
SINGAPORE – Setting the Scene: Overview of Recent Agenda-Setting Initiatives
Friday, March 21st 2014 – 10:00 to 18:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

PANEL: Setting the Scene: Overview of Recent Agenda-Setting Initiatives

RAFIK DAMMAK:

So thanks, everybody, for joining us today. I think we have all panelists at the table. So I don't think I need to introduce them. They are enough famous around within the community and their groups, so we have a quite, yes, a cross-community panel. And for today, we try to -- I mean, with this session, to do the scene setting for the -- for the conference.

So first, how to say, as introduction, it's really been the several initiatives that we saw in the last month with strategic panels, with 1net, of -- how to define it, as a movement, space, and also the cross-community working group and the high-level panel for -- for Internet governance and so on. And then we have this last announcement from India NTIA which I think add more complexity to those initiatives and the kind of outcome that we can expect from them.

So I'm not trying, how to say, to -- to impose panelist to kind of compare between what we can describe, maybe, between top-down process or bottom-up process, but I will let them to talk for each one, like, for three - five minutes to just give their thoughts and then after we will try to cover the several question that we have so you can see the program.

So maybe we should start from my left with Okutani-San.

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.

IZUMI OKUTANI:

I'm speaking as someone who is relatively new to this area. And I work for JPNIC, which is a registry for IP address, managing IP address in Japan. Because of what we do, we collaborate very closely with our technical operators' community in Japan as well as the Asia-Pacific region. So this is basically where I come from.

And in terms of this area of NETmundial and wider area of Internet governance, what we do as organization is we share what's going on about the events or the discussions within Japan, and we collaborate very closely with Adam Peake from GLOCOM to make sure that we review certain, like, notable events, such as IGF in Bali and what would be, you know, the perspective of the Japanese community, how we should prepare for NETmundial as Japan. And I've also seen a panel that was held in the APRICOT, which is a technical conference for the Asia-Pacific region on the technical operators. We had this discussion and how we think about the globalization of IANA.

So those are the things that are happening in Japan and the Asia-Pacific.

And I must say that, with my limited experience and observation, I'm really astonished by the difference in the level and the depth of discussions that's happening in the 1net and the other mailing list on this topic worldwide, and the kind of level of discussions that's happening in -- in the communities that I work closely with, which is specifically basically operational communities within Asia.

And a lot of people are still at the level of asking questions of, okay, why does this meeting in Brazil have relevance? How can we exactly get involved when they're discussing about principles? What would be the impact that would have on us?



So we are still at the level of not being able to directly make our specific contributions to the meeting or the mailing list. But I still think that this meeting in Brazil is useful, and some of the other initiatives that are taken in the context of it doesn't mean that these people are not interested in the issues itself. It's just that they don't know how to participate or the relevance that these meetings or initiatives has on them. But I'm seeing that, for example, in the area of capacity building, there are works being done on -- like, workshops being done on developing countries to train people on IPv6 and is a specific case that has really worked. I think Bhutan is now listed as one of the top 10 or 15 countries with really high v6 deployment, and there are really lots of work being done by the operational communities. But they don't think they do this for the Internet governance. They just do it because they think it helps the Internet.

And I'm also seeing on the other side, the people on this Internet governance discussion saying, hey, we really want real-life solutions to the issues we're having and what exactly should we do? So I'm seeing a gap between the people who are looking for solutions and the people who are doing actual specific work, but not necessarily joining the discussions.

So what I think is helpful in some of the contributions I'm seeing on NETmundial and also considerations made by the high-level panel or the strategic panel on the ICANN on the role of what ICANN do is identify what is the expertise of these people? What are the things these entities or individuals or communities are doing? And then maybe slowly build some kind of, like, I don't know, a map helping people. So to give a more real-life example, if you're, like, finding for directions.



I think what's happening at the moment is more like people asking any individuals who they happen to know on the solutions that they may be able you believe to provide. But if we have some kind of road signs to guide people on where to go, then that would be really helpful on using the maximum use of expertise that been available, the people -- the work that people are already doing.

And then I think this would maybe, if we can consider how we could specifically do that as a part of the discussions on the evolution of the Internet ecosystem on NETmundial and continue, hopefully, discussions online through 1net, and if we can also further do the feedback on forums, such as IGF, I think that would be something that would be really useful in helping solve some of the issues on the table.

So that would be my input.

Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thank you, okay Okutani-San.

So now we can move to Suzanne.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Thank you. I'm Suzanne Woolf, and as usual I wear many hats in this community but I'm speaking just for myself.

I think we're all trying very hard to make sense of all of the activities currently going on. Sally and Steve alluded a little bit to this. Lots of meetings, lots of papers, advisory panels on this, strategy panels on



that, announcements, all kinds of activity. It's a little hard to tell where it's going and I think that's going to be true for a while yet. We're very much in sort of the creative phase of some of these activities. But it does mean that we have to pay attention to where it's all leading.

I do have a couple of observations of my own. One that's, I think, a cautionary kind of concern, and the other, another that I think is very helpful.

The worrisome aspect to me is that the level of activity that we're looking at, there's a lot of overload going on. There's a real challenge in just keeping up with all the different venues where these conversations are occurring. I'm looking around the room and I'm realizing that I've seen -- I've had conversations with many of the people in this room already in the last couple of years about volunteer fatigue and concerns of overreaching, and really kind of the need to tend to our housekeeping. The need to not lose sight.

