
ICANN84 | Prep Week – ICANN Board Engagement with the ICANN Community
Monday, October 13, 2025 – 20:30 to 21:30 IST

WENDY PROFIT

Hello, everyone. Welcome to the ICANN Board engagement session with the community. The topic is WSIS+20 and the future of IGF. My name is Wendy Profit, and I'm the remote participation manager for this session. Please note that the session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Interpretation for this session will include English, French, and Spanish. If you'd like to speak during the session, please raise your hand in Zoom. When called upon, unmute your microphone to speak, and please keep your comments, questions, and remarks to one to two minutes maximum to give everyone a chance to participate.

Please state your name for the record, including the language you will speak if it's other than English, and speak at a reasonable pace for our scribes and interpreters. I will now hand the floor over to the chair of the ICANN Board of Directors, Tripti Sinha.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Wendy. Welcome, everyone and thank you for joining us online today. It is a pleasure to open again this virtual community-based engagement session ahead of our annual general meeting at ICANN84 that will soon take place in Dublin.

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.

This session is an opportunity to reinforce our cooperation and work together on topics that are very important for ICANN and our collective future.

For this 60-minute plenary session that Chris Buckridge and I will lead on behalf of the board, we will focus on WSIS+20 and beyond, including the future of the IGF. We are at a pivotal moment. The outcomes of the WSIS+20 process have the potential to shape the global internet and digital ecosystem in ways that directly impact ICANN's mission.

We know that many of you joining here are involved and engaged in these processes and appreciate all the work by all of you. That is why we are particularly interested in hearing perspectives from the ICANN community who have been keenly following the work as well. Our discussions will be on topics reflected in the Zero Draft of the WSIS+20 outcome document. In particular, what conditions and assurances will be needed to ensure a more effective and permanent IGF.

This session is intended to be an open exchange while the board will share its views. We are here to engage with you. We want to hear from our community. Your insights may be useful to inform our high-level positions that best align with our commitment to serve a single, open and interoperable internet. So, I encourage you to actively participate.

We will spend about 40 minutes in discussion and we'll use the remaining time to summarize your thoughts on what success looks

like and how we can achieve this together. Before we start the session proper, Chris will provide an overview of the Zero Draft of the WSIS+20 outcome document. And going forward, we will commonly refer to this as Zero Draft in this session, and the WSIS+20 preparatory roadmap. So, Chris, over to you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Okay. Thank you, Tripti. And yeah, I have the challenge now of trying to give a very brief introduction to this very large topic. It's great to see so many people joining us for this discussion. We're coming to really the business end of quite a very long process that has been this preparation for the 20-year review of the UN's World Summit on the Information Society.

In late August, we received, as Tripti noted, the Zero Draft of the outcome document of that WSIS+20 20 process. And there's been a number of processes associated with that to get feedback from both UN member states, but also, other stakeholders in the global community. There are currently, I believe, 75 responses to the Zero Draft that have been published on the WSIS+20 website, which the UN DESA is maintaining. And there have been a number of other in-person discussions with the co-facilitators, which we'll hear more about later.

So, ICANN is one of the organizations that has given a response to this Zero Draft. And I think I'll talk a little bit about ICANN's perspective. From ICANN's point of view, and I think the point of view of many in the multistakeholder community, the Zero Draft is

well-crafted, provides a very strong basis for further development. It's a very positive start to this discussion. ICANN welcomes the inclusion of a number of elements that we see as very positive and that we hope that will be retained in the final version.

Without providing an exhaustive list, I would say, the affirmation of multistakeholder cooperation as the fundamental basis of internet governance, the recognition of the importance of linguistic diversity, acknowledgment of the risks of internet fragmentation, particularly at the architectural level, commitment to an open interoperable internet, and recognition of the evolution of the internet governance forum, and supporting that as a permanent institution and the central space for global internet governance discussion.

In terms of potential improvements, ICANN has made a few suggestions in its response. One is regarding the term technical community. And this has been something very important to ICANN and others in the technical community to be very clear about the role that technical community has as a distinct stakeholder group. So, one of the suggestions has been to use a distinction between technical community and academia, respecting that each of those communities have somewhat different perspectives and roles in this internet governance.

The other is a suggestion to include action points to more practically encourage adoption of systems to facilitate multilingualism on the internet. And there's a suggestion also to

recognize the complementary role of the WSIS+20 informal multistakeholder sounding board. Now I'll note, I'm a member of that informal multistakeholder sounding board, as is Theresa Swinehart from ICANN staff. So, it wasn't my suggestion to include this. But that informal multistakeholder sounding board, which was formed by the co-facilitators at the suggestion of some member states, has been, I think, a very important demonstration of their commitment to making this a more multistakeholder and inclusive process.

