

---

BUENOS AIRES – Internet Governance  
Monday, November 18, 2013 – 13:30 to 15:00  
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. We're going to start in a couple of minutes. If you could take your seats, please, we'd appreciate it. Thank you.

So hello, everybody. Good afternoon. My name is Chris Disspain. I'm a member of the ICANN board, and this is a session on Internet governance.

You might think that we've already done a session on Internet governance, for those of you that were here this morning, and you are correct.

However, we're going -- in this session, we're actually going to talk about what happens -- what happened this year and what we think next year holds, and that may, of course, involve us in discussing some of the things that we also talked a bit about this morning.

So we're going to have a review of the IGF in Bali. Some of you would have been there. We're going to talk a little bit about the enhanced cooperation working group that is part of the CSTD at the United Nations; a little bit about what's coming up next year,

---

*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.*

the plenipotentiary in Korea and a few other things; and how our efforts in the Internet governance landscape can help.

We would like this to be a very interactive session. There are no presentations, just some esteemed guests at the table, and we'd like comment, questions from the audience at any time. So there's a microphone at the front here. If you want to wander up to that, we'll take a question or a comment on any aspect at all that we're talking about.

Before we start, I'm going to ask our panelists if they would be kind enough to introduce themselves to you and just briefly tell you where they're from.

We'll start with Olga here on my left.

**OLGA MADRUGA-FORTI:** Hello, everyone. Thank you for coming today to one of the first panels in the course of the week that will talk about the topic of Internet governance, all of the new ideas coming about in the field, and the events to follow.

I am Olga Madruga-Forti. I am a member of the ICANN board. I am an attorney by profession and some tell me an honorary engineer by way of being in information technology, satellite services, straight telecom services, for about 26 years.

---

So glad to be here with you.

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN: Hi. I'm Jeff Brueggeman with AT&T, a small telecommunications company. I'm also a member of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group for the IGF.

DAVID MARTIGNON: Thank you. My name is David Martignon. I am the French special Representative for International Negotiations on the Information Society and the Digital Economy. Sorry for the title which is quite long. To make it shorter, I'm the head of the French delegation here and notably at the GAC, and again it is a great pleasure to be here in Buenos Aires and South America.

CARLOS ALFONSO: Hi. My name is Carlos Alfonso. I am with CGI.br, in Brazil, a board member representing civil society organizations, and I am also chair of the Internet Society chapter of Brazil and a member of the NCUC.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. We're back again.  
  
Thank you very much, indeed.

---

We are missing a panelist. If anyone knows where Alice is, Adam.

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Hiding. Excellent. Thank you.

We're going to start with a look at the IGF in Bali. Can I just get a show of hands? Would you mind raising your hand if you were at the IGF in Bali?

Oh, that's pretty good, actually. That's impressive. Cool. So I'm going to ask Olga to start us off with her impressions of the IGF because I think, Olga, this is your first -- this was the first IGF that you've ever been to, so tell us, you know, what you thought and what could be improved, what you think it's there for, that sort of thing.

OLGA MADRUGA-FORTI: Thank you, Chris.

And I think it's our intention that this is very much an interactive panel, so I hope that we can share questions and I may ask you a few questions.

So indeed, it was my first opportunity to attend an IGF forum, and I have to say that it was the sublime exercise in the multistakeholder model. It was a very unique experience for one, such as myself, more accustomed to the multilateral structured setting, and it is only by way of actually having been there that one understands how much is gained by the dialogue among all of the participants in the various panels without the objective of agreeing in the panel to specific treaty-like text or a resolution, et cetera. It is just the wealth of the information that naturally blossoms by way of the dialogue, and that is, I have to say, of all the fora that I have participated in internationally, unique in and of itself and has incredible value in terms of the multistakeholder process and actually in terms of human experience and how it is that we dialogue internationally.

So I felt that it was a privileged experience to see how the model plays out, and we have much to learn in other fora internationally on how to incorporate that way of dialoguing.

But -- so that is just a general impression that I can share with you regarding overall.

But I was also impressed by the importance of Internet governance throughout the course of the week in Bali. Almost every panel had a set of questions or ended up bringing the topic of Internet governance to the forefront of the topic. Whether --

whether it was civil society dialoguing about their concerns or panels in and of themselves about Internet governance, or panels having to do with eCommerce and issues more along those lines, inevitably the questions that are before us regarding the future of the Internet led to the most interesting dialogues regarding what are the issues that we worry about and how are we going about discussing them in a multistakeholder model. And the one takeaway on that topic from the course of the week is that everyone involved in the Bali IGF certainly could agree on the fact that the way to begin to solve some of these very difficult international problems, not only of those that operate in the Internet space but of society, having to do with the Internet, is in a way that the dialogue brings into play all of the stakeholders that are necessary to even begin to attempt to solve the problems. And by that, being civil society, the technical community, governments, and Internet users, as well as academia.

And so that is a theme that is beginning to resonate throughout many of the multilateral organizations and I think that it was also very important in Bali that some of the ideas that we are talking about a little bit more this week, having to do with 1net, having to do with the possibility of Brazil calling for a meeting on Internet governance or on some of the issues that are causing us to think about Internet governance, and in Bali many people were thinking

and opining about those ideas for the first time, so there were many lively discussions. And by the very nature of the multistakeholder process, I think that the big -- the greatest challenge was to put an idea on the table that is open, that is not yet filled with facts and a lot of structure, such as the Brazil meeting, such as 1net, and by the same token, have enough parameters so that we are all discussing the same thing.

So there was a lot of discussion about "What is it" and there was a lot of response along the lines of "What does it need to be?"

So I think we're ready to start moving on, but I was also not surprised that in a wide-open type of dialogue you would get those kinds of questions. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Olga.

Jeff, I'll go to you. From a business perspective, Bali?

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN:

Yeah. I would echo a lot of what Olga has said. I think the IGF continues to prove itself as an amazing platform and a very large tent for discussions on any topic, and I think as business, we really value the ability to be in a forum where you can identify the cutting-edge issues and debate Internet governance issues itself,

---

which as you mentioned, Olga, was a major theme of this year's Internet Governance Forum.