There are tremendous possibilities in all of the activity going on currently, but we do need to make sure that we're focusing. We're tending to our housekeeping, to our knitting, to doing the job that ICANN and IANA are charged with, as well as possible, and that that remains the focus. And the challenge is to be open to new inputs and new participation and still maintain that focus, to strengthen the institutions we have as well as being open to new ones.

So I think that's a concern. I'm seeing nods around the room. I think that's a concern of a lot of us. But that's a very nuts and bolts concern that comes, I think, from my orientation primarily in terms of the --



what's usually called the technical community. So that actually brings me to a more, I think, hopeful observation also.

A lot of what seems to be happening lately is we are getting some good cross-community dialogue and discussion and perspective going. It's in fits and starts, but there's more cross-community discussion within ICANN. There's -- I think 1net is sort of working its way towards being a really good place for some thoughtful cross-community engagement. There have been serious discussions about Internet governance and the role of the technical community in a number of venues where, frankly, I wouldn't have expected it even a year ago. In particular, the recent IETF, there was some very good discussion.

And I think that the cross-community engagement is absolutely critical at this point because we've already done all the things we can do in our silos. We've done the things we can do in our separate communities. And I think being able to work across some obvious challenges and understanding each other across our communities is really where we need to go next.

So I'm not entirely sure how we get there, but I think there's a lot of very, very promising activity, and I'm looking forward to seeing what happens this week and in the near future.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thank you.

So, Philip, please.



PHILIP CORWIN:

Good morning. I'm Philip Corwin. I'm going to be speaking very fast because I have a lot to say.

I'm a member of the business constituency representing a trade group of domain name investors, but I want to make it clear that this morning I'm not speaking for the B.C., for any client or anyone else. These are my personal views.

I am a globalization skeptic, which does not mean that I'm against globalization in the abstract. It means I have great concerns about the quest for globalization that's going on right now.

We are clearly in a time for ICANN of hope and change, that makes me very nervous because hope is not always rewarded and change is not always for the better. I'm also a firm believer in the maxim if it ain't broke, don't fix it.

How did we get to this point? Unfortunately, and I know this reflects the view of many of my colleagues who work within ICANN, we got to this point without much, if any, consultation with the community on the steps that have been taken. In the last period, particularly in the question which was out there since last summer of whether the NSA revelations undermined trust in ICANN and the Internet and required the type of response we're seeing. Instead, we saw the establishment of top-down presidential strategy panels. We saw -- and I hate to say this -- a new low point in ICANN with the secret Board resolution last September that authorized the CEO to take many of the actions that have been taken, from Montevideo Brasilia, et cetera. I think that action showed a disturbing mistrust to the community. That should have been a topic much community discussion. And all of this has been



based on what I believe is the false premise that the NSA revelations, which I in no way defend everything the NSA was doing, in some way required some substantial change in current arrangements at breath-taking speed.

Now, let me quote someone: Legitimacy comes from accountability. CEO, Chohade said that a few months ago. I agree completely. And accountability requires transparency, and we have not had substantial transparency, although hopefully that will improve going forward.

As for globalization, I can't imagine ICANN becoming any more globalized than it already is. I have been participating in this community since 2006. I have met other people participating in it from every corner of the world with every type of expertise. It's open to all. The meetings are open. The Board is composed of people from around the world, the stakeholders. Governments have as much role as they want through the advisory role in the GAC.

So we're left with globalization of IANA, and there the fact is, the historic fact, that the U.S. is the contract counter party for the IANA functions.

Contract, I think that role has been benign. I don't know of anyone charging its ever been abused, but for better or worse, we have now embarked upon this globalization quest which raises the question if the U.S. hands over the contract, who is going to get it?

So we all must engage in this process, even in dissent.

I believe the contract will be handed over to a committee. I don't see any other outcome that can come from the process we're now engaged



in. And committees become very complicated and hazardous enterprises. And that committee, I can't see any way it does not include governments. And let me point out the NTI statement of last week does not preclude government participation. It precludes a government led organization, which is quite different from a government participating organization. But we'll see what happens and if I'm correct in that prediction.

As for the other NTIA condition that ICANN not become an intergovernmental organization, evolution is a process, not a vent, and I believe whatever happens in the next 18 months is not necessarily the end game but simply a transition point that will lead to further change down the road once the U.S. has receded from its role. And it does not preclude, not in 18 months but perhaps a few years, a headquarter of ICANN in Geneva as some type of litigation-proof organization.

Let me speak with a very U.S.-centric observation. And I realize most of you are not from the U.S. and are not familiar with the intricacies of the U.S. Constitution. But there is a 2000 report from the General Accounting Office in the United States and an opinion from the then General Counsel of the Commerce Department at that time controlled by the Clinton administration which spun off ICANN from the Commerce Department that there was a legitimate question of whether congressional authorization in the form of legislation was needed to transfer the IANA contract.

I don't have a firm view on whether that is or isn't required, but I do know that it's going to be a topic of great debate on Capitol Hill with the house commerce committee already announcing its first oversight



hearing on this matter the first week of April. So for you non-U.S. folks, right now the contract is in the hands of the U.S., and it's not clear that the administration on its own without congressional consent can transfer it. And this debate involves a separation of power issue which can become very volatile.