From that informal multistakeholder sounding board's perspective, we've been doing what we can to draw in the different perspectives of non-governmental stakeholders and synthesize those in a way that can be useful to the co-facilitators in further drafting and iterating this outcome document as we go forward.

As far as a roadmap goes, there are actually some virtual consultations being facilitated by the UN DESA with the co-facilitators happening today, later today, and tomorrow. So, they have two with different time zones. There will also be a further round of stakeholder consultations happening at the ICANN84 meeting in Dublin. We will have one of the co-facilitators there, Ambassador Lokaale, and the staff colleagues of the other co-facilitator, Ambassador Janina, from Albania.

And we would encourage interested members of the community to participate in an informed and productive manner. And note that there is really still time to have your voices heard. We will still see

probably a number of iterations of this outcome document. And we look forward to seeing how that develops with the input from the multistakeholder community. So, I'll hand it back to you, Tripti. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Chris, for sharing this analysis on Zero Draft, including your insights and experience in your capacity as a member of the informal multistakeholder sounding board. It's quite a mouthful. I would now like to open the floor for the first round of discussions. But before I do so, just real quick, the topic for this round is about the priorities for the WSIS+20 and what we hope to see as an outcome. The key point is to examine our objectives at the beginning of the process and where we are now that we've seen the Zero Draft.

To recap, ICANN started this endeavor with the fundamental question, will the internet remain guided by inclusive multistakeholder collaboration or shift towards control by a single stakeholder, risking fragmentation? For ICANN, any erosion of the multistakeholder model risks sidelining the technical community, introducing geopolitical influence and motivation into technical decision-making and undermining the open and interoperable nature of the internet. As such, ICANN has three main goals for the WSIS+20, which is one, preservation of the multistakeholder model of internet governance. Two, recognition of the unique role of the

technical community in the internet governance and extension of the IGF mandate.

So, when we examine these goals against text of the Zero Draft, our outlook is positive. The details have been shared by Chris earlier. So, we want to hear from you now, our community, what you think is missing, misaligned, or what the Zero Draft has got wrong. So, I see that Michael Palaj's hand has gone up. Michael, over to you.

MICHAEL PALAGE

Thank you, Tripti. Michael Palage for the record. Tripti, I'd like to potentially discuss the financial sustainability of the model. So, a bedrock principle of WSIS in the IGF is about multistakeholderism. However, when you look at the statistics prepared by the IGF, over the last 10 years, ICANN has actually been the second largest financial contributor, second only to the European Union.

My concern is that when you step back and look at even the bigger picture, the vast majority of the funding for IGF has been from governments, and those companies profit in from the sale of domain names and IP addresses. Non-domain name and IP address, private sector financial support is almost non-existent. So, to me, that is concerning for the long-term financial stability. Do you have any insight into how you could perhaps broaden the private sector support of the IGF and WSIS+20?

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Michael for that. And as you know, one of the recommendations coming out of this process is to indeed fund the IGF going forward. I understand that you're saying that it's a very narrow swath of entities that are actually funding this. I'm going to turn this over right now to Veni, who is deeply involved in this endeavor. Veni, could you comment on this?

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thank you, Tripti. And thanks, Mike for the question. Indeed, the IGF is doing everything they can to bring more funding, and they're urging governments and private sector to participate. We have seen some good results in the last, I would say, two, three years with big companies committing to provide funding. And we are expecting to see more, but it's up to the IGF Secretariat.

And should the IGF be extended, whether it's made without limit, as the Zero Draft suggests, or with some limits, in terms of timing, the expectation is the Secretariat would feel stronger to reach out to other stakeholders and not just to rely on the ones that have been supportive so far. But we have seen companies that have not participated so far putting actually their money where their mouth is. So hopefully this will continue.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Veni. Next question, I don't see any hands up. Yes, Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Thanks, Tripti. And thanks, folks, for the summary. I'm curious, the context for Kurtis's most recent blog that seemed to be really trying to reaffirm the limits of the boundaries of ICANN's remit while this conversation was going on. And I wonder with that blog, with the new document, with sort of how things went at the IGF, if this issue is as big a concern for our community as we have historically considered it.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you. Oh, I'm sorry, Jonathan. Were you finished? I cut you off.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah, I thought I was, and then I wasn't. Not your fault, my fault. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA

