I hope you'll understand why because I've met you in different spaces and nothing has changed since I left New York for me to be able to give you any new material. So, I apologize for that in advance.

But very quickly, because you've heard some of what I'm going to say already, I think this outcome review process has been very eye-opening in many respects for us as ambassadors or diplomats based in New York. In a number of respects, first there's been a reaffirmation of some of the things which are unique, I think, to the WSIS process and the WSIS framework and that continues to shine through.

And second, as we've embarked on writing different versions of the outcome document, there are certain things which are beginning to emerge as possible points of convergence, but there are also a few which seem to be points of divergence of opinion up to this point. So, very quickly, if I can just summarize, one, there's a remarkable community here. There are people who have been at it for 20 years since, or even more.

Some of you go back to the potential conference in 1998, so I hear. So, there are not very many human beings who can be committed to an idea as I've seen people in this space being committed, and that has struck me, and I think it's one thing that I to live with having managed this process, and that's very, very impressive indeed.

But more substantively, a number of things. First, reaffirmation of the relevance and importance of the WSIS vision. That over people centered, inclusive, and development-oriented information society, I've said this before, there are some suggestions on updating perhaps that language which is still a subject of

discussion at this point. But I think the essence, the foundational vision, many of you agree, as well as other stakeholders who are not in the room, that it's relevant.

Second thing that stands out is the multi-stakeholder model, which is very central to WSIS. And we've tried to stay or remain faithful to that model, and also find ways of applying it to the work that we're doing currently in the hope that it's going to improve the way that the United Nations manages intergovernmental processes in future.

I'm sure you are aware by now that we've already established a multi-stakeholder Sounding Board and many members are in the room comprised of people from the technical community and others. And I'm very happy that I'm sharing this platform with Vint, who has been phenomenal in his contribution to the Sounding Board.

We also tried to, as part of promoting that multi-stakeholder model, tried, and I'm grateful to my co-facilitator because we seem to share a desire to create spaces for those of you who are not necessarily aligned or part of government to contribute in processes, which to some, have been intergovernmental or multilateral. So, we've tried to convene joint sessions, informal sessions, bringing together technical community and others, and so on.

Thirdly, as I said yesterday, technical community is very active, and we've tried to give recognition to that section of stakeholders in the

zero draft, and it's our intention to keep it that way until the eventual outcome document, because I think that recognition means a lot to the WSIS community as a whole, and hopefully coming out of this process of subsequent intergovernmental and negotiations can also recognize technical communities in whatever subject areas whether it's the medical field or others and so on. I think it's a good precedent that we are going to set coming out of this. Are we pressed for time?

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

No, you can keep speaking. But I was also going to see whether any of our members might have questions for you as well, if that is agreeable with you.

EKITELA LOKAALE

Absolutely. I was just going to ask if I can stop at this point and respond to any specific questions that you may have. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you very much. So, this committee, this is sort of our one in a series of sessions that we have done on WSIS+20. We've had sessions focusing on the contribution that ccTLD managers are already making to achieving the WSIS vision.

So, at this point, I would like to open it up and see whether any of our members would like to, while we have this opportunity, would

like to ask a question of the ambassador. Over here and then over here. Thank you.

JORDAN CARTER

Ambassador, thanks. And committee, thank you. Jordan Carter .au domain. As ccTLD managers, we all have different relationships with our own governments, and it isn't always with the foreign ministry, but it's often with a ministry that will be able to talk to the foreign ministry.

And the Zero Draft that you've prepared for this review is quite good on a lot of fronts in terms of some of the issues that you've spoken about. My own personal view is we couldn't have hoped for a better first draft of this outcomes document. Is there anything we can do on the national level to help reinforce support for the Zero Draft or any things that you think we should be talking to our governments about?

I don't know enough about the UN to know if it's improper to ask you a question like that. But if there's stuff that we should or could be doing as CCs nationally, you'd be welcome to suggest those to us. Thanks.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Please, Pierre, and then we'll hear the answers.

PIERRE BONIS

Thank you, Annaliese. Pierre Bonis for the record from the registry of the .fr, France. So, first of all ambassador, thank you very much for your time. Thank you very much for your work, especially at listening to us. There is a feeling that since with the two co-facilitators take their office, the technical community has channels and ways to listen, and this is very, very nice.

And we didn't frankly have this kind of feeling the months before, so, you made already a change. Thank you for that. My question is very practical. You said that in December of New York, we will see the white smoke in a way. And I would like to know if even if we are not Cardinals, we will be able to enter the room. In which way can we participate to the last mile?