Looking forward, I found myself in violent agreement with my friend professor Milton Mueller. Not on his proposal, necessarily, for where the IANA function should go but I did believe the IANA contract cannot be passed on to ICANN or to a consortium of the ISTAR technical organizations that it dominates. That's the same as handing it to ICANN itself. This involves the fate of the oversight function embodied in the Affirmation of Commitments. If the agreement becomes one with the world, in my opinion it's in agreement with nobody. It can't be with the world. It has to be with someone with real oversight and enforcement power.

I do believe without adequate oversight and enforcement -- and this is nothing negative by ICANN or any individual in cane, it just comes from my study of history of organizational dynamics, ICANN is a very well internally funded organization, has an ability to raise very large sums of money without needing to ask any government for a dime, and that type of organization without sufficient accountability can drift toward an unaccountability and even corruption. And again, that's not to impugn ICANN or anyone in it. It's just what happens with organizations that are not under adequate control.

One last point. Regardless of where this globalization quest goes, if nothing changes, I think one thing that must happen with ICANN is that



the board meetings must be opened up. My preference would be for all nonfinancial, nonpersonnel matters to be Webcast live, but at a minimum all policy debates should be Webcast, and there should be transcripts, there should be minutes. When you look at the minutes now you would believe every issue the Board agrees with. There are no arguments, no dissents. No votes. That is not adequate transparency.

And let's not forget that all this globalization debate is happening during the launch of the largest and riskiest project in ICANN's history, the launch of more than a thousand new TLDs. And something may not go right with that, and that could intrude on this debate over the next 18 months.

So --

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks for --

PHILIP CORWIN: In closing, my final thought, be careful what you wish for. Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thank you, Phil. That's quite, I think, strong statement and it looks like kind of insight from B.C. So you said something controversial, I guess, so thank you for that. But just I want to remind other panelists, please be concise. You have three to five minutes and then you have questions to answer. And we need really to provide more time for the audience. And then I guess they will ask you a lot of questions.



So now we move to Adiel. Please, go ahead.

ADIEL AKPLOGON:

Yeah, thank you, Rafik. Before starting I would just like to say that I'm talking here not in the name of 1net, to start with, because I will say what I think about 1net in my personal capacity and how 1net is probably organized right now, but I'm also the CEO of AfriNIC and also the chair of the NRO, which is the Number Resource Organization. I will be able to talk about the African perspective on all of these things happening and also what we think as NRO on some of these things.

I think there is a lot of debate, discussion around what is happening now. For me, I think it is an important milestone and the turning point in the evolution of the Internet governance ecosystem. This is something, in fact, that we have been calling for for a while, but I think we also surprised at the pace at which it starts happening, which explain all the discussion and debate, question around it. But if we look clearly at the story of this community, we have been asking for some of these changes that are happening right now. And I think our responsibility is to be able to show that we were prepared. We are well organized. We know what we are -- we were asking for, and take the challenge and clearly show the rest of the world that we -- we mean it when we're calling for these changes.

To come back in particular to 1net, I think it is very important to remind everybody where the idea of 1net started from. If you remember the Montevideo statement, the second point of that statement clearly says that we have, after long discussion, identified a need for an ongoing effort to address internal government challenges and agree to catalyze



a communitywide effort toward evolution of global multistakeholder and Internet cooperation. That is where the whole idea of 1net comes from.

And today what we are seeing and witnessing on the 1net mailing list is exactly something going into that direction. Probably not perfect yet, but the idea is to create a platform where people from different background, multistakeholder, multi-interest, however we call it, can discuss issue, can put their view on the table and listen from others.

And I think that is where -- where we want to push 1net to, to become that open platform, to discuss those challenges related to the Internet governance.

Generally, from region like mine in Africa or developing region, the participation is very -- is very low. And someone said at the beginning that people who raise the issue are not actively engaged in the discussion and the debate that are happening. Why is that? There is probably two reasons for that.

First thing is that right now, most of the debate happening on 1net, to some extent, happen between technical expert. But people who raise issue of Internet governance or have some issue are not always technical people. They see Internet governance from a different perspective, and sometimes they are expecting discussion to happen outside of the only technical view of things. And probably we need to find a way of conceptualizing the difference between technical coordination of the Internet for its stability and all with what people -- all the issue that people have, which may not be within the Internet governance scope.



So I think the debate should allow us to open that door to allow other people who can express their issue and have a clear direction of how they can get it solved.

One thing on 1net that we still need is to engage government. I think it is a multi-interest, multistakeholder platform. What we don't want is the Internet governance to become a government-only led thing, a multilateral solution, but we want it to be multistakeholder, wide open. And for that to be effective, we need government to be there so that they can also express their view. They can put them on the table, get answer from expert, and share, as well, their view from government perspective.

So I don't think we have done enough for that yet on 1net list to allow engagement with government there. Because that's really critical for the success of this dialogue.

In my region, particularly people are watching, observing, not actively engaged in the process. But from all the feedback I got, and from some government people who are on the list and observing, is that it is very, very informative for them because for once, they have somewhere where perspective -- different perspective are discussed openly, and they can learn from it, which is good.

On the other hand, in region like mine, they have some more basic issue that people want to solve than those high-level, very deep, precise technical issue, which is not their day-to-day challenge.

So people are looking at it and asking themselves what and where they can actively or positively influence the discussion. And that will happen

through more and more awareness, communication, and narrowing the debate to very specific issue.