All right. Actually, Kurtis is online. I'm going to turn it over to Kurtis.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Yeah. Thank you, Tripti. That's a great question, Jonathan. Just to give you the background, we have been asked in—I mean, don't read too much into the blog. I was going to say, obviously, it's a very great blog post, but we have been asked a lot about whether ICANN would help build new structures, new governance models, et cetera, in topics outside ICANN's core mission, right? ICANN's core mission is what it is in the bylaws, and I don't believe there is any

appetite to change that, expand that, do so. That doesn't mean, of course, we believe the multistakeholder model can work in many other governance models, but I don't know if it's ICANN's role.

And I think the purpose of the blog post, as I said, it's not our role to go and solve all the world's problems with the multistakeholder model. We would support that. We think it's a great model, but I don't think that we should go and help—and we have had questions to go and work on this, and I think somebody's request has been quite far outside our mission, and that was really the purpose of the blog post was merely to say, look, ICANN has a very clear mission, and we engage on that inside the multistakeholder model. Not beyond that, nothing more, nothing less. That was really the purpose of this.

But you are right, there is a lot of other discussions around the IGF in many topics that I think Chris and Theresa can probably talk more about than I can do. But this was more just to remind people involved in these discussions what ICANN's mission really is, and where our remit ends in these discussions, nothing more than that. Hope that answered your question.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Kurtis. Anne has a question in the chat, which I'm going to read. It says, it appears the informal multistakeholder sounding board meeting on Monday is closed. How can we best provide input

to the IMSB? Chris Buckridge, you're best positioned to answer that.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Yes. And sorry, Anne, I misread your question when you typed it first, and I was thinking co-facilitators. The informal sounding board is going to have a working session on Monday, so that will be closed just as a discussion. But the IMSB's whole intent is to engage with everyone in the multistakeholder community to the best of our ability. So, I mean, we've had members of the sounding board who've been at various national and regional internet governance initiatives in the last, well, last days. I was at SEEDIG on Friday, and I know the Asia Pacific Regional IGF has had an event in the last few days as well.

So yeah, I think if there is an eagerness to speak to the IMSB, we're endeavoring to find those opportunities. We often have virtual sessions with different groups as well. So, if there's a specific group that would like to try and organize one of those, please let me know, let Jen Chung know who's one of the co-conveners of the group. We'll try and make that happen.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Chris. Avri?

AVRI DORIA

Thank you. I wanted to follow up on Jonathan's question, because one of the things that I look at when you're saying, we have to

follow our mission, and of course, ICANN has to follow its mission. What else would it be if it didn't? But I don't understand why, therefore, we want an IGF. What does an IGF offer the ICANN mission? What does the IGF offer in terms of—I think the IGF is important, but I don't see that it affects or is related to ICANN as we're coming to understand it now. I have another question after that.

But I'm really kind of curious, because yeah, I've always thought IGF is important, but I thought it was important because it was a model and we wanted to help the model increase and improve and be used by others. But as you say, that's not our mission. Our mission is to do our own thing, not somebody else's, not to help them, not be affected but to do our thing. So why?

TRIPTI SINHA

So, Avri, is that question directed at Kurtis or just to the board in general?

AVRI DORIA

To any of you that are the powers that be.

TRIPTI SINHA

Okay, so the powers that be. All right. So, let me take a crack at this and then I'll turn it over to Kurtis since it was tied to his blog. So, Avri, yeah, why are we involved in IGF? As you know, ICANN is a multistakeholder community. It is a model. It has worked well for

us. It has supported our mission. So why would we not participate and lend our wisdom and our experience to the greater good, right?

And as you know, we manage names and numbers. These are important elements of the underlying technical infrastructure of the globe. So, why would we not participate in this and say it's important for the community to rally around our mission and they have and it's worked well for us. So, in that context, it makes sense for us to participate. And I'm actually going to turn it over to Kurtis now for him to share his perspective. Kurtis?

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Thank you. That's a great question, Avri. So first of all, just to explain a little bit background of—so I have personally had questions from everything from organizations, the members that asked us, would we be willing to support the formation of an ICANN for everything from IOT to AI governance, right? That is very far away from what ICANN does. And I don't think that's really in our mission. And building [secretariats] and knowledge and skills, I mean, yes, we might be able to support with good advice, but I'm not going to divert staff resources or ICANN resources to formulating that. That's not our role. And that's the first part.