So we're both looking at how to tackle the policy issues that affect the global Internet, as well as thinking about the governance issues that can be very politically divisive and challenging.

There is a need for a place like the IGF to bring together stakeholders from around the world to have these discussions.

And I'm always amazed at how organic the evolution of the IGF process is from year to year in terms of being able to absorb new issues and new ideas into it.

And sometimes it can be difficult to quantify that effect, but I think it's very real, nonetheless.

Speaking in terms of particularly this year, I also think that there was a concerted effort to try and address practical issues that we had all heard about at the global WCIT conference the year before, particularly among some developing country participants, about security, trust, and economic development impacts of the Internet, and I think, again, the IGF showed that it can help manage those types of discussions which are important as well in terms of sharing information and cultivating capacity-building while we're also discussing the most cutting-edge policy issues that are facing the Internet as well.



And it's important that the IGF be able to do that effectively.

And then a final comment would be, I think we were all particularly aware of the IGF's importance this year because of some of the funding challenges and the other turmoil that kind of happened during the year, the fact that it was such a successful event and that the community really rallied throughout the year to make it a success.

It's kind of a situation where sometimes you don't appreciate something until it's almost taken away from you, and I think this really has validated the commitment of all types of stakeholders to the IGF process.

And one point I would make is, we're already starting to look ahead at -- at the U.N. considering the IGF renewal and I would urge everyone in the room to really push that the sooner that commitment is made, the better. I think last time, we really had to go right down until the end of the wire on the renewal, and a strong commitment to keep that continuity going I think will help ensure the IGF's success prospectively.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Jeff.

David, you come at this from a government perspective. What's it like being in a -- having governance involved in an event where government, it's unusual that they are mixing with, talking with, liaising with nongovernments as the multistakeholder model requires?

DAVID MARTIGNON: Sorry. Since it's very hard to hear you, I'm still trying to read what you said. But you gave me a flavor of your question.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: I'm sorry.

DAVID MARTIGNON: Well, anyway, it's getting harder and harder to add anything interesting after our two previous speakers, so the thing I would like to say is that to answer your question, it's actually very comfortable to be representing a government in such a forum. First, because it's a forum. Second, because we are also used to listening to everybody and to make concerted decisions. And third, because -- especially because of that, because we don't have to make a decision in -- at the IGF, and that is quite comfortable.

Then comes a time when we have to make decisions, but that wasn't the case and the time.

I would also like to say that Bali was especially interesting and useful because it came at a time and in a context that was evolving, I would even say day by day, and it was definitely the place to be to understand the current tendencies and what was really at stake.

And it may be a bit provocative what I'm going to say, but I've been attending, in my career, many international conventions, summits, et cetera, and it's funny because there is always a time in a convention when the main topic becomes "Where are we going together next and what are we going to talk about?"

And though the Internet is tomorrow's world and even today's world and it's probably the fast- -- the quickest evolving side of our societies, it reminded me of many of those conventions when there is a time when you ask, "Okay. What are we going to do in Brazil? When will it be? In which city? And what are we going to talk about?"

And that's -- that was the topic. That was the context. That was extremely useful, and hopefully the Brazilian delegation was large and strong and we could have a lot of exchanges with them and

notably not only, of course, with the government but with the other stakeholders.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you. And I'm sure Carlos will be able to answer all of those questions, but before -- just before I go to Carlos, I'm going to come out to the -- I'm going to come to the audience next for questions and comments, so if you have a comment on the IGF, some experience that you want to share, some feedback, please get ready because we're going to come out to you in a second.

But Carlos, over to you.

CARLOS ALFONSO:

I'm not sure I will be able to answer all the questions.

[ Laughter ]

CARLOS ALFONSO:

Okay. First, I would like to make some comments about the IGF.

The IGF is, of course, an interesting event. It started in 2006, and in the eight IGFs you don't see any major change in terms of processes and the agenda, the methods, et cetera.

---

Perhaps the only major disturbance, I would say, happened between 2006 and 2007 when we had a lively discussion about some themes that should be inserted in the debate.

Other than that, the IGF remains a sort of dialogue space, an excellent dialogue space, as the other speakers have said, an opportunity for bilateral dialogues and multilateral -- multilateral not in the sense of governments but in the sense of society. No?

Participative or multistakeholder dialogues. And also in a space in which several groups, organizations, et cetera, are able to get together and organize what they call dynamic coalitions, specific activities, and so on.

So that is the crucial importance of the IGF as I see it today.

However, if you read -- who has in their heads the full text of the Tunis Agenda? Nobody does. It's a very long text with 122 items, and two or three of them specifically refer to the IGF as a task to be carried out by the United Nations. No?

And in particular, Item 72 or Paragraph 72 of the Tunis Agenda lists 12 activities that the IGF should carry out.

Most of them are not being carried out the way they are formulated in the Tunis Agenda.

Some governments and some organizations see sometimes the Tunis Agenda is a sort of Bible you cannot touch. We have to follow it. But some of these same governments do not fulfill the mandate of the Tunis Agenda regarding Paragraph 72, which is the items regarding the IGF.

At least four of the items, the 12 items, points to recommendations which continues to be a no-no in the IGF. And I can quote one about capacity-building.

So the IGF remains despite the fact that in the Tunis Agenda it should not be so. It remains an event-oriented organism, if you want, or a space instead of a process-oriented activity. So you have the IGFs. You have the logistical committee called the MAG, the Multistakeholder Advisory Group, which is constituted by people filtered by the U.N. General Secretariat in order to participate, is a reasonably good representation of all sectors. But sometimes they lack the proper expertise to deal with all the themes of Internet governance; and some are really challenging for most people, even the experts. So this is one of the challenges we have regarding defining the agenda for the IGF every year.

The other point I would like to make is that the WGEC, the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, is another process which is running more or less in parallel and which sort of, you know, learns from the WGIG, the Working Group on Internet

Governance, which started the process last year. And the main objective is to provide a report to the CSTD, which is the Commission on Science and Technology for Development of the United Nations which, in turn, will present this report to the General Assembly next year regarding cooperation among nations or enhanced cooperation related to the future of the Internet. So it's a very broad theme.