We have launched yesterday an open consultation very specific to the evolution of the IANA function contract within our community. And we hope that that could be one very specific issue that can be discussed on 1net, because this discussion and consultation has to be multistakeholder and not only within the ICANN framework, not only within the IETF framework or ISOC framework. It has to be completely wide, even for people who do not participate today. And I think 1net could provide that kind of platform, extended platform for this kind of discussion.

It is very important for us to understand that Internet governance for people is not only technical issue. People don't say in Internet governance only technical issue. They want to discuss things that are beyond technical issue, and that some would say we have to distinguish between the network itself and the content or its usage. And I think it's for us to articulate that and make clear how those two aspect of the governance issue can be dealt with or they are not linked to the Internet governance.

So I will probably stop there by saying that at RIR, we fully support the evolution of the IANA function contract. We will engage with ICANN. But more specifically, we will engage with our original community because we have a very diverse regional community that are already engaged in our policy development process, and we are going to use those community to ensure contribution and participation from different region and from different perspective.



Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thank you, Adiel. As a fellow African, I'm happy that you are giving this insight from Africa and the perspective about the whole process. And it's interesting you mentioned Montevideo and NTIA announcement. So we have two kind of statement or announcement which set the agenda for us for the next months.

Okay. So now we move to Byron. So, please.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thank you. I'm Byron Holland, and I wear three hats that are probably germane to the discussion today. I'm a member of the -- what started out as the high-level panel but is now the panel on global cooperation and governance mechanisms. I'm also chair of the ccNSO, and I'm also CEO and president of CIRA, which is the Canadian dot CA TLD operator.

So I'm here speaking on my own, not for any of those three entities, but clearly those three inform my personal views for which I'm speaking today.

In terms of what I'll still continue to call a high-level panel, our work continues on until May. So it's by no means a fait accompli at this point. And, in fact, our last meeting was prior to the NTIA's announcement, so we haven't had a lot of opportunity to have discussion on that. But I will say, in terms of the high-level panel, we have made a submission to the NETmundial conference. If you're interested, I encourage you to take a look at that.



The panel itself is quite broad. It is not -- in fact, there are very few traditional ICANN insider folks. There are a very wide range of opinions, wide range of geographies, different types of actors, those who are very informed from the ICANN world, although there are only a few of us, and those who bring expertise from a whole range of other sectors, industries, and types of actors. So it's been a very robust conversation. The submission we made to NETmundial includes a number of high-level principles that we believe would be important for the Internet, writ large, going forward, as well as the beginning of a roadmap to operationalizing some of those principles. And we do encourage and we are encouraging feedback.

But I think there are several that are particularly germane to the discussion today. Certainly one around globalization. And, you know, I would add that globalization is more than just the IANA contract. So while that is certainly a hot topic today, we need to continue to look beyond just the immediate issues.

Anybody who sat through the WCIT and participated in the WCIT will recognize that today's current state does not address the many legitimate issues that international actors around the world have the current environment. The notion that if it ain't broken, don't fix it I think is certainly questionable. And while that may be true for a bunch of ICANN insiders or people who have been in and around the Internet for a very long time, it is certainly not true for many of the folks who are coming into the space, new to the space who are not part of the two and a half billion people online today but are part of the next two and a half billion people to come online who may have different views,



different backgrounds, different cultures, different takes on how the Internet should be administered and operated.

So I think we need to keep that in mind as we look at what ICANN globalization means.

One of the other key elements that had much discussion in the high-level panel was around the notion of subsidiarity and the fact that while there should be global solutions and principles, on-the-ground Internet governance internet governance needed to reflect some local flavor and local color. And I think we see that in various regional Internet governance forums. For example, and something that's a little closer to my heart, in terms of CCs. Many folks think that the CC community is a homogeneous group. I can assure you as the chair, it is not. It is very heterogeneous with different types of governance structures, different interests, clearly different sizes, different business models, and very different opinions.

So whatever global model we choose has to recognize that there need to be local flavors to it.

And also, we recognize as a high-level panel that the ICANN world is not the only world around which Internet governance issues and Internet issues in general happen or are us asked or are decided upon. And as such, we need to continue to encourage, reinforce, strengthen some of the other forums that bring other actors into this debate. And certainly the IGF would be but one example. Regional ones as well.

So there were other areas of discussion, but certainly as we're in the process of having this dialogue in the high-level panel, those would be



some of the key threads that I think would be worthwhile mentioning. And like I say, we have put a submission forward and I encourage you to read it. I won't walk you through the 11 principles that we generated, but I think they are worth scanning.

You know, we're clearly at a very exciting point in the evolution of the Internet, and we shouldn't be afraid of change. We shouldn't leap into it. We should recognize that there's important history that we should learn from. In the CC community, we can look back to the early 2000s and look at a number of issues that we, as a community, had with ICANN and took ICANN to task with them in terms of delegation/redelegation. ICANN's tardiness, to put it nicely, in terms of doing consensual redelegations, and there are some very important delegations and we should learn from that history. But that does not mean that we should be bound by that history; that we need to be looking forward in terms of what's right for the broader global community, but we should certainly pay regard to ensuring that we don't find ourselves in the kind of situations that we did in the early/mid-2000s.

The Internet is full of entities and actors who serve their time. As we heard already, the Internet is an ecosystem. By definition that implies evolution. You know, who here remembers the International Network Working Group? Or the Federal Networking Council?

Okay. I've got between two and four hands. They probably just don't want to admit their age, but....