The second part is, why is the IGF important? The IGF is really, from when we first started this 25 years ago, until now has been in support in enhancing the work of the multistakeholder model and really helping deliver on that. And that is really as part of ICANN's role and ICANN's being, and of course, this is in support on our

mission. Having an IGF, having these evolving discussions run into the governance, that really helps us. That is really in support of who ICANN is and what we do, so we should support that. We should be part of that.

The IGF has evolved over the years. I think everything evolves. That's probably natural. I mean, let's play a hypothetical example. If the IGF stopped talking about internet governance and purely spoke about AI governance, then I agree with Avri, I think we should question, is this really about who we are, should we do this? But it isn't, it hasn't. It still includes internet governance. There were lots of very vibrant discussions in the last one, and it continues to be. And that's really in support of ICANN's mission, it's in support of who we are, and we should support that, as long as that is relevant to us.

And I think we should also—I mean, if I speak personally, I think we should anchor internet governance discussions in the IGF exactly, so it doesn't get just taken over by the topic of the day, but actually remains where the root was. And I think that's something that we should, I personally think we should do. If that's successful, I mean, I don't know, but I think we should do. I hope that answers your question, Avri.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Kurtis. And Avri, I just wanted to point you also to the ICANN's most recently ratified strategic plan, pages 26 to 30, where an entire section 1.3 is dedicated to exactly this, to expanding our

strategic alliances to advocate for the MSM of internet governance. So, I think we gave you quite a bit to think about, and I hope you would agree. Thank you, Avri. Dr. Jimson, go ahead. Jimson?

JIMSON OLUFUYE

Yes. Thank you very much. Both Chris and staff, thank you for organizing this. Well, this is Jimson Olufuye. Yes, member of the MSB and former member of the CSTD. United Nation Commission for Science and Technology Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. Well, I just want to chip in a few words. A plus one to Tripti and yeah, Kurtis, on justification to continue to engage. And I want to think maybe Avri was just pulling her legs because I believe Avri has been in the whole process all this while. Okay, I want to believe so. Because the real issue why we have the World Summit on Information Society, is precisely because of who controls the internet, because the ICANN, the IANA function and what have you.

And during the period when the working group, at least five of us, there at the end, were very, very strong about the need for ICANN to continue to maintain their role, which we have done so well over time. And we even did well to persuade many countries to come to GAC, okay? We persuaded many countries to come to GAC, [inaudible], India, even some other Arab countries, and even recently Saudi, to embracing the multistakeholder approach.

So, when I was very active before in the ICANN, I've always maintained that ICANN should be very proactive in UN activities. And I'm very glad that I've been seeing the ICANN staff in CSTD. We

are not there before. So, this is very good because we need to be heard. So, it's because of what we do that we have the IGF. We need to have more opportunity to brainstorm, to discuss, to get the community, global community to understand the issues.

So, I think ICANN is going to play a very, very strong role in this because the work we do underline the information society for which this was set up. So, this to fully support your engagement, Tripti and the board. Chris has been very, very active, the MSP and very active all around. So, this needs to continue. We are making progress. We need to sustain it even with funding. Thank you very much.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you very much for your remarks, Jimson. Avri, I recall you said you have a second question. I assume you're going—

AVRI DORIA

Yeah, I do, and I want to get to it. I'm not actually trying to pull anybody's leg. I'm really quite serious in the question [inaudible] because of this very narrow stick to our mission line that seems to be coming out in blogs and elsewhere. And that restriction says, well, then the only reason would be a defensive one.

But anyhow, the other thing I wanted to ask is, you make the plea and it's a plea I've been making ever since WGIG days that the technical community be a community in and of itself, et cetera, et cetera. Now within the Zero paper, and this has been one of my

interests in the Zero paper, there's a very strong statement that says, we want to stick to the roles and responsibilities that were defined in the Tunis Agenda and such. And I'm wondering, have you offered? And I looked through the paper and I don't really remember it. But have you offered therefore—there is no role and responsibility to find in the Tunis Agenda other than sort of across the limit.

So, have you made a recommendation? Are you making a recommendation for how the roles and responsibilities need to change to accommodate the mission-led reason that we participate in the IGF model? And so, I'm really curious as to how you're dealing with that. They want to stick to the old roles and responsibilities, making the technical community important in itself as I think it should be, as a stakeholder has to change the roles and responsibilities, has to change how it's looked at and I'm wondering where your answer is on that one. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Avri. Indeed, we have provided feedback. I'm going to turn this over to Veni again. Veni, would you like to comment on that?