Is it only through our governmental delegation, if they accept, or will there be another way of participating to this last mile? Because it's always in the last minute we know that some important things are decided. Thank you very much for your answer.

EKITELA LOKAALE

Thank you. On the first question, I wish I was not in the role of a co-facilitator, I would be a bit more upfront in making those requests for what you can do to talk to your governments. But I think for a process as important as this, what we would wish for as co-facilitators is that stakeholders and member states engage constructively, hold the view and the positions, but not draw too many red lines on the sand, so to speak.

Because if delegations are able to come into the room open to give and take, then that way we are able to advance a bit more rapidly in the negotiations. I know there are things which are very close to the hearts of many delegations in terms of national positions, but WSIS is one area which in my brief experience of interaction with it, is one way it's possible to find very many points of convergence, because it's an agenda, which has been with us for 20 years.

A lot of the issues have been discussed, they have been litigated, so, we know where people stand on a lot of issues. We know those that can easily amount to deal breakers if we were to be rigid about them.

So, my encouragement would be there are those issues that are being litigated in the past in Tunis, in Geneva, during WSIS+10, and we managed to move forward. Perhaps it may not be extremely helpful to revive them and focus more on those that can take us forward. So, that would be my first requests.

Then the second is for those of you who have some leverage or influence within your governments, I would encourage you to channel some of the useful insights that I've gathered in the course of my three or four days here through those delegations. Because there are elements of the process that will be in many ways, intergovernmental, and that it'll be member states only in the room. So, if you're able to channel those through them, we will find that most helpful.

Then to the second question, yeah, we have another opportunity for you to engage. I think it's now confirmed as of this morning, we've agreed with my colleague that after we produce REV1 on the 7th of November, then we'll have another joint consultation on the 14th of November where we expect you to give us more feedback that will enable us to get into REV2 with a near final--

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

We've just been told--

EKITELA LOKAALE

Is that a suggestion that I go back to everything I said? Maybe not, eh. Okay, I apologize. So, I was saying there are two more opportunities for you to engage. We'll produce the REV1 on 7th of November, and then have a consultation on the 14th. It's now confirmed, but actual details will be on the DESA website.

So, at that point, we hope that you'll be able to give us your input on specific sections. Maybe not in a written format at that stage, but if you're able to just speak to specific sections of REV1, that will be useful. Another way, and at this point, I'll be inviting Denise to also speak about the high-level meeting.

I think there's room for some of you to participate and actually address the meeting as happened in 2015, there is a mechanism there of selecting who gets to attend and actually address the high-level meeting because we just did a technical rollover of the

modalities resolution that we had in 2015. But stakeholders have been creative so far already.

There are those who have approached, I think, their national delegations and have been invited to be part of those national delegations. So last week, for example, I saw one or two colleagues in the room who came there in their capacity as part of member state delegations. So, that's something that I would encourage you as the experts in this field to also explore the possibility of doing. Yeah, thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you. And thank you for the questions. I will pass over to Byron Holland now, Byron Holland. And I understand it's quite a short presentation, I'm hoping that you will be able to stay. We know from your staff that you have pressures on your time. But if you are able to stay for this presentation on how the technical community can strengthen multi-stakeholder, that's okay. Thank you. Thanks very much. Over to you, Byron.

BYRON HOLLAND

I feel like it's getting shorter in real time. Good afternoon, everybody. Great to be back in this room with friends and colleagues. Just a handful of weeks before the WSIS+20 High Level Meeting in New York. And I know it's a cliché to use the word, but we really are at an important crossroads here 20 years after the original WSIS. Governments, stakeholders are coming back with

new conclusions about how the internet should be governed and overseen.

And for ccTLDs, of course, this isn't just some abstract policy conversation, it goes really to the heart of how we operate, how we're recognized, how our work is valued in the global governance system, and of course, potentially how we might or might not be regulated.

I want to frame my remarks around three key ideas. The first is a perspective that's informed by Sarah's recent original research on the role of the technical community in strengthening multi-stakeholderism. Second is the distinct role that the technical community coalition for multi-stakeholderism or TCCM is playing in these global debates.

And third is what this means for us as ccTLDs. Why must we step into WSIS+20 boldly and not just defensively? Sierra's recent study on multi-stakeholder governance was informed by over 90 voices from the technical community. And what we really saw shows real progress, but also some non-trivial gaps that we need to close.

When all stakeholders, governments, civil society, technical community, business are truly engaged, governance simply works better. Unfortunately, sometimes our system do fall short, limited by unstable funding, sometimes weak decision links, slow community processes, and potential capture, whether intentional or not.