[Laughter]



You know, the fact is it those were important entities in the evolution of the Internet at a point in time. It did not make them required for all time. And we should be okay with that.

Today's mechanisms aren't, by definition, required for all time. And as we have this discussion, we should bear that in mind.

As an operator, as a TLD operator, as a ccTLD operator of one of the top 15 largest CCs -- or registries in the world, you know, we deal with IANA on a -- well, not a daily basis but a regular basis. We are their customer. We interact for real, not in theory, with IANA. And, you know, I do want to say that while there have been challenges over time, I do want to just leave on the note that the IANA function has been well done and very receptive in terms of operations to the community and to the users, to its customers. And we should also keep that in mind, that through the evolution of the IANA function and ICANN's operation of it, we have seen very significant, positive progress since the days when the CC community was taking it to task.

Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Byron. I think you gave several perspective, and it's interesting you talk about we should not be afraid of change because we have the previous panelist which he say that he is afraid of change. So that's interesting kind of antagonism.

So now we'll move to my -- let's say my co-facilitator in the cross-community working group. Olivier.



OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Rafik. My name is Olivier Crepin-Leblond. I'm chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee, but also as Rafik just mentioned, one of the two co-facilitators of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance.

The working group itself was built in a typical bottom-up fashion at the Buenos Aires meeting. The Noncommercial Stakeholders Group and the At-Large Advisory Committee met and decided to action some of the discussions that had taken place during that meeting and to put together a small working group to start working on this new, what was called at the time, the Brazil summit or the Brazil meeting. There was no -- the NETmundial name hadn't been called yet. And the two sides decided to start work together. Very quickly, this was heard across ICANN, and many of the other supporting organizations and advisory committees decided they wanted to join as well. And that, therefore, transformed the group into a cross-community working group.

Today we have 41 members from all across ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees with about a dozen observers or so. There is a limit as to the number of participants per part of ICANN. And it's all supporting organizations, advisory committees, and GNSO stakeholder groups as well.

So the whole principles of the working group are very bottom-up in nature. We have two facilitators. We don't have chairs at the moment. I don't think anyone wants to put this kind of load on their shoulders. But of course the first thing that needed to be done was put together a charter, but at the same time there was this real deadline to have a



statement ready for the -- contribution ready for the NETmundial meeting.

The charter was worked on and put a little bit on the side. It takes a long time to establish charters which every part of ICANN agrees to. So this, for the time being, is shelved, which means that the contribution of the Cross-Community Working Group are not the contributions of the ICANN community as a whole with you should be seen as a contribution of the working group members themselves. And we're hoping that with the -- the next steps will be to collect more input from the ICANN community on Monday, during a Monday public session. And then the working group will meet again on Wednesday to try to focus and see if we can get the supporting organizations and advisory committees to actually ratify this by the time we reach NETmundial in Brazil.

Because this is a consensus, bottom-up, multistakeholder group, it's difficult to come up with any earth-shattering contribution in such a short amount of time. So as a result, the contributions of the working group towards NETmundial were very broad in nature, but focused on several topics that we found were quick wins, easy wins, that we could actually push forward with.

One of the restrictions that we had is of course because it's an ICANN working group, it really needs to focus on ICANN issues. And whilst we had considered looking at other issues as well, we decided to focus on what we know best. And, therefore, the contribution is all about the future of ICANN, et cetera, et cetera.

Just going briefly through the different topics that were touched on, and I believe that the statement itself is available on the -- on this



conference Web site. But effectively, it looked at broad principles. The ICANN multistakeholder bottom-up consensus-based model best serves the Internet community, and of course better serves the ICANN community as well. And it touched on the bottom-up multistakeholder model in the RIRs and also in the IGF. These are other examples of multistakeholder models.

The cross-community working group supports an Internet with a single root. There was consensus on this.

The cross-community working group supports a single -- sorry, a unique Internet. The cross-community working group supports best practices that enhance Internet security. And that section, allusion to the DNSSEC as one of the examples of best practices that support enhanced Internet security was described.

The Cross-Community Working Group supports transparency and in internet governance discussions.

And then as far as the roadmap contributions are concerned, the Cross-Community Working Group focused on a couple of scenarios. Of course designing a roadmap for the evolution of ICANN, for example, is not something that you can do in a month. Bearing in mind we didn't have any face-to-face meetings. All of the meetings were by conference calls, so we basically made use of telephone, virtual rooms, Wiki spaces, and also the document itself was drafted using a well-known service where many people can type on the same document at the same time. And we're scattered around the world so it was a bit of a challenge for that.



The roadmap contributions really focused on the evolution of ICANN, the principles by which ICANN should evolve and of course at the same time the globalization of the IANA function was announced. So this got a few changes, a few amendments in the contribution.

And then, of course, the evolution of ICANN. The globalization of ICANN, really. The principles by which we should be looking at the evolution of ICANN. And I think the emphasis in most of the contribution was about the ICANN community needing to be involved at all levels of those discussions, and for the input to be really gathered from all across the ICANN community.

We warned about some nation states that see the globalization of the ICANN-IANA function as being a political thing. I think that ultimately it's something that we have to be aware of.

And then looking at the international frameworks for ICANN's accountability. Again, we focused on the fact that these need to be all worked out with the ICANN community and by the ICANN community.