VENI MARKOVSKI

Sure. Hi, Avri. Thanks for the question. Indeed, participation at events like the IGF and not only ICANN participates at—we have ECOSOC consultative status. We are like the sector members and

we participate at meetings that have the potential to touch on ICANN's mission, and that's what drives the participation. Because we have seen in the past and we see it even in this year, that there is always desire to discuss issues related directly to ICANN, be that DNS, IP addresses, new IP, et cetera. And we have to be in the room.

And that's why also, the point to the strategic plan, which is talking about expanding strategic alliances which means we work with other [inaudible] or technical organizations but also, businesses, even civil society and governments through the GAC to make sure that there is enough knowledge in the rooms where these discussions are taking place, so that they're addressed properly, and they're not aiming at finding a solution to a problem that doesn't exist, for example.

I mean, again, we can talk for hours, but I also want to limit myself to two minutes because there are other questions. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Veni. Jordan?

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks, Tripti. Good morning or whatever time it is, everyone. I'm joining in the morning from Melbourne. I just wanted to offer a comment briefly on the question of why ICANN should be involved. ICANN is probably one of the core institutions in the internet governance realm of dealing with core internet technologies in the identifier space. And it is also one of the best-resourced public

interest organizations in this environment. And the mandate of the IGF is to deal with internet governance questions.

It's perfectly consistent for ICANN to be focused on its specific role and not creeping beyond its mission. But also, to take a systemic interest in the environment within which it operates. So, I think it's an integral player to the IGF. If a stakeholder group like ICANN who is kind of organizing part of the technical community, walked away from the IGF, then it actually undermines the IGF's multistakeholder nature. And it would also be a situation that undermines ICANN's claim to be a gathering point of that internet technical community as well. So, I think there are all sorts of connections that are important there, and I strongly support ICANN's ongoing role there.

Tripti, I want to just come back also to your earlier question about the nature of the Zero Draft. I think if we were going to start from somewhere, this would probably be the best kind of draft that we'd like to start with in acknowledging, suggesting a permanent mandate for the IGF, and acknowledging the multistakeholder nature of internet governance. It's a lot better than the Elements Paper was. And I think we should be all doing what we can to encourage that decent first cut language to be kept. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Jordan. I agree on all points, and thank you for reinforcing our earlier comments. Other questions, other hands, comments? We've got plenty of time, come on. Okay, Jonathan.

JONATHAN ZUCK

Yeah. I was wondering if you were planning any activities or events around WSIS. And if so, how we might be involved?

TRIPTI SINHA

In Dublin, there is a session on WSIS+20 that the co-facilitators will be at. One of the ambassadors will be there and staff representing the other ambassador as well. So, that for sure is happening. Veni, I'm going to turn it back to you to comment on other sessions. And also, Chris, if you'd like to add anything to this.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thanks, Tripti. The communities, SOACs will have bilateral meetings with the co-facilitators from Kenya and the staff from Albania plus UN DESA representatives. They're the secretariat for the WSIS+20 [inaudible]. They're doing an amazing job in keeping everything open in the public view.

Other than that, Jonathan, if the question was about the WSIS+20—oh yeah, I see the chat. It says it's about the WSIS+20. We have not decided yet whether there will be a need for a side event during the WSIS+20. It's going to be a two-day event. Ten years ago, at the WSIS+10, it was really packed with government officials, heads of states and others, who were participating there and speaking. So,

it will really depend on—we have to see what the outcome will be of the consultations this week and next week. And also, what the next Zero Draft version will look like.

But as you know, we also provide briefings for diplomats. If we see that there is such a need to provide such a briefing for the diplomats before the WSIS in December, then we will do so. Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Veni. My apologies, Jonathan. I thought you were referring to the upcoming meeting, ICANN84. Other questions? Okay, there's a question from Jim Prendergast. Is this the session with the [inaudible]? No mention in the description. Can someone validate? Chris Buckridge is not—

VENI MARKOVSKI

This is it, yeah.

TRIPTI SINHA

Yeah. That's it, Jim. Thank you for confirming, Veni. Michael?

MICHAEL PALAGE

Hi, Michael Palage for the record. Tripti, you cited to the strategic plan on the importance of this initiative, and I posted a question to Xavier in the chat, and maybe if he could answer the question. Given that this isn't a strategic plan, what are the actual hard and soft cost associated with ICANN in the IGF sponsorships, staff,

travel? Do you have any numbers specifically since this is cited in the strategic plan how the board would go about an ROI on those numbers?