And we started by trying to gather all the issues that should be treated by this enhanced cooperation thing. And we ended up with a list of about 300 -- 300 items which now we have to create a sort of commission to reduce them to some manageable number.

And this reminds me of the WGIG, which we did more or less the same thing and arrived -- and we will be arriving probably at the same conclusion regarding the basic themes of Internet governance that we have to deal with. So this is basically the picture I give you.

Regarding the question that David asked, the information we have is basically what you all have already. There is this meeting in Brazil. It will be -- it was -- the idea was to call it a summit in the first place, but this is long ago. Then it became a conference, and now it is called simply a meeting, a global multistakeholder meeting on the future of Internet governance. That's the title of

the event. It will be in April, I think, from 23 to 25 or 23 to 24 or April in the City of Sao Paulo. So all this is already established.

The ways in which it will be organized, the process of relating to it, all of this is pending, is open to discussion. Some of the organizations we have here, the ISTAR group, ICANN itself, are already relating because, you know, the seminal process started with a meeting between President Dilma Rousseff and Fadi Chehade. And, of course, the kernel of this all is the Montevideo declaration, no?

But we don't know yet details that we need to know as soon as possible in order to, each group, each organization, each stakeholder, organize themselves in order to better participate in this process. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Carlos.

Alice has joined us. So I'm just going to ask you very briefly to give us your impressions of the IGF in Bali. And then we're going to have comments from the floor.

I know you just got here but just some brief thoughts about what you got out of IGF in Bali apart from great weather and fantastic beaches.



ALICE MUNYUA:

I apologize for coming in late.

My impression of the IGF in Bali, to begin, it was a fantastic meeting, I think the greatest we've had. And I say that having organized the Nairobi one which was also the greatest we've ever had.

But I think for me what was important is I think how we've evolved in terms of just the level of discussions we're having. And also I think the focus, especially coming from my region, on more substantive regional IGFs. This year we had a South African IGF, the second one, despite having had five at the East Africa level, five West Africa and Central Africa. So having the South African region have the second one was quite a big achievement for us.

And I think coming from my region, it is still very important to see an IGF that deals with issues that are of specific interest to our countries because for us -- for me, the multistakeholder model is only relevant and works when it is put into practice at the national level. And we have seen that work very well at the Kenyan context in terms of just developing ICT policy. And now we have it enshrined in our new constitution where the government is actually compelled to hold multistakeholder discussions when it comes to implementing any legislation at the national level.

So I think -- and I wouldn't -- and I would attribute that entirely to the multistakeholder model that was introduced by the IGF or, you know, the ICANN multistakeholder model, but it has had an impact coming all the way from our experience having participated very actively in the World Summit on the Information Society and understanding the advantages of involving various stakeholders in implementing ICT for development at the national level and in different sectors and having a government that was quite open and adaptable to using that model in various other sectors. So we see that working very well.

I think the challenge is that to always acknowledge the multistakeholder model is not an end in itself. The idea here is to achieve inclusive and democratic Internet governance in order to acknowledge that that meaningful inclusion needs to be -- needs to be improved at the moment and in the current process of global, national, and regional processes and, also, acknowledging that the outcomes of these processes would be more substantial if there was more meaningful participation at that level. So it's acknowledging that there are differences in terms of just the multistakeholder model itself and participating in that model itself. And I think that's one of the challenges of the IGF, ensuring that there's meaningful participation and acknowledging that these differences to access and resources makes it difficult for some regions to be able to participate effectively at the IGF and

---

by extension in other Internet governance policy processes at the global level. Yeah. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Alice.

Well, there's a fair few thoughts there from everybody up here on the panel.

Questions from you? Thoughts from you? Those of you who were there, weren't there, anything at all that you'd like to ask? There is a microphone. If you wouldn't mind, there's a microphone here. And if you could come to that, that would be very helpful.

AYESHA HASSAN:

Thank you, Chris. Ayesha Hassan from the International Chamber of Commerce.

I wanted to build on what a few people have said and particularly something that Alice has just mentioned how important the IGF has been in terms of helping communities at the national and regional level to also integrate the multistakeholder approach and to see the benefits.

And I thought this year at the IGF we tackled that discussion in a new way, both on a session on principles for multistakeholder

cooperation in the main room but also in a workshop that I'm proud that ICC and ISOC and APC and Brazil put together to dive in: What does it really mean when we are saying "please create a multistakeholder initiative at the national level?" When you talk about participation, what does that mean? Does it mean you have one person? Or does it mean that you have a range? What does "inclusion" mean?

And we had a really good discussion with governments talking about how challenging sometimes it can be in certain situations to implement a multistakeholder approach or from business and civil society and the technical community about how important certain of the elements are to really achieving the objective.

So I thought that was a really good new topic addressed this year, and hopefully the discussion will continue. Thanks.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thanks, Ayesha.

You will have noticed that we've had one more person join us up here on the stage, Byron Holland from dot ca, Canada.

Byron, do you want to say a few things briefly about the IGF in Bali and generally?

---

BYRON HOLLAND: Just in general? Anything that comes to mind?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Exactly.

BYRON HOLLAND: First, my apologies for being a couple of moments late.

I thought the IGF in Bali was actually very encouraging. And one of the things that I really -- I take considerable value from the IGF experience about is the different players in the ecosystem who come together who you don't see here, that we don't regularly in the ICANN sphere cross with.

And it gives, I think -- breathes life into what the IGF should be, which is the opportunity for many diverse and different but deeply impacted by the Internet communities to get together and exchange views and insights.

And the other thing is, you never quite know what will come out of an IGF and I think we can all look back to previous ones where there were key or seminal events. And that's part of the beauty of it, is it's catalytic for issues and events that may surface in that environment that would not have the opportunity to have oxygen or to gain life. And perhaps what we have seen around 1net is really an example of what can come and take shape in an

---

environment like that that would be very difficult in other environments.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Okay. So we can move on to something else, if there is no one who has -- Yes, sir? Come on up.

And if you wouldn't mind, please say your name so we know who you are.

BARRACK OTIENO: Thank you. My name is Barrack Otieno from AfTLD. Now I wanted to just make a few observations and also ask some questions more or less in line with what Alice had pointed out.