For ccTLDs, this comes as no surprise. Security and stability rely as much on governance as on technology. And without credible trusted processes and a seat at the table, decisions can easily overlook technical realities. So, the lesson from our research from 90 Voices in the community is clear. We need to be ambitious about making multi-stakeholder internet governance work and work better, and we need to carry that ambition into WSIS+20, which I think we have, but importantly, beyond that.

Research provides some of the foundation, but it's clearly not enough on its own, and that's where broader coordination within a technical community comes. Alongside some of the work that CIRA has done, ccTLDs far and wide, and other members of the technical community have created the TCCM. We've grown it in 18 short months from an idea to 44 members around the world. And what's unique is that the TCCM unites registries, registrars, numbering community, TLD regional groups, and DNS service providers to speak with a clear voice in international discussions.

The TCCM is about showing up, articulating why the technical community matters, and what matters to it, and insisting that we have a place at the table when internet governance is debated. For ccTLDs, the TCCM turns individual voices into collective influence, and together, we become acknowledged as a core pillar of the Internet's architecture. And that visibility counts when governments shape commitments at WSIS+20.

And this is the link to my final point. Platform only matter if we use them, the coalition can amplify our voices, but ccTLDs are and distinct from the TCCM still need to decide what to say and how to boldly say it. And that brings me to the heart of my message, my sense that this is the time for ccTLDs to be bold. The Zero Draft of WSIS+20 outcome, I think, and I think we mostly agree, is in good shape from an internet governance perspective.

It is very likely that the IGF will be made permanent, which is what we've been arguing for. Now, we have to step up and make sure it works for all of the internet community. And I'm not sure that all stakeholders feel welcome at the IGF. For example, over the years, and I've been to many since 2008, we've seen less and less active participation by the private sector, for example.

We know that governance works best when all stakeholders are at the table. The IGF needs to be relevant to all and designed to foster true dialogue. We need to ensure that no one group dominates the discussion or the agenda. And yes, funding for the IGF also needs to be shared by all stakeholders. We must recognize the critical value that local and regional IGFs play in the global IGF.

And I think we in this community know because we support them, we sponsor them, we pay for them, we participate in our local and regional IGFs or NRIs. So, maybe one thing we could also do at the IGF is let's make it less about high level features and more about hearing from the NRIs, the actual challenges and opportunities of the information society from the bottom up.

If all we do is defend the status quo, we risk being sidelined in a process where others are pushing forward with ambitious agendas, some of which might sideline the multi-stakeholder model in favor of more purely intergovernmental models. And being bold means more than just protecting the status quo. It really means shaping the future that we want.

So WSIS+20, that means demanding or asking for at least a permanent properly funded IGF that genuinely shapes agendas, not just holds conversations. It means calling for structured pathways that ensure voices, multi-stakeholder dialogue forms actually influence decision making. The crucial point is this, vision alone is not going to be enough.

We must match it with the effort and the resources to truly bring it to life. We as a community, we as TCCM, all the technical operators have worked very hard over the last 18 to 24 months to shape a strong WSIS+20 outcome. Now, we have to make it count by building the IGF we want, the one we've envisioned. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you very much for that, Byron. I see that we are making you anxious over there. I don't wish to keep you from your next appointment to put you behind. But thank you so much for joining us. Please, join me in thanking his excellency.

EKITELA LOKAALE

Thank you for having me. Sadly, I have to leave for another engagement. So, it's been a pleasure getting to interact with all of you. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you. Sorry for the interruption, Byron, but I think we will have-- are there questions for Byron? I think it was a very interesting presentation. I'm glad the ambassador was able to stay. You have a question, Olga, go ahead. You can go while they are thinking.

OLGA CAVALLI

Thank you. Thank you very much, Byron, for a very interesting presentation. Who can be member of this coalition? I mean, it's only for technical community. One thing that I would like to mention is I'm an engineer and I'm never considered a technical community member, I don't know why. So, this is why I'm asking the question.

BYRON HOLLAND

The TCCM has worked on exactly that question to try to define it. It started as a very loose coalition, really formed around an idea more than a specific set of rules and regulations. But it really has been geared towards organizations who are involved in providing what we call critical internet infrastructure.

Now, there are members of the secretariat in the room who have actually worked on the very specific question you're asking. I might

throw it open to somebody from the secretariat who can give a more granular answer than I can, but we've really tried to shape it around the organizations who deliver the services. Any of my fellow secretariat members?

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Any volunteer?