TRIPTI SINHA

Okay. Thank you for the question, Michael. Kurtis, do you—I don't know if you have the numbers handy. Xavier is on the call.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

I did not have the numbers handy. We can probably find out. I don't know how much we have to break out into soft numbers, but I don't know it off the top of my head. I can't tell you. I'm sorry.

TRIPTI SINHA

Okay, Michael—is Xavier on the call? I'm going down the list. Can we get back to you on that, Michael?

KURTIS LINDQVIST

He was [inaudible].

TRIPTI SINHA

Yeah. Michael, we'll get back to you on that.

MICHAEL PALAGE

I can wait. Thank you very much. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA

Yeah, thank you. All right. Tinueade, you're next.

TINUEADE OGUNTUYI

Okay. Thank you so much. Tinueade Oguntuyi, ICANN84 Fellow. Thank you for this opportunity. I just wanted to check with ICANN President Kurtis. What would we say success will look like for ICANN, both the broad community and the org after the meeting in December concerning the WSIS+20? What is success for us as a community?

And I've asked because as Fellows, we also are very interested in knowing how everyday work, our everyday input also contribute to this. So that maybe when we know what the [inaudible] metrics are, we can also be part of the voice to enable it even before then. Though I am also lending my voice to the IMSMB by contributing on the informal calls that have been made, but I just want to know on a larger scale. Thank you so much.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

So, I don't know what the outcome in December is going to be. I wish I did. But, I mean, there are—in the Zero Draft, there is the proposal to make the IGF permanent. I don't know, and I think Chris and Theresa might be a better position to talk about this than I do. What happens if this becomes permanent, because the current reason why we have the WSIS+10 and WSIS+20 and WSIS+30 is that we keep having these 10-year reviews. If the IGF is made permanent, if this becomes a permanent US process, I would

assume there is no more WSIS meetings, but I'm going to leave Theresa or Chris to speculate on that.

So, Theresa's hand is up. I was just going to say that the question was about, if we assume that is the case, then we will continue as ICANN staff to engage with the IGF and the sessions. We have done this, and built that around that. And again, that's what we do. The current process we have around every IGF. But given that we don't know what's going to happen in December and which way the UN will vote, I can't say what's going to happen. I don't know if Theresa wants to add anything about the options around that.

THERESA SWINEHART

I think one of the themes, and it's been identified, and Chris also notes a little bit unclear right now sort of what the outcome will be. Kurtis, as you note. One area that has a quite strong support and was in the Zero document, and given the comments provided is reflected in many of the comments on the Zero Draft is a permanence of the IGF. It leads a little bit into the next part of this conversation of what does that look like? What are some of the assumptions and criteria that are necessary for that? Stability, stable funding, et cetera, and I saw some conversations in the channels as well around that.

So, I would expect that would be one theme. But of course, a Zero Draft contains many, many other themes that are not within

ICANN's remit unnecessarily. So, just an observation that that will definitely be a theme and then what that looks like will be key.

TRIPTI SINHA

Okay. Thank you, Theresa. Thank you, Tinu, for your question. I hope I pronounced your name correctly. Moving on.

TINUADE OGUNTUYI

It's Tinueade.

TRIPTI SINHA

Tinueade.

TINUADE OGUNTUYI

Thank you.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you. Moving on to Claire. Claire?

CLAIRE CRAIG

Hello, all. This is Claire Craig for the record. I understand Avri's question as it refers to, why should we care? Why should ICANN care about multistakeholder model in relation to WSIS+20? But I also heard the responses to that saying that this is part of our strategic plan and it's something that we need to be working actively towards. So therefore, as you know, we in the At-Large

community, ALAC, look at our priorities and try to line them up with ICANN's strategic plan.

And so, therefore, what I would like to find out is how can we as the end-user community support ICANN's activities as they relate to WSIS+20?

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Claire, for the question. So first, I'd like to start by saying you are already supporting our activities by participating in all kinds of events. I mean, you're very active in sessions inside of the ICANN ecosystem. You're also [inaudible] with many other meetings hosted like the IGF and so forth. I'm going to turn this over again to Theresa and Veni, if you'd like to add any thoughts on that. Theresa, Veni?

THERESA SWINEHART

I'll let Veni answer that one. Thanks.