One of the things is we really need to start by supporting the Internet Governance Forum at a country level. As it is, the discussion appears to be very elitist or too high level, which is really out of touch with the Internet users. And I think that is the big gap that really undermines the continuity of the IGF process going forward.

The other thing is we need to think about how do we get more governments on board the IGF ship. When I looked at the statistics for the Bali event, it was clear that government participation and representation was still significantly low. Now,

the government represents the people's voice. If the government is not there, then the people are not there basically.

The other issue is we've seen over the years the Internet governance agenda pushed by a team of dedicated volunteers of people whom we can easily identify with. Beyond these people, how is the Internet Governance Forum going to be carried forward? Are we mentoring any leaders for the future, considering it is not a profit or is a (indiscernible) thing?

The other issue is one of the tenets of governance is promoting equity. Now, is the current push for Internet governance going to ensure that the underserved and unserved communities are brought on board? Because if really there is no value proposition, then the Internet Governance Forum might not be relevant for a long time. So those are some of the issues that I'd like to point out.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you. And I know Olga wants to respond. Others may, too. And then we'll come to you.

Olga?

---

OLGA MADRUGA-FORTI: Thank you. That's a very good question because it actually raises a point that we've been talking about a good bit this first day of the week, which is how do we ensure that the multistakeholder process as it plays out also takes into account the public policy experts are government participants and brings into those discussions more and more voices from developing countries.

I'll share with you concretely one experience in Bali and from my hometown. It was the first time that I was able to share an IGF experience with representatives from the Argentine government who went, specifically the regulator, the CNC, the Comision Nacional de Comunicaciones, who I see are sharing today's discussion with us. And by virtue of being there, one of the most interesting things was that they were able to meet with and have a dialogue with some of their counterparts from other countries, I think specifically Mexico and Brazil, that either were in the process of establishing a multistakeholder process or have a rather developed such process already. And that dialogue was so rich that everyone has come back with the notion of formally really fueling and building such a process here in Argentina. And I think that was one of the most fulfilling and concrete outcomes of the IGF for the home team.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Olga.



Jeff?

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN:

Yeah, I also wanted to follow up on Alice's comments. We've heard a lot this morning about, you know, global meetings. And I think we're going to hear more -- or we're going to discuss more of those on the agenda for next year. It's already quite a busy calendar. I think sometimes we lose sight of the importance of the local level. And I think that is the challenge that we all have is. In my view, there are always benefits to getting together at a large global meeting, but there are also extraordinary benefits of building up capacity and knowledge and engagement at the local level.

And I think we are all here, whether it's ICANN itself or the participants have those links into the local level. And what are we all doing to help support Internet governance and multistakeholder at that level, which is really, I think, the long-term future of what we're going to need to have.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Yep, absolutely.

Alice wanted to comment and then I will go to Zahid.

ALICE MUNYUA:

Okay. And I think I would like to thank Barrack very much for those questions because I fully agree with him from my experience at the East Africa level, that if it doesn't make sense or it doesn't impact on the way we view Internet governance at the national and global level, it's going to be very difficult to have the African continent and the various stakeholders represented at the global level.

Like, I think just looking at participation from our governments and business sector, I might actually say it was nearly perhaps 1% or less or probably nobody. And most of us were from civil society. So I think it's very important to support the regional and national processes so that then it makes sense but then at the same time, also to acknowledge the fact that it's going back to the fact that we cannot have meaningful participation and engagement. We really don't have -- we don't have the same resources, and we don't have the same level of access like the rest of the world.

So we need to encourage that as well. But that can only happen at the national and regional level. Thank you.

And in terms of mentorship, I think when you look at the African regional IGFs, there's been a lot of handing over. You know, the Kenya IGF, for example, was led by the government in Kenya for the first four or five years. It has been handed over to a very

---

young ISOC Kenya Chapter. And that is happening in other regions. And I think it's to encourage a more widespread understanding of not just the model but Internet governance itself. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you.

Zahid?

ZAHID JAMIL:

Hi. My name is Zahid Jamil. I'm from Pakistan. And I have been to a few of the IGFs. I have to say that, you know, these are -- these international conferences can be terrible because everybody catches the flu. Everybody catches a virus, et cetera, and fall a little bit. And I think all of us in the traveling circus know that.

But there is something else that also attaches and infects us in the good way, which is the culture that is developed at the IGF which, by the way, doesn't exist anywhere else at all which is now penetrating through the national structures. It just doesn't exist.

I mean, is it the ITU? Could we look at that and say that has a structure? Does it have the ability for people to just come in and say "I'll register, walk in." I can organize a workshop. I get space. I get audio/visual. I get remote participation support.

All I need to do is get a bunch of people to come to this event and have a workshop.

I organized one and co-organized another. I have got to say this IGF that we particularly had, I have never seen this much energy despite and notwithstanding the problems we had with resource, the fact that there was people detracting from it.

But I have never seen this much excitement notwithstanding all the difficulties we had to have this and make it a successful event.

Now, let me speak from sort of a personal perspective from where I come. If it hadn't been for the IGF, we would not have had -- let me put it a different way. The IGF gave birth to the dispute resolution provider in Pakistan for domain names. It didn't exist earlier. It is the IGF that gave birth to the concept of having multistakeholder discussions for our legislation. Didn't exist earlier. It is the IGF that gave us the ability to come and learn from a multistakeholder bottom-up, not a multistakeholder discussion, but what a multistakeholder bottom-up process looks like and how you come into sort of decision-making as a result of that, not a top-down decision-making, "Well, we've listened to you, great to a multistakeholder meeting, but we decide at the end of the day."

Going beyond just our own country, we actually then were able to set up a developing country center for cybercrime where we are trying to do capacity-building across the region. So it has had those concrete, tangible outcomes and effects.

Now, that culture might be under threat if the U.N. doesn't do something which we all want it to do which is renew this whole process. What I'm also concerned about is whether this culture will actually find and infect its way to other processes that we just talked about and Jeff mentioned in other international meetings that will take place later next year.

Chris, of course you know that's the meeting in Brazil.