One of the concerns that I have, I think, what makes me nervous about the NETmundial meeting is the fact that about 75%, maybe even more, of the contributions were made about ICANN. And when one looks at the title of the conference, it's not an ICANN -- you know, a conference on the future of ICANN. It's all about the Internet and Internet governance in general. So I'm personally quite nervous about this, that everyone wants to talk about ICANN for a reason or other. I mean, maybe it's such a great organization that everyone wants to be in it, but maybe it's not. I don't know. For their own reasons.



The concern I have is there are a lot of so-called a what people call orphan issues, which might not be orphan issues as such but which certainly came out on the World Conference on International Telecommunications in Dubai in December 2012, and which seem to be some of the topics that would need to be discussed at the time. Spam, network security, or what some call network robustness. These issues don't seem to be really touched on by anyone, and I'm concerned about that.

Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Olivier. Nice introduction of the cross-community working group.

So I think we have, like, around 30 minutes, and I guess that we should open the floor to the audience to ask any questions, but also panelists can intervene to respond to some question that we have in the program. And so we can have those interactions between panelists.

So let's start the Q/A session, and who wants to ask the first question?

Okay. We have Milton. That's scary.

MILTON MUELLER:

Got to get something going here. Is this mic working? Yes, it is.

Phil, I have a question for you.

So I think we agree on the need to keep ICANN accountable, but I want to know how you think the system is not broken. I want you to take



yourself out of your shoes in Washington, D.C. and, let's say, plant yourself in New Delhi or South Korea and say how is it that a system -- how is a system accountable to me in South Korea or New Delhi or in Africa when every three years the U.S. Congress threatens to hold hearings because they've been lobbied by somebody in big business interest in Washington and the NTIA has to redraft the contract, and you don't know whether the administration of the U.S. is going to be republican or a democrat or whether it's going to be completely conservative or liberal or internationalist. How is that system accountable to you? Do you think that system is broken in any way from the perspective of the wider world?

PHILIP CORWIN:

Professor Milton Mueller. By the way, you will indulge me one moment. I just want to express my thanks and appreciation and congratulate Olivier for leading the CCWG group, for putting together a statement for NETmundial, an excellent statement under extreme time pressure. I was one of the B.C. participants in that, made some small contributions, but I think his leadership and contribution should be recognized, and I wanted to say that before I got onto this.

To the person -- the hypothetical person in Delhi who said how is this working for me when the U.S. government holds this counter-party status contract and no other government has that role. It's a unique role by historic accident, you know. Internet created in the U.S., spun out of Commerce, et cetera. I would say several things. One, your government has ample opportunity to participate and shape ICANN



policy through active participation in the Governmental Advisory Committee.

Two, the U.S. has not abused its role at IANA party -- IANA contract counter party to deny an addition to the root, to cause a TLD to be pulled from the root for any political or other reason, and it occupies a certain space, and when it withdraws, a vacuum is created, so the question becomes who will fill that vacuum.

And as I said, I believe that the role should not -- I agree with you, should not be passed to ICANN or to a consortium dominated by ICANN because that does not provide sufficient accountability. So you're going to wind up, I believe, with some type of committee structure with various constituency groups, and I don't see any way of looking at NETmundial and looking at that point of view that more governments should be involved where governments do not become part of that committee structure in some way. And I question whether, if you can put aside concern about the U.S. having a sole function there that no other government has, that role has, in many ways, prevented some bad things from happening to the Internet in terms of taxation, censorship and other things. And my concern is about what replaces it and whether the barriers to bad things happening to the Domain Name System will be as robust.

So that would be my response. It may not satisfy that person.

And I would note that -- again, I'm going to quote Fadi Chehade here. There are things I agree with him on. He gave an interview on C-SPAN last month and he was quite clear, he said the stakeholders already control the Internet. The U.S. has no real control through the IANA



function. So I'm not sure what -- what the breadth of the concern is, but we'll be in that debate now, won't we.

MILTON MUELLER: Yeah. I'll just say maybe an appeal to you on a personal level. It's like, give it up. It's going to change. So you better be focusing on --

PHILIP CORWIN: I don't have it. I have nothing to give up here.

MILTON MUELLER: You haven't convinced me of that.

What I'm trying to say is you've got to be focusing not on defending the status quo. Stop the "if it's not broke, don't fix it" stuff. It's going to change. It's the U.S. Department of Commerce that's saying it's going to change. If they say it's going to change, it's going to change. So you better be focusing on what changes should be made. Constructive plans.

PHILIP CORWIN: I'm not against change. I recognize that change is inevitable, but my concern is about the way of change has been initiated, the speed at which the change is being considered, and the possibility of the change not being for the better or for the worse, and the great amount of energy it's going to take to make sure it's at least as good if not better at the end.



MILTON MUELLER: Looking for constructive (indiscernible).

STEVE DELBIANCO: Steve DelBianco with Net Choice. And, Phil, Milton is right. It's going to change.

PHILIP CORWIN: There are other panelists here. I don't want to take all the questions.

STEVE DELBIANCO: But Milton really did set up a false scenario, this notion that every three years, Congress rewrites the contract on IANA in some way and politics dictates.

Let's be clear that in 2012, the Commerce Department, not Congress, Commerce Department did two notice of inquiries and invited the entire world to comment on how IANA should be run, how it should be operated. They did two rounds of comments, put out a very detailed request for proposal or RFP, and the first time, the first response from ICANN was inadequate. There wasn't enough recognition of how they needed to raise their game for operational delivery of IANA. So that was a global -- a globally participatory process that Commerce ran. And I'm not suggesting for that reason don't change it, but it would be a mistake to claim that it is broken using the example that Milton gave because what he described has no connection with reality.