VENI MARKOVSKI

I was nodding actually that I don't have anything to add on that. I think we have—all the comments and questions that we are getting here are extremely valuable for our overall understanding of where the community is vis-a-vis the WSIS and the IGF because these are—I mean, the IGF is part of the WSIS, so it's not a separate process. But depending on whether it's continued as the Zero Draft suggests indefinitely or is extended for a certain period of time, it will continue to exist until the next WSIS. So, we are looking

forward to see what the outcome of the negotiations will be, and especially to see the positions of the member states.

Some of them have already expressed something in writing, which you can see on the UN DESA website, and I'll ask my colleagues to publish a link to it. And we'll know more by ICANN in Dublin and hopefully, we can address that during the public sessions there.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Veni. Judith?

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN

Hi. Thanks so much. It's Judith Hellerstein for the record. And thanks so much for your comments and your efforts on standards and capacity building. So, I'm also wondering what efforts ICANN is doing also in ensuring that the standards that we put in are also accessible for persons with disabilities, especially as we're looking at expanding the IDNs and going into the next round and how much of that is an accessibility issue as well as it could be an accessibility in fact, but the problem is, unless there's an increase in an awareness by ICANN staff and others, we will have accessibility in name only.

And so, I wanted to ask what efforts are being done in training ICANN staff on how to produce accessible documents and how to do work with accessibility. Whether also hiring someone on staff whose remit is that issue, because I know your efforts are in there,

but there's a whole bunch of awareness issues that are not being looked at. So, I'll leave it at that, but thanks so much.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you, Judith. Kurtis?

KURTIS LINDQVIST

So yeah, thank you. I'm not an expert in the work we're doing in this, but I do know the comms team do the work on document for accessibility and the work around this. And also does some work around the websites. I mean, if you could always do more, we should do more. I know that we are looking at maybe not dedicating staff to [inaudible], but having staff who are more looking on the reviewing and the writing of documents at the end of the day, we need to ensure that we have the resources for that. But I know that the comms team are looking into this to make sure that the documents that we produce are more accessible and reviewing that.

That's slightly different than I think Judith's question was about how we work with that towards the IGF, but I'm not talking about the ICANN documents. Can we expand that into the IGF and take that on? I think that's a little bit, again, stretching it a bit too far with our resources. The work that we do, we should cover with that absolutely, but can we stretch it beyond that? I think that's a bit more questionable.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN

Thanks so much, Kurtis. Yeah. No, it will be great if comms stuff because so many of the comms use a lot of the photos and they don't use the [inaudible] description to describe the photos. And so, it's losing a lot of the effort that you wanted to put in.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

I know that we're looking at new document templates, and I know that this was one of the things that was being looked at, so I know that this has been a topic that's been reviewed. Thank you for that.

TRIPTI SINHA

All right. I did a quick time check. We have maybe time for one more question before I turn it over to Chris. All right. I don't see any hands. First, thank you all for asking your questions and making your comments. I'm going to turn it over to Chris now, who will talk about the future of IGF and conditions and assurances. So, Chris Buckridge, over to you.

CHRIS BUCKRIDGE

Yeah. Thank you, Tripti. So yeah, we, obviously, the discussions so far have touched on IGF a fair bit, and that's, I think, sensible because this is where ICANN really engages and intersects with these multistakeholder discussions. Along with the response to the Zero Draft, ICANN also submitted a document on its perspective on the future of the IGF and how it needs to evolve. And it's observing that, for really the majority of responses we've heard to the zero draft, the IGF is recognized as essential, and the move to make it

permanent in its mandate has been widely supported by many of the stakeholders. We'll see how that translates into the multilateral negotiation at the end. But I think it shows a very strong level of support.

And that was also actually recognized in the Global Digital Compact, which is a different UN agreement that was reached last year. And part of the discussion around WSIS this year and the review is, how those two processes will actually integrate. But the Global Digital Compact recognized the IGF was the primary venue for multistakeholder internet governance dialogue. So, we make the mandate permanent, ideally, but then we also, from ICANN's perspective and the perspective of many stakeholders, need to continue making the IGF stronger, better fit for purpose, able to respond to the needs of the global community.

And so, this document from ICANN, which I believe is available also on the website, received feedback from various different stakeholders and laid out a few different areas of priority and suggestions for how that could work. The areas that we looked at specifically, logistical stability and predictability. So, looking at ways to ensure that the IGF can continue to hold its annual event. Administrative stability, so looking at the secretariat that runs the IGF from within the UN and works with the multistakeholder advisory groups. How can that be strengthened and developed? Financial stability, so going to the question earlier in this discussion

about ensuring sustainable, predictable, multistakeholder financing.