My question -- and I'm glad -- Olga, thank you so much for yesterday at the GNSO session, making such an articulate explanation of what had happened. It really helped us understand what the meeting was all about. And thank you from CGI to understand more about it.

But question basically is just one simple one: Do you think -- and you might not know yet. But -- because we heard that no topics are on the table at the Brazil meeting.

Do you feel or do you know that whether the IANA function issue is, A, either on the table, B, off the table or, C, possibly but not sure? Thank you.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN:                    You certainly can.

DAVID MARTIGNON:                If the Sao Paulo meeting is -- comes with the understanding that the approach will be multistakeholder, the answer to your question is whatever you want. I think it would be a good thing if the internationalization of the IANA function would be on the table. So I would recommend my government to plead for that. Up to you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:                    Olga and then Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:                Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:                    I said Olga first. I'm having trouble with the microphone.

Olga first. Carlos wants to say something and then quickly you and then Stefano.

Sorry, Olga. Go ahead.

OLGA MADRUGA-FORTI:            No, no, no.

---

Very quickly, I just wanted to give Zahid and everyone a perfect example of how it is that we'll begin to prepare this conference, et cetera.

Do you want the IANA contract issue on the table? And, if so, in what part of the fora, et cetera? And I will start taking notes.

What do you think, Zahid?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Yes, you can answer that.

Carlos, quickly.

CARLOS AFONSO: Okay, very quickly. Okay. Well, what Alice said is quite important. I think this is one of the greatest benefits of the space that has been created by the Tunis Agenda.

And we have examples in your region, very strong examples. And in Brazil, we have one example which is very relevant which we turned, as I said before, into a process, a very long process, which is the building of the so-called civil rights framework for the Internet, which was started in 2009 and is now going through Congress and suffering all the challenges that you know very well in a representative democracy of being approved by Congress and then submitted to the Presidency.

This was built in a truly participative model and with strong participation of nearly every sector. And this was also a learning process because many people wanted to participate and wanted to understand first what are the challenges and entered into a sort of learning process, not in order to get involved in this building of this -- what we call the Marcos review.

So this was a sort of marginal IGF process, if you will, because the objective is to establish a full range of civil rights for the views and deployment of the Internet in the country.

We don't know what the final outcome will be, but we hope it will be the one civil society together with government and all the other sectors proposed to the Congress.

So that's an example of this multistakeholder process, which I think that Zahid is right, this multistakeholder idea was one of the things that came out of these consecutive IGF processes; no?

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Carlos.

Tijani.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you. Tijani Ben Jemaa from Tunisia, and I am ALAC member.



---

Everything about IGF is in the Tunis Agenda. We don't have to forget that IGF doesn't have anything to do with anything which is daily operation of Internet. It is written clearly.

And those who were in the process from the beginning remember very well how difficult it was to bring the Internet critical resources to be discussed as a theme. At first, it was -- it was rejected.

So we have to be careful when we speak about what we can do in IGF.

Barrack just said that there is less involvement, less interest of governments in the IGF. And that is very true. From a meeting to the other, the participation of governments is decreasing. This is a problem.

There is another problem. Some sessions, you have less than ten people, and they are general sessions. I remember -- I remember Baku, there was a general session in the afternoon where we were perhaps ten or 15 persons. This is a big problem.

For the workshops, also you have some workshops who have very few people.

---

So I think that the IGF has to evolve. And to make the IGF evolve, we have to involve the U.N. system, because it is the only way to change the rules.

If the IGF don't evolve in the future, I don't think it will be sustainable.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Tijani.

Stefano.

STEFANO TRUMPY:

Good evening, Stefano Trumpy. I'm representing the government of Italy, and I participated in all IGFs but the last one.

And I have to say that members of the parliament in Italy and of the government participated in the IGFs together with me, and I had many times to try to explain to them that it was worth to go to this sort of talk shows because their impression sometimes was quite negative. We do -- have not to decide anything, and so on.

So, but now I think -- Okay. My opinion is positive. And in the end, it was positive with the opinion of those that came with me.

---

And the IGF is a process that is son of Tunis Agenda, of Tunis meeting, and we are approaching Tunis +10. So it is time now to try to say what we would like to be.

Also, having in consideration the children of global IGF. We had reasonable IGFs. We have many national IGFs. And each one of the national IGF was conceived just to try to spread the word of multistakeholder organization, and so on, to the local community, possibly involving the government and possibly telling to them that they have then to represent this in the global meeting.

So since we are approaching 2015, that is worth now try to exchange ideas and I really appreciate this kind of discussion because in the countries, national IGFs would like to continue, because they think that this has been a very useful process in order to make these talks in the national environment, the local Internet community. and this is quite precious value.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Byron, last comment before we move on to something else.

BYRON HOLLAND: I just want to pick up on the point made there that local and regional IGFs are the son or daughter of the IGF. My organization,

CIRA, which operates the dot CA have picked up on that mantle and we have created a Canadian IGF. And I think we shouldn't lose sight of the importance of that. And it's -- the event that we run and all of the other ones like us are really informed by what happens at the global IGF, but it is a two-way street. We also bring back to that environment rich content that shows a real diversity of views and issues and challenges in the various domestic regions or the national or regional regions.

So I think we shouldn't lose sight of the importance of what the global IGF drives down into the local environments. And because of it, us and others have created environments in our countries where government does come together with end users. I mean, I know in my country, certainly, the ability of an end user, some person who just wants access to the Internet, to get up and ask a question of, in our world, the assistant deputy minister, the top bureaucrat for governance in the Internet, that just never happens. And that's a two-way street. They don't typically get to hear from the end user.

And business gets in there and security people get in there.

There is huge value in what happens at the global IGF because it allows us to start to filter down that information and make real -- and I said it before -- breathe life into the multistakeholder down at the ground level.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Well, that sounds like an incredibly positive note to move off of the IGF and on to something else.

We're going to talk -- I'm conscious -- I do want to deal with what's coming up next year. So I'm going to ask Nigel, who is sitting in the front row here, if he can just very quickly run us through what's on the agenda for next year. Nigel, you might -- yes, take it up. That's fine.

On the agenda for next year, and then we'll ask the panel to talk about it.