DAVID LAWRENCE

Hi, it's David here from CIRA .ca for the record. Yeah, we've defined TCCM as effectively members of the Internet's technical community. So, the companies, organizations, groups, and actors whose day-to-day job is really to manage and operate the critical infrastructure and services at the heart of the internet. I hope that helps.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Are there any other questions? Anriette, go ahead.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN

Sorry, I wanted to put my hand up in Zoom. Anriette Esterhuysen, actually from NCSG, Civil Society Association for Progressive Communications. Thanks very much for that presentation, Byron. And just to speak from a civil society perspective, one of the things that's been really useful for us is that through TCCM, we've been able to engage in cross community statements around WSIS,

particularly around processes and good modalities for participation.

I wish that we, as civil society, we're as organized as you are in the technical community, but I really want to commend you for establishing TCCM and achieving so much progress in the 18-month period that Byron referred to. And Byron, just in response to your comments about the multi-stakeholder process and the IGF and the reduced private sector participation, I think it's worth really having an understanding of why that is happening.

I think we tend to blame IGF processes, but they might just be different priorities and interests, particularly for big internet companies at the moment, that makes our spaces not as relevant to them as they were 10 years ago.

So, I think rather than necessarily thinking about how to be welcoming to private sector actors, we have to think about how are we relevant to private sector actors? And sometimes you can be relevant by actually challenging particular actors, not necessarily by just being welcoming.

BYRON HOLLAND

Anriette, thank you for that. And actually, I love the distinction because I think it's an important decision, distinction rather. I'm not suggesting we just be welcoming, I'm suggesting that we need to make it relevant, and perhaps we're just debating in violent agreement here. But I think we do need to make it relevant to

them, including as a challenge function, and probably most importantly as a challenge function. But we got to make it relevant so they show up because at the end, I strongly believe we do need all the relevant stakeholders in the room when we have important conversations.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Vint Cerf, I see your hand up. Go ahead, please.

VINT CERF

Yes, thank you very much. Byron, that was a very powerful speech. Thank you so much for telling us more about TCCM. I'd like to suggest one line of reasoning that that makes TCCM more important to almost everyone. If you think about it, the internet works a certain way and it's evolved over time, certainly, but it has very important technical underpinnings.

Policy can sometimes ignore the way the internet works, and policies can be adopted that are not compatible with the way the internet can work or does work. And so, that makes TCCM even more important, because as I assume it would speak to the policy makers about what's feasible in the internet space in terms of policy as it either reinforces or interferes with internet operation.

The parties who make the internet work among, which of course we include the ccTLDs, are kind of essential to everything. So, I'm a big fan of what you and your colleagues have done with regard to TCCM, and certainly encourage you to continue the work.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks for that. We might move to our next speaker. Olga, would you like to-- You can. We'll pass it.

OLGA CAVALLI

Thank you very much, Annaliese, for inviting me to this very interesting and important panel with such distinguished colleagues and ambassador that just left. And a big audience, by the way. Good to have you here. So, I was asked to reflect on the differences between digital governance and internet governance or internet governance.

So, my presentation is short and it tends to be just food for thought. And remember that I'm a technologist, so this is maybe I have a bias, but that I cannot avoid. So, we'll move to the next one. I would like to start with the meaning of the words semantics, digital. Where does the digital word comes from? It comes from a technology that was developed in the 1950s that led us to this important development of all the electronic industry.

It comes from gates that the only thing that deliver is one and zeros. This is digital, two digits. This is how the computers work. For those of you that are not familiar with the technology of computers, this is everything inside the computers only turn on and off. That, of course, with many things and software, seem to be very quick and intelligent, but really this is how it works. Zero and one, this is where the word digital comes from.

The sequence of beats is how everything happens in the computers up to today. The internet always has been for every one of us, a network of networks, different networks that are interconnected by the very well known here in ICANN, the digital identifiers or the IP addresses and other numbers that allow us to interconnect these networks and have the feeling that it's only one network all over the world.

So, it's a global system of interconnected computers in a big network. So, this is the meaning that we all have in mind for digital and for the internet. About most of the digital governance, common and name has been assigned to digital technologies covering, for example, artificial intelligence, data algorithms, platforms, digital identity, and e-government.

Mainly focus on digital transformation, and mainly who uses this digital governance term are institutions like OSD, G20, United Nations, development process in UNESCO, ITU, United Nations Digital Cooperation initiatives like the Global Digital Compact. The governance model that is using this digital governance concept is mainly state and institution centered, emphasizes intergovernmental cooperation.

About internet governance, we all know the definition that was done during 2005 and before by the WIIG, the definition about internet governance, all the rules that apply to the work and the functioning of the internet.