PHILIP CORWIN: Steve, I agree. I'm not sure there was a question there. But I would add to what you said that the history of the U.S. involvement has been to diminish control, to replace direct oversight with the Memorandum of Understanding, and then 2009, to replace the Memorandum of Understanding with an end of -- and just the Affirmation of Commitments, which I believe benefits the entire global Internet community.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thank you, Phil.

I think Byron want also to intervene.

BYRON HOLLAND: I want to make an intervention there that I think there's a false dichotomy set up between the if it ain't broke, don't fix it, and it's broke and we need to fix it. It's not it's broke and it needs to be fixed. It's that we're at an inflection point that is part of a natural evolution. And it's an evolution that we've seen ongoing, depending how far back you want to go, but many, many years. Certainly prior to ICANN and during the time of ICANN.

So it's not about it's broken, it's not broken. It's about an evolution that recognizes the next two and a half billion people coming online and what do we do to make sure they have as positive an experience overall as those of us who have been online since the beginning.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Yes, Adiel, please.



ADIEL AKPLOGON:

Yes, I just want to reinforce that very specific point. It's not about something is broken. It's about evolution. And we want to recognize that the system, the environment, the use of the Internet has evolved. There is no way that the ecosystem itself should not evolve.

And I think a lot of people are observing things here want to see that evolution happen. So I think it is also very important that we align the way we present this thing externally so not to be seen as defending the status quo but by being open enough to support the evolution. And that's very important.

PHILIP CORWIN:

I do want to observe that for the next billion or two million, or however many, we have very meaningful and robust processes and organizations already in place -- ICANN, the IGF, et cetera -- which they are all free to enjoy -- to engage in, to join and engage in, and I'm not sure what else is needed that we don't already have.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Phil.

I think the question is that our panelists want to is intervene. So now it's Olivier.



OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks, Rafik. Olivier speaking. I was going to make an analogy. Some of you might not remember but there's a time in your life when you have to take your nappies off, and now is that time for ICANN.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Okutani-San.

IZUMI OKUTANI: This is Izumi. I really agree that we're at the time when we really need to think about evolution, and I think the timing of the announcement is right. And we really have to face the reality that the U.S. government have made this announcement. So the next step for us is so what part of the IANA function should we change? Should we change -- some people say we should take this out of the ICANN and some people feel maybe the IANA actual administrative part of the function should remain as it is. But the oversight -- well, the wording, the oversight might be too strong, but making sure that the checks and balance are being paid, that part should be made independent from the ICANN. And those are the kind of things that we want to start thinking in terms of what we are exactly going to do as the community.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thank you. Just to be sure, Suzanne, you want to intervene or -- no.

So back. Bertrand, please.



BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Good morning. My name is Bertrand De La Chapelle. I'm the director of the Internet & Jurisdiction Project.

I'd like actually to piggyback a little bit on what Byron and Olivier have mentioned.

The topic of the session is review of a certain number of agenda-setting initiatives, and I think the term "agenda setting" is very important.

When you look at the definition of Internet governance, I always highlight that it covers the evolution and use of the network or of the Internet, which, in the way I normally formulate it, it covers governance of the Internet and governance on the Internet.

I think in as much as the evolution of the IANA function is an important topic and the announcement by NTIA is an extremely important step in a major topic, we should absolutely not forget that the other aspect is as important, if not more.

What is missing at the moment is multistakeholder frameworks for handling the tensions between the different legal systems that deal with the use of the Internet. On freedom of expression, on cybercrime, on international cooperation, on many aspects.

The technical infrastructure has its ecosystem that is working pretty well, and there are still evolutions, improvements in inclusion, in transparency, in accountability. Right. And the IANA function is an important element of this. But I think we would miss a tremendous opportunity if we didn't use NETmundial to address also the other aspect, which is how do we continue to develop the institutional ecosystem to handle the issues related to the use of the Internet? To



basically governance in cyberspace, and not only the governance of the Internet as a system.

My two cents.

SEBASTIEN BACHOLLET:

Hello. Sebastien Bachollet. I concur with what just Bertrand said, and I would have not write as well as he say it, but I agree with him.

I wanted to add few things. The first one is I know we want to discuss everything everywhere, but maybe we need to try to find where we want to discuss what. And NETmundial could be the good place to discuss everything but ICANN.

There are so much things that for end user are very important for the future of how we use Internet that we need a place to have this discussion. And my thought was that Brazil would have been the right place to do that.

But then we will say, okay, but we need also to discuss about the ICANN stuff. But maybe no. We have already the ICANN meetings. We have IGF, national IGF, regional IGF, global IGF. And I am sure we can find other place to discuss ICANN issues. Because if not, at the end we will just discuss, even in Brazil, the ICANN situation. And the ICANN situation, it's better than for some topics where there is no multistakeholder process in place. Then let's also not forget those places.

Now, when some of you talk about don't try to fix something which is not broken, but I will not take the analogy but another one.

When by -- you are -- you start a family, you have children, you know that one day you will have to fix something. They will leave home. And you know that it's -- your relationship is not broken before. Hopefully it is not broken after. But you need to handle that. And we're in this situation. We need to leave the house of the U.S. And to leave the house of the U.S, we need to have the agreement with the parents, okay, but we have also to agree with our friends, with our colleague, with all of our live had environment. And it's exactly where we are with ICANN.