I know one of the major ones is the plenipotentiary, and I'm guessing, Jeff, that you actually probably have access to that being a sector member, David, you would obviously have access to it being a government, so I'd be interested in your views.

Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thanks very much. I'll be very brief so there's lots of time for discussion.

As was mentioned in one of the sessions this morning, just concentrating on one year of course is quite narrow. Things go on very year. But 2014 and into 2015 there's a concentration of events.

If we take the ITU, the next main ITU event that touches on Internet issues is the world telecommunication development conference. This is a four-yearly conference on the development wing of the ITU, and there's a preparation phase for that, which has been ongoing with different ITU regions preparing proposals for areas of work for the development sector of the ITU to study.

That conference is taking place in early April. The venue is still to be determined. It was supposed to be Sharm El Sheikh, but it's possible it might be moved to another country.

The relevance of Internet governance in terms of that particular conference is proposals to -- for the ITU to work -- do work on IPv6, on cybersecurity, and potentially on naming and addressing. And those are all things that will be discussed in one way or the other.

Going forward from the WTDC is the plenipotentiary. The plenipotentiary is a four-yearly conference of the ITU and it really is the sort of the set piece -- it's the set-piece event where elections are held for elected posts at the ITU. At the plenipotentiary in October, at Busan in Seoul, a new Secretary-General will be elected. A new Deputy Secretary-General will be elected as well.

And also, at that conference at Seoul in the plenipotentiary, member states will have a chance to open up the Constitution. It's possible parts of the Constitution could be changed if member states so want to change the scope of the work that the ITU does or to change various other aspects.

Of course, member states participate in the ITU and sector members participate in that conference as well. And, no doubt there, might be proposals to define more precisely the work that the ITU does in terms of the Internet space and the work other organizations like ICANN, ISOC, do as well.

So that's the plenipotentiary, and it's certainly something that ICANN and the other Internet organizations and ISTAR organizations take very seriously.

Away from that, of course, there's the process that's been alluded to in terms of the review of the World Summit on the Information Society. Many of you, of course, were involved in the 2003 and the 2005 summits on the Information Society. One of the results from that, the Tunis Agenda, asked the U.N. General Assembly to review the effectiveness of the Tunis Agenda in terms of the action lines that were adopted. And these action lines range from the need to create multilingualism, the need to be educated about the Internet, the need to have Internet access, et cetera.

The review of the WSIS agenda is under way. The U.N. set out a process for it. There was a fairly major conference that UNESCO hosted in Paris back in February.

The next main event is, again, linked to the WTDC, so it could be in Bucharest, it could be somewhere else, in April, it's back to back with the WTDC. And that event again will look at the Tunis Agenda, will look at the effectiveness of the action items and make certain recommendations.

And there's a preparatory process under way for that which is very, very open. The ITU have completely opened up the preparatory process. All the documents and suggestions are on the ITU site.

And then just finally, discussions going on in New York right now as we speak. Well, probably they might have stopped, but they're certainly going on this week, into the final way that the WSIS review will be concluded. Because as I said, we've had the UNESCO event. We'll have the ITU event in April. And there has to be a decision on whether you have a big summit in which you invite world leaders to look at the World Summit on the Information Society or whether you simply have a report to the U.N. General Assembly in 2015. And the methodology for doing that is being discussed.



Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you, Nigel. So, Jeff, let's start with you.

What -- How can we find opportunities to bolster the multistakeholder model inside events like the plenipotentiary and so on?

From your experience being in those, what can we do, what can you do, who can help to make -- to bolster the model?

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN:

Well, I think, first of all, it's a challenge for all of us just to support all of these events.

I think a couple of thoughts. One is there has been good progress, as Nigel mentioned. The ITU is being much more open in how it is doing the preparatory process for this. So I think that is a positive sign.

And one thing that Nigel didn't mention is the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation which Peter Major is chairing. And I think it's very notable that that is a multistakeholder effort as well, after a lot of debate.

So I think one of the -- one of the points that we, as the broader community, need to make is that the process will be better off by making it truly multistakeholder in process and not just on a consultative basis, and that we will show up and contribute when things are structured that way. So it's a little burden on us, responsibility, but I think that also has to be our consistent message.

I think the other theme that is running throughout this is what is the role of government on Internet governance generally. And I think it's very important that we avoid kind of a bifurcated world where there are multistakeholder organizations like ICANN that are viewed as a very limited role for government, and then there are kind of the government-controlled processes where there's a limited role for other stakeholders. That's the divide I think we need to avoid.

So I think it's important to have a cross-pollination where we go to the U.N. and we go to the ITU and we participate in these proceedings.

The WSIS action lines have a lot of important aspects of economic and social development associated with them that are important to users around the world. And so it's an important component of what we do that may be less in the day-to-day operations but, nevertheless, very important.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you.

David and Carlos and then the gentleman in the audience.

DAVID MARTIGNON: So, yeah. The list of events next year is huge. I started imagining how happy my wife will be next year and my kids not to see me that much, but that's our life.

It's really difficult because all those questions revolve around the notion of Internet governance. And I must say that we governments -- and I can speak only on behalf of the French government, but my understanding is our discussions are complex, which means other governments are assessing their positions on this sequence.

It's really difficult to get into that topic without having in mind the subjects and the problems we are trying to deal with, in fact. What is Internet governance? I don't really know. Obviously ICANN governs names and numbers. Obviously the ITU governs other things. But I think the effort that we need to do is to try and identify those problems, those topics that call, that demand for a modernized governance or a governance because they are not governed, actually.

And it's really difficult to say, because to -- to identify those topics.

But I understand there is always a fear of competition between an organization, and notably here. And that's fair and that has to be respected. But first of all, I don't think we can talk about one multistakeholder model. I think it's -- it would be more accurate to talk about a multistakeholder approach. And many multistakeholder approaches. There's one in Brazil. There are other type of methods in France and in other countries.

By the way, it will be always very difficult to identify, frankly, the ITU as a purely intergovernmental organization, because it's simply not here because I see here people from companies that I always meet in Geneva at the ITU because companies are part of the ITU, too.