The famous definition that is also included in the Tunis agenda, WSIS 2005. And all the institutions involved that use the term of internet governance are more multi-stakeholder led, say, ICANN, IETF, internet Society, Regional Internet Registries, all the WSIS forum and processes, Internet Governance Forums, National and Regional Internet Governance Forum.

So, the term internet governance is more related with a concept of multi-stakeholder environment, multi-stakeholder organizations. So, defined semantics and processes. Main processes using internet governance, the World Summit of the Information Society defined internet governance and created the Internet Governance Forum. Internet Governance Forum itself, a global multi-stakeholder forum, we all know it since 2006 it exists. And we are hoping that it will exist forever.

And the NETmundial in 2014 and 2024 organized by the government of Brazil by the CGI reinforced the multi-stakeholder principles. We all remember what we did last year, very interesting meetings in Sao Paulo about internet governance. ICANN and IANA transition was also named as an internet governance activity. The national and regional IGF, the schools of internet governance, the dynamic coalitions, research institutions, and others use internet governance.

About digital governance main processes, United Nations Secretary General's roadmap for digital cooperation, global digital compact, shared principles for digital governance, as I mentioned,

artificial intelligence, data platforms, connectivity, OECD, digital economy outlook, and artificial intelligence principles, 2019 and the renew artificial intelligence document that they had produced.

They used this concept of digital governance for artificial intelligence, platform regulation, G20, digital economy working group, digital economy policy coordination, and European Digital Governance Act from 2022.

So, you can see the distinguish in between more government led processes using digital governance and more multi-stakeholder processes using internet governance. So, summarizing what I have said, technologies based on digits, one and zero, technology, as I said, develop in some several decades ago. Artificial intelligence, data algorithm platforms, digital identity, internet governance is more related with naming forums, dialogue, research, coalitions, capacity building, and multi-stakeholder participation in general.

But we have this, what we do with this? What happens with qubits? What happens with this? This is reality. And I didn't bring the one that is happening in China, it was the largest, and I didn't bring the picture of the one in Germany or others. It's quantum internet. It's an internet not based in digits, it's based on quantum. It's based on photons going from one place to the other using whether wireless connections or fiber optics.

This is real. This is happening now. It's not the future. So, I brought an example from a country near mine where I live in Argentina. So you can see that this is happening in many other countries. So what

do we do with this? What we do with qubits, it's not bits, it's qubits. Are we going to name quantum governance three names for the governance?

Digital governance, quantum governance, internet governance, the internet, always the network networks, and we don't know how this will evolve. I see a smiling face. Yeah. This is why I wanted from you, to smile and think of this. So, I don't have the answer, I don't know how this network that will evolve in the future will interact with the networks with digits, but this is happening and I think it will always be networks.

And something that I have learned working in the development of regulations related with technology is that you have to be agnostic about technology in doing laws and regulations because technology changes. Now, we see that technology is changing. We have like 200 quantum computers all over the world, we have now quantum governance and quantum internet.

Are we going to name it quantum governance? So, I don't have the answer. I think that internet governance is a more broad and inclusive way of naming all the rules related with the internet, having the concept of being the internet and network of networks, whether it is digits or it's photons or whatever, it's sent by the connections. And this is the idea of food for thought, and open for comments, questions. You can agree with me or not, but just wanted to have [00:44:37 - inaudible] I liked it very much. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks very much, Olga. That was a very interesting presentation and not a perspective I have heard before. We have heard that internet governance versus digital governance conversation has been taking place in recent days. Any questions or comments for Olga? Anybody changed their position on the name, on their preferences as a result of that? Go ahead, please.

VINT CERF

Well, first of all, thank you for this suggestion, Olga, because it puts in perspective the odd granularity that we're seeing about the use of the word governance. I mean, we've got AI governance and we've got digital governance, and we've got internet governance, and now you've got quantum governance. I think you're right to point out that we're being overly granular. What this really amounts to in the end is applications of digital technology in networked environments, because that's the world that we're living in, and that's the world we've all built together. So, I'm glad that you point this out.

It says that we need to be more inclusive and more cohesive as we talk about governance rather than splitting the things up into tiny, tiny little granular pieces, partly because any governance decision made in any one of those areas is going to have an effect on the others, and we need to be conscious of that. And I think the Internet Governance Forum over its 20 years has expanded its space of consideration as the application space has expanded. So,

thank you very much for both an amusing and thoughtful presentation.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Vint. And we have a question down the back of the room. Go ahead, please.