So, not just coming from the UN budget, but coming from really a multistakeholder mix of donors in a predictable, sustainable way. And then also in terms of scoping the coverage. How do we leverage the flexibility that's there in the original mandate to the IGF, which is paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda, to ensure that it's able to take in other digital-related discussions without losing that connection, as Kurt has said, to the very fundamental ideas of internet governance that sort of form the basis of these discussions.

So, the suggestions are not exhaustive. We're certainly looking for feedback from the community. The IGF multistakeholder advisory group, which is currently in place through the end of the year, is having its own discussions on how the IGF should evolve. And a number of member states in their responses to the Zero Draft have also made some practical and in some cases, quite radical suggestions for how the IGF and its different elements could evolve. So, I think this is a really important discussion to be having and looking forward to talking more with people here and in Dublin about ideas for that. Thanks.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you very much, Chris. And thank you, everyone, for participating in this discussion. I hope it was meaningful and helpful. Before we wrap up, I was going to turn to Veni Markovski as

our rapporteur, and he's going to give us a recap of the discussion.
So, Veni?

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thanks, Tripti, and I see we are running out of time. So, we saw a lot of questions both in the chat and thank you for asking also questions online about the funding of the IGF items all in the multistakeholder model environment. We were reminded that we are not the only one contributed though we are among the strongest supporters. We were reminded to take a look at the strategic plan for 2026, 2030 and see how our engagement aligns with the strategic plan.

And then there were more questions about the ICANN's involvement in the IGF at all. And I believe that by now it's kind of clear that we provide experience and expertise. Where others are having questions, we have answers when it's related to the ICANN's mission and the technical functioning of the internet. And it makes sense for us to participate, to be at places including at intergovernmental organization's meetings and sessions and multistakeholder sessions like the IGF because if we are not there and the discussion touches on ICANN's mission, there is nobody to actually talk for us. And it's not about justifying our existence as one would have been arguing 20 years ago, but it's about actually explaining more how the internet functions.

And then we discussed about the importance of the IGF, which helps deliver the results of the ICANN model. And in a way, it's

actually supportive of our mission. And one reminder, obviously, is that the IGF is not really only about internet governance or only about ICANN, we are participants, but we have a couple of sessions during the IGF. And there are hundreds of sessions from many, many other organizations, governments, businesses, et cetera.

And then there were also some voices on the community that we should continue the support for the multistakeholder model and the IGF. And the ICANN engagement proves the point about the positive sides of the multistakeholder model of internet governance. And then Chris had a presentation of the IGF and the paper that we published, which was called the IGF We Want. And I'll finish, because I think we are beyond time.

TRIPTI SINHA

Actually, no. You've got time. Yeah, yeah.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Okay. I got it wrong. But I think it's a very lively discussion. This is what I think the board was looking for. And we are looking definitely for feedback from the community. And as interactive as it is with diversity of views and ideas, this is what we really want to make sure that, A, we are aligned with the community, but also, the community is aligned with our strategic goals and initiatives, so that there is no misunderstanding as to who is doing what, how much time we spent, and who is involved, et cetera. So overall, I

want to thank on behalf of government engagement for this. This is very useful for us.

TRIPTI SINHA

Thank you very much, Veni, for summarizing the discussion. And in closing, I'd like to say the board and the organization were very united in our commitment to fostering a strong, inclusive community, and we value your input. And just to reiterate what Veni just said, we have to participate. We can't say, why should we? Obviously, that's a very good and provocative question. And I think, if anything, I would say that we stand up as a model of a multistakeholder governance in how well we do our job, and we should be highlighting our experience and expertise.

And don't forget, we're also a stakeholder. And when you look at the greater IGF, we are the technical stakeholder community here, so we should certainly participate in this. And we're all in it together. So, with those closing remarks, I'd like to say, together we should be very proactive in how we engage with the WSIS+20 process. Ensuring a comprehensive approach as we contribute to its future directions.

And with that, for those traveling to Dublin for ICANN84, which is in two weeks, I wish you safe travels. We will continue these discussions in Dublin. And of course, talk with each other at smaller meetings and bigger meetings and look to the future of the

internet. So, with that, thank you for joining and safe travels to everyone and see you in two weeks. This meeting is adjourned.

VENI MARKOVSKI

Thanks, Tripti. Thank you, everyone. Good seeing you. See you in Dublin.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]