And we could address the same questions to the ICANN -- to ICANN. ICANN is obviously multistakeholder, one multistakeholder model. And sometimes we governments have to assess the way we are heard and we work together with -- with ourselves and with you at the board. All those are very respectful questions.

And so I really think that debate is kind of made more difficult to understand if we only stick to that conflict or pseudo conflict

between multistakeholderism and intergovernmental -- intergovernmental model.

I think we really have -- And when I say that, I'm supposed to be one of the experts at the French Ministry of Foreign Affairs. I must say that I don't fully understand everything, so imagine what my authorities think and understand of that.

And so I think the only way we can move on and try to find solutions to these questions is to try and identify the problems, and then to try and balance the advantages and the problems raised by the way they are currently governed to try to find solutions.

What are those problems? Spamming, obviously. Is the current state of the law and current state of the international organization enough to deal with this problem?

Do we have -- Do we use, as governments, taxpayers, companies, business, stakeholders, do we think we get the right answers to that problem? I'm talking about Spam, because I know it's been at the core of the discussions in Dubai, for example. But we governments face other problems, like how do we protect our children, how do we fight efficiently against cyber criminality? Is the Budapest Convention enough? Does it work? Is it effective? Is it efficient? Do we need more? How do we tackle the fact that

our sovereignties sometimes are in a collision course when it comes to dealing with those topics?

These are the kind of questions that I think we need to address. And that's the type of suggestion that -- that, I mean, we really need to move on on those topics.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you.

Carlos, going to come to you and then --

CARLOS AFONSO:

Very quickly. Interestingly, two points. All this scenario Nigel described to us shows the limits of the multistakeholder process, which we have to cope with.

How do you imagine that organizations mostly south of the equator, which have no resources, which have their national challenges to cope with, manage to participate in all those trends meaningfully? And be present in exercising their role as part of this multistakeholder model?

It's almost impossible. I would say it's almost impossible, even for large organizations, well organized, which are very closely related to Internet governance.

---

So this is one of the challenges we have in realizing the multistakeholder model.

How to participate in the IGO threads is nearly impossible because these are real processes, not just the event. There is a whole preparatory process which you can influence if you're able to participate. But this is a challenge for us in the south, mostly. This is one point.

The other thing that I would like to point out can, which I think is very interesting, regarding the Brazil meeting, is that shortly after she made her speech at the U.N., President Rousseff did a radio program in Brazil two or three days after, and she said that for her, multilateral means among nations, not among governments.

Her view is broader than the view typically considered by governments in their diplomatic interrelations.

This, I think, shows a genuine interest to converge the relationship between governments to the relationship between or among all the other agents in society. And I think we have to take advantage of that and try, as much as possible, to participate in the process leading to the Brazil meeting to see if we can have an effective voice in there.

Thank you.

---

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you, Carlos Alfonso.

Sir.

NARESH AJWANI: Naresh Ajwani, vice-chairman address counsel, president CCIO civil society, managing director of VNL, a business organization.

Here I am speaking my mind, a mind which was wondering before I had got in, has started wondering now, more after listening to speakers. And I must tell French gentleman, I don't know whether he was snooping my mind or actually we both were on the same page.

I have a simple question. Is Internet governance a policy position, or a technical, legal, or regulatory?

This is in relevance to many people talking about bottom-up approach, top-down approach. And I have been listening last six years. Concerns or accusations starting from vested interest, move to conflict of interest when ITU came, and recently Snowdenism.

This journey is not arriving at some decision. We are talking. We are enjoying talking. We all want to hear each other. Rather, we want to hear ourselves, too, at times.



---

My question to all of you out here is when would be the decision? And if it is a policy decision and a bottom-up needs to have a show of hands. If it is a technical decision, it needs just technical understanding among various countries.

My request, we stick to the question whether Internet governance would remain just merely discussion or a decision.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you. Anyone else want to come to the microphone? Desiree?

DESIREE MILOSHEVIC:

Hello. My name is Desiree Milosevic with Afilias.

I have a comment, and maybe a question as well, with regards to what's been said about multistakeholderism.

I think this is not something new in the policy development. This model has been in existence since the '90s and maybe it's new in the context of Internet governance but it still has been around.

And I would agree with some of the previous speakers that we have a multitude of multistakeholder processes rather than models, and the real question is: As we have moved on as a

society accepting the multistakeholder model, is there really a need for processes within Internet -- international government organizations, IGOs? Can they really effectively address any of the Internet governance process, being a closed governmental-only process that we're seeing now?

So that's a question maybe for David or some other speakers.

And lastly, I think I'd like just to mention the Oxford Internet Institute held a discussion forum last year and we made a general contribution with a paper on enhanced cooperation that actually gives examples of how governments work today effectively with many multistakeholders. We have quoted the IDN fast-track process where, Chris, you participated and worked closely with the GAC. We have quoted the national example of CGI in Brazil. And we hope to continue to quote these examples of effective working of governments and all other stakeholders together. And if you have any suggestions and would like to give us more examples, we're happy to address that as well.

Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Thank you. David, if you want to just respond to that thing that was addressed to you. Then what I'm going to do is ask Olga and Alice and Byron, who haven't spoken on this topic, to just kind of

---

wrap it up for us about what they think the -- not just in the ITU but all of next year, what they think the opportunities are that we can take advantage of.

David, did you just want to quickly respond to...

DAVID MARTIGNON:

I think basically to answer your question, to make it very short, I think multistakeholderism or a multistakeholder approach comes with democracy, basically.

So I have absolutely no doubt that the consensus is expanding on the fact that whenever you need to shape a legislation, identify a problem, make a legislation be -- make sure that a legislation is correctly implemented, then in all those cases you will need all the stakeholders.

So that would be my answer. I have absolutely no doubt and no fear that this is the future but at the same time, we all have to have bear in mind that at the end of the day, if a problem is not solved, the political responsibility weighs on the shoulders of the elected officials.

CHRIS DISSPAIN:

Okay. So the question is: What are the next -- what do the next 12 months hold that are opportunities to promote, to bolster

---

multistakeholderism? Not -- I think we often think that the ICANN model is the multistakeholder model. It is a multistakeholder model. There are plenty of others. "Processes" may be a better word than "model."