MARKUS KUMMER

Thank you. Makus Kummer, I'm [00:46:41 - inaudible] veteran. I was the head of the secretariat when we started it, and I was also the head of the secretariat of the working group on internet governance when we actually developed the definition. And just a short comment, it was an interesting presentation, but I would like to go back actually to the Tunis agenda.

The Tunis agenda doesn't just provide definition of internet governance in the [00:47:08 - inaudible] actually, paragraphs that explain in detail what internet governance is. This one paragraph says it's naming and address, and it clearly states it has also deals with public issues [00:47:27 - inaudible], it lists human rights, it lists cybersecurity, it lists multi [00:47:32 - inaudible], these are all issues related to the use of the internet.

And as Vint just said, IGF right from the beginning has dealt with all these issues, and obviously the internet is not the same anymore as it was 20 years ago, but it is, and as Olga rightly said, we are [00:47:53 - inaudible] of networks and all these issues are actually included.

My fear when reading the GDC, but also the Zero Draft seems to be an artificial limitation of the scope of the IGF. It tries to narrow it down. It says the IGF is here for [00:48:14 - inaudible], but then there are other issues such as AI, such as data, and, and, and. No, these issues are all part of internet governance, and the IGF has always dealt with these issues.

So we have to be careful that we don't narrowly, artificially reduce the scope of the IGF. And I made the comment in one of the consultations that it should not be [00:48:40 - inaudible] reducing the scope of the mandate of the IGF. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Markus. And I think, Anriette, you wanted to say something? Go ahead.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN

Thank you very much, Annaliese. Anriette Esterhuysen for the record. I strongly support what Markus is saying, and I [00:49:00 - inaudible] Byron's presentation very directly. I think to achieve what you were saying, Byron, which is sure that we do have [00:49:13 - inaudible] for that matter. At the IGF and in our multi-stakeholder spaces, we need to look at the scope and the definition.

And I think Markus is sounding a very relevant warning. If we allow this narrow definition of internet governance and the role of the IGF or the scope of the IGF to continue and be finalized in the Zero

Draft, it's in a sense saying the IGF is not relevant to all the emerging debates and challenges, which in fact, those very stakeholders you are talking about are so engaged with at the moment.

So I think we need to claim the fact that our definition is broad enough of internet governance, that it includes names and numbers, but it includes so much more as well in order for us to have this very inclusive, multi-stakeholder approach that provides that sort of, if you look at a Venn diagram, that overlap between the public policy issues, the bigger sort of human rights, social impact challenges, and the specifics of the technical coordination and governance. So I think we will regret this if we allow this very narrowing of internet governance to become the status quo.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Anriette. I do have three questions over here, and then we do have one more presentation to go ahead, but I will do these three here. Janis, please.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you very much. Janis Karklins, recently appointed Head of Government Engagement at ICANN, but I would like to take this hat off and pretend to be a veteran of WSIS. So, when we need to look in the context at the time, and we're doing WSIS, internet governance in reality was geared towards speaking about governance of the internet.

It was all about names and numbers, cables and access, and so, it was really discussion how that should be governed because there was one situation that was at the center of conversation. But then, few years later, it became more this conversation about governance on the internet. And then actually appeared another term, which was generic, which was the cyberspace and the governance of cyberspace.

And now we are talking about cyberspace more in terms of security, cybersecurity. And on digital and internet governance, we're talking in different aspects. So, it really is rather contextual. You need to look at what you're trying to address and then what are these governance elements that we are using in addressing those issues.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you. Pierre.

PIERRE BONIS

Thank you, Annaliese, and first of all, thanks to the panelists for TCCM and for this study that you made about the distinction between digital and internet. That's very, very interesting. I just wanted to echo what Janis just said. And by the way, we are a bunch of veterans of WSIS in the room, I guess. That's not that I disagree with what Markus Kummer said, that's that I see that there may be a danger, and I'll explain myself.

The organizations that are established to be part of the internet governance old fashioned way, names and numbers, ICANN, IETF, they exist and they work on that. Of course, they don't ignore that there is AI, and they include this in their reflection, but they are not here to set the rules for other things that names and numbers or some protocols that are linked to the networks.

As part of this technical community, AFNIC, .fr, which is a name, I'm not very sure that I have something more to say about, let's say, AI than my neighbor in my apartment. I don't know. That's not because I'm part of technical communities and I'm a specialist of AI, I'm a specialist of names and numbers.

So if the technical community is 100% or 99% from that community of the, let's say, basic roots internet, and wants to have a mandate as a technical community to discuss things that they are not involved in, and they are not maker of, I'm not very sure that it's a good way.