But what do we have coming up in the next 12 months? What opportunities do we have to bolster it and to promote it?

Olga, do you want to start? Thanks.

OLGA MADRUGA-FORTI:

I think we've had some interesting comments regarding the fact that people prefer not to think of our current situation as a bifurcated world where you either have just a multilateral model or the multistakeholder model as we know it today.

I think we're going to begin to explore issues and find that there is actually a new way of going about public/private cooperation to answer some of the tough questions that we have to deal with, and I will give you one early and concrete example of how this might play out in the year to come.

And that is, in August of last year in Montevideo, we had the Americas regional preparatory meeting for the World Telecommunications Development Congress, and the purpose of

---

that meeting was to bring about consensus as to what the ITU should be focusing on regarding development.

On the question of ICTs and the Internet, one of the issues that was able to glean consensus was the need for capacity-building throughout the region for a broader participation in a multistakeholder process.

Once you start peeling that, "Okay, how are we going to go about that," that means then an outreach and a partnering will have to take place between government sectors eager to be part of processes that they may not have been a part of before, such as the GAC, such as the IGF, and those technical and participatory experts that are already in the space.

So bottom line, the only way some of the issues will begin to be solved is if we stop thinking about the world as in two camps and start more designing a camp in the middle that brings all the experts to the table.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you. Alice?

ALICE MUNYUA: Thank you.

There was a question about how to engage with some of the processes, and especially the plenipotentiary, the ITU one, and I think after the WCIT experience, I think what I would say over and over again, having been a member of my own government, you know, for the last seven or so years, is the ITU's just a secretariat and so we have to go back to the national level to ensure that our governments do embrace the multistakeholder model so that then -- they are then able to contribute to ITU policy processes or any other global policy processes, for that matter.

And for Kenya, we have that quite clear in terms of, you know, the institution that is mandated to represent the Kenyan government at the ITU has to ensure that that process happens at the national level before they create what we call a national position on various issues.

Having said that, I think, you know, we worry about the overfocus on institutions, and I think it's about time we began to get away from that and focus more on how -- on ways that we look at -- we look at Internet-related activities and how they relate to the other activities, especially when it comes to socioeconomic development, rather than focusing so much on institutions.

And it's -- for me, it's more important to have the institutions adapting to the issues as they evolve at the national level or the needs and challenges at the national level, including ICANN, and I

think that's why some of the strategy panels, especially the one on ecosystem, is about looking at what the Internet ecosystem is going to be like and how ICANN will then have to adapt to that, not the other way around.

So that's important, looking -- taking -- actually considering very seriously ICANN -- Internet-related activities and how those then can be linked to, you know, various and broader socioeconomic development at the national level.

So for me, the challenge is no long, you know, how -- what about Internet governance, per se. It's about looking at, you know, Internet activities and how they relate to that.

There's also the issue about, you know, the differences in terms of how we ensure that the multistakeholder model is taken seriously. And again, I agree that the ICANN multistakeholder model is just one, and that we can't apply that multistakeholder model to every issue.

As we've seen the example at our national level when we were trying to get the fast fiberoptic cable into the east Africa region, what was more suitable at that particular moment was not the multistakeholder model, it was more the private/public partnership at that particular moment, and then we then branch out, and when we are considering universal affordable access to

broadband is when we consider the multistakeholder model. So it's important to think about applying the various models to the various situations and not the big -- it doesn't always work for -- you know, for everything, and that it's -- again, it's not an end in itself. Thank you.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thanks, Alice.

And Byron?

BYRON HOLLAND: Thanks, Chris.

Just for the AV guys, if you could put the speakers on behind us, it's very hard to hear up here. It would be helpful for those monitors.

I think, you know, many good points have been made here, but I just want to pick up on a couple of them and maybe sort of reframe it.

Multistakeholderism, this is not religion. It's not just two camps with a polarity between each other.



I think the great thing about the multistakeholder environment is that it's incredibly adaptable, you know, and we also have to look at the success of what has been done over the past 15-plus years.

And one of the things we have a tendency to do is focus on what's not going right or focus on the negative. And not to be naive, but we should also focus on what has been delivered.

Because I think that's one of the greatest strengths in going back to national governments. And to pick up on some of the comments Alice has just said, and others, the ITU is not some entity of itself. It is a collection of national governments of which we have relationships with to greater or lesser degrees.

So the opportunity to do the hard work through various forums, different ISTAR community members, et cetera, over the next short while between the various -- well, the three events in particular that have been spoken about, ending with plenipot, is to go back and remind and highlight the strengths of the model that's put 2 billion people online, it's probably the only bright spot in the global economy for all of our economies, and remind our national governments that when they're in multilateral environments, that there is real strength in a true multistakeholder model.

---

But it's going to be tough sledding. There's no silver bullet. We have to do it in our own diverse national environments, but we do have some time as we move through these milestone events, and I think the key for us -- certainly I know in our domestic environment -- is to continue to remind our national government of the successes that this model has had, the adaptability that this model has had, and the end result that it has -- that it has created, which is the success we know today of the Internet.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: Thank you very much. So --

>> (Speaker is off microphone.)

CHRIS DISSPAIN: What? What about it?

If you want to come to the microphone, come to the microphone just quickly, but very quickly.

>> (saying name), dot ru. A very quick question. We just found out a press release which is very intriguing. I mean, there was a new panel which has just been created. I mean, and the ICANN was

---

the catalyst of that. It's a high-level panel with multistakeholder -- pretty much multistakeholder panel, and they're about to convene in London in December to discuss policy framework for Internet governance, so --

CHRIS DISSPAIN: This is the fifth strategy panel that Fadi announced at the same time as he announced all of the strategy panels.

>> Okay.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: This is not some magic new panel. This is just the fifth strategy panel.

>> Okay. So that was the question.

CHRIS DISSPAIN: And the session that follows this session at 3:30 is about the strategy panels.

So if you want to hang around, you can hear more information about the strategy panels and hear -- and four of the five chairs of

---

those panels are here and will explain what each one of those panels is going to do.

We're out of time. Can you please join me in thanking this panel.

[ Applause ]

[ END OF TRANSCRIPT ]