So saying that we want an IGF that will stand forever and discuss of every matters that happens on the digital world, I don't know. I don't know if I will be comfortable with my neighbor at the next IGF because maybe he will be talking about things that are so different from those I know that I will be uncomfortable.

And to finish with that, this is a position to discuss about a lot of things, e-Education, e-Health, e-everything, what we have in the WSIS. This discussion was led by government representative. They

have to be generalists. They talk about everything. They are not specialists of anything. This is their job. This is not mine.

And I don't see our technical community, for instance, talking about, I don't know, the that or that societal approach, which we have an individual thought on it, but we don't have a legitimacy as technical community to carry on with these topics. So, it's a tricky part and it's not so easy as to say IGF is the only way it has to be permanent and speak about everything and listen to technical community on every matters. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Pierre. I'll go to you, Peter, and then we'll move to Vint. Go ahead, Peter.

PETER KOCH

Yeah, thanks, Annaliese. And danke, Olga, for being both inspiring and a bit provocative. I can chime in on some things that people have said before, but the point I was going to make is we've seen patterns where proponents of new technologies or new paradigms claim that with their new technology, there needs to be a new governance, and we should always challenge that by asking them for what the actual new governance questions are, rather than implying that just because I have an IP, blah, blah, I need a totally new governance system.

Now, that said, and this goes into what others have said before, it has helped, our site has helped if we keep the internet governance

forum open enough to at least starting the debate of what I said, what exactly the governance questions are. And that is, I think, the openness that we need to maintain without assuming any of these questions than automatically into the IGF. Thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you. I think there is still much more to discuss on this, but we'll move now to Vint's presentation. Vint, we do have your slides and I'm happy to move them on at your direction. Go ahead, please.

VINT CERF

Thank you so much. I'll try to make this very brief. Let's go to the next slide, please. This is basically discussing how the IGF Secretariat is supported. And my main bullet point to jump to the end is that I'm looking for ccTLD operators to help to support the IGF secretariat because it is underfunded and it's being asked as the years have gone on to do more and more in support of IGF activities, including the national and regional internet governance activities.

So there are basically two sources of support for IGF Secretariat. One comes from the host country and another comes from the main grant, from UN sources. If you go to the next slide, you'll see - if you could go to the next slide, please. There we go. You'll see how this breaks out from the government support, which has been the primary support for the last several years as you can see.

Private sector varies pretty dramatically. The tech community has been relatively consistent. And then there's other which almost doesn't show much at all. The 2025 budget here was as of the midyear, and if we go to the next slide, we'll see some projections for the end of 2025, where the budget and expenditures look like they will end up at around 2.4 million.

What's important for you to appreciate is that the IGF Secretary, of course, supports the mag, it supports the leadership panel, it supports the NRIs-- oh, I see, my camera seems to have gone off and I don't know why. There we go, I'm back. We estimate that the budget that should be supporting IGF is around 3 million a year. We are coming close to that in 2025.

If we go to the next slide, I think we'll get a better sense for how things split out. And the point that I want to make here is that while we're getting closer to what I consider to be the best and optimum support level, which is about 3 million a year, we're still short of that.

A modest contribution from the ccTLDs could make a very dramatic difference, even if every ccTLD operator was able to afford even just \$10,000, when you do the math, you're in a million dollars plus, and that would make a dramatic difference for IGF Secretariat. The reason I want to emphasize is the utility and value of making a commitment.

And what Elisse has suggested is a multi-year commitment, which the ccTLDs made some years ago, a three-year commitment as I

recall is that the importance of the IGF secretariat spans into the NRIs especially, and this should be of some interest and concern to the ccTLD operators as well.

I think the next slide is sort of just a summary of where we end up in terms of estimated balance at the end of the year. And the reason I want to say that having a balance at the end of the year is important, is that the IGF rules do not allow it to do anything to spend any money unless it actually has it in the budget.

So, advance funding is very important for IGF secretariat to get off the mark at the beginning of each of its fiscal years. I think that's probably the last slide. There is one more, which just says this is an important year because we're about to renew our mandate, which will be for a phase four, assuming that IGF and WSIS, sorry, are renewed by the general assembly.

The last slide, next one just shows where to go to igf@un.org if the ccTLDs are interested in making commitments to support the secretariat. Just as a private sector note, Google put a half a million dollars into support for the IGF in this calendar year, and I hope to be able to do that again in subsequent years.

So I just ask for your support for the IGF Secretariat. I also want to thank Byron for an inspiring talk, and also the importance of TCCM, just to emphasize that the technical community needs to help the policy community understand what's feasible and what's

reasonable and what's potentially harmful to the operation of the internet.

None of the applications that we've been talking about will work if the underlying mechanisms of the internet are not reliable, safe, and secure. Well, I'll stop there and I'll thank you for your attention, and of course, I'm happy to answer any questions that you might have.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Vint. Theresa, go ahead.

THERESA SWINEHART

Thank you very much, and Vint, thank you for your comments. They're very timely. I think that in the Zero Draft we saw the recognition of an IGF and the national and regional IGFs. I think that is a huge step forward. And from the ccTLD community standpoint, there are many opportunities in relation to the funding as well, because you have the direct link to local businesses and you have the direct link to other stakeholders who might also be able to contribute.

Additionally, to the financial stability is the participation of all stakeholders and including the private sector, of course, is fundamentally key. And so, the opportunity for ccTLDs to not only contribute to a secretariat, and we can ensure long-term stability for that secretariat and the longevity that we've now gotten recognized in the Zero document, but also potentially also reach

out to your networks, to the private sector and really encourage what the value is of this and encourage them to contribute.

Businesses are running businesses on a platform that is dependent upon good policy and thoughtful discussions and noodling complex issues in forums such as ICANN, but also in forums such as the IGF, and anything you can do to help. Also awareness for the private sector I think would be very good also for the financial contributions to the secretariat. So, just an observation of a great network that we have and how we could use it. Thanks.

VINT CERF

It's Vint. Let me jump in and thank Theresa, but also draw attention to Anriette's comments in the chat that the ccTLDs also supply support for the national and regional IGFs. And we're very grateful for that because independent of what happens in the general assembly in December, the national and regional IGFs, which have sprung up in a voluntary way, could persist regardless of the story of WSIS and IGF. And I think it's very important for us to keep the NRI space as healthy as possible.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks, Theresa and Vint, and thanks for your comment, Anriette. Any other questions or comments? I'll go here and then here. Go ahead, please.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you. Janis Karklins for the record. Just maybe to manage expectations and understand when we're talking about permanence in IGF, what that would mean in reality. So, first is for the moment, the mandate of IGF should be renewed every 10 years. So the first step would be to get the decision that mandate stays permanent and that would already ensure permanence of IGF. Second element is that for the moment, IGF is the project of UNDESA, which is funded from voluntary contributions and the permanence.

One of the elements of the permanence would be if, for instance, IGF Secretariat would become members of the United Nations that are paid from UN regular budget, all the rest of activities would still be paid by voluntary contributions of governments and other stakeholders. I think that these two elements would be important to secure in the last bits of negotiations, and then hopefully we'll get there.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you. Yes, go ahead, please.

CRAIG STANLEY-ADAMSON

Thank you very much. Craig Stanley-Adamson, I'm UK GAC representative for the record, also part of the UK negotiating team for WSIS+20. So, this is quite a really interesting conversation. Thank you very much, and thanks very much to Vint just now for that presentation, of which I'd like to echo quite a lot of it,

particularly the fact that the IGF is crucial in upholding the multi stakeholder model, which is obviously the big parts of this WSIS+20 review.

Without the IGF, there is an undermining essentially of the multi stakeholder model. It could rise, lead rise of maybe challenges in the future that we want to avoid. So, really, really strongly echo Vint's points there.

And also just like to say that the UK is a contributor to the IGF, the United Nations IGF, and also just like to give a shout out as well to Nominote, our ccTLD operator who run a fantastic UK IGF. And I think it's really important how ccTLD operators really have a strong role in this. And yeah, just like to echo a lot to what's been said and encourage some of the things that Vint said as well. So, thank you.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thank you very much. Any final comments? No. I think that almost brings us to the end of our session. And regardless of what is decided at the end of the year, ccTLDs have an important role in these conversations and in their national IGFs and will continue to have an important role beyond WSIS. So, I'd just like to thank you all for joining us today for the discussion.

The internet governance committee will be considering at our next online meeting, we'll start our planning for our next work program, and to be thinking about the priorities that we'll be focusing on for

2026. And I think there has been a lot of food for thought out of this conversation today.

I would like to thank our support staff. Joke is always fabulous, but it has been organizing this session and wrangling multiple diaries. You've done a marvelous job. Thank you, Joke. And thank you to all of our speakers, to Vint, and to Olga, and Byron, and to the ambassador in his absence.

OLGA CAVALLI

Thanks to you, Annaliese, you are the leader. Thanks. She has been great in organizing this session.

ANNALIESE WILLIAMS

Thanks.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]