And final word, it's I really like what Byron said that subsidiary is very important. We don't need to do everything at the global level. Global, it's important, because we don't want to stay just for some issue at the national level. But what could be done at the local level? And it's -- on purpose, I don't use national. It's good to be done. And CCs are good place where we can do things, but there are other. The At-Large organization can be also a place where we can do things. And I don't want to take all the other stakeholders, companies, and so on and so forth. Then let's do and let's trust in us. Because ICANN, it's not the Board, it's not the CEO. It's us.

Thank you very much.

[Applause]

RAFIK DAMMAK:

So I see there is a lot of focus on the IANA function and the globalization, and ICANN globalization but just I want to if maybe we



can back a little bit to the topic of this panel which is about the several initiative that we have, and how the communities see them.

So we want really to hear your feedback about that.

But in the meantime, I think Adiel wanted to reply to --

ADIEL AKPLOGON:

Yeah, my response is going a little bit in the -- We shouldn't be surprised that everything evolve -- I mean, everything we are talking about go back to ICANN-IANA function globalization, et cetera. The framework and the agenda of NETmundial, for instance, was clearly set; however, more than 68% of the proposal were IANA globalization ICANN thing.

The reality is for us to be able to address the other issue, which are equally or even sometimes more important, this one is a kind of a mass on that we just have to pass, because people, globally what they see is ICANN, is IANA. And they tend to focus on that world because it gives them a fairly good way of probably either criticizing or supporting the system.

So I think although it is not the most important or most critical, we need to probably fix that, and then open the door for addressing all the other issues. Because if we don't do that, we will be turning in a circle. People always continue and continue coming back to that. And forgetting they should -- even locally. We can push things as much as possible locally. What people say, and you know what? This Internet thing, it's controlled by the American. Why do you want me to put effort in it? I don't want to talk about it.



That perception, even if it is a perspective, try to fix it. Try to propose something that make everybody at ease to address all the other issue.

That is -- I think it's important for me.

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm a member of the business community, and I guess, like Bono, I too describe myself, too, as a global citizen since I probably actually spend more time traveling around the world than even he does going to a range of meetings where these topics are being discussed.

And I want to build on a comment that I think Sebastien was laying out. And I want to suggest that, in fact, there are three discussions that are being very confused. And I don't disagree that the discussion about the IANA functions agreement, where it's housed, what its legal backup is and what the capability of the organization is that both oversees the technical and operational part but also oversees the policy part of the -- of the functions. Those are incredibly important discussions, and we are in an evolutionary process to make changes there. And it is very appropriate that that is being discussed here at ICANN.

It will undoubtedly be discussed at a number of other places as well, but I hope that ICANN community is going to take very seriously that this is our opportunity to hold that discussion here, and to even broaden the participation in ICANN itself by bringing other people who may be watching ICANN but not thoroughly -- totally engaging in ICANN.

But the second set of activities is about the further globalization of ICANN in a more responsible, transparent, and bottom-up approach.



We are right now rushing toward globalization of ICANN in a staff-driven, precipitous approach that the community can't keep up with. And I think it's really important, since I think most of us support the further globalization of ICANN, that we figure out how we have the discussion here at ICANN of how to accomplish that further globalization, but in a way that actually can engage the existing stakeholders of ICANN in how we broaden and deepen participation, again, in ICANN.

And the third area of discussion is the evolution of the broader Internet governance ecosystem, in which ICANN should only be a part of the players. And I feel sometimes like we don't spend enough time kind of parsing what fits in where, and we are rushing to think about every topic at every meeting. I don't think we have time to do that, and I think we don't have resources to do that.

So my call to the participants on the panel is, whether you agree with that kind of parsing -- I see Izumi and Bill and others who were recently at the IGF consultation with me where we are trying to build and strengthen the IGF, and I do think we have a little bit of a tendency to just take every question and plug it into, as a community, we plug it into every meeting we go to. I'd prefer, myself, that maybe this group and the ICANN community on Monday in our consultations think about how we divide the work so we can actually get work done.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Marilyn.



Just I want to also to ask maybe the audience to try to reframe the discussion. So talking about all these initiative that we saw in the last month, how -- what we can learn from them in the, okay, if we want to talk about the (indiscernible) transition, what we can learn from them to -- how to say? To design this transition process. So what we can use, what we should do or not.

So please.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

Michael Palage, Ferris Global. I have a question of the panel and it's a very high level one and it deals with transition.

One of the things I struggled with in my 15 years of ICANN is its role as a trustee. And as a trustee, it's about coordinating resources. And what I've struggled with is the role it sometimes plays from an operational standpoint. So in connection with the IANA contract and dot ARPA are two TLDs, and Article II, Section 2 says ICANN shall not act as a Domain Name System registry or registrar; right? But it's operating TLDs. It also operates an L-root server.

So I guess my high-level question here is if -- is it appropriate for a trustee in charge of coordination and policy to have a hand in operations, or should there be a bifurcation.

So in this transition, I guess that would be my question, do you see a problem with ICANN having an operational role, or should it focus more -- should there be a bifurcation between operation and policy?

Olivier.



OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Michael.

I think -- I've always been of the view that both policy and operations need to be somehow linked since there is some accountability that has to permeate between the two. And so I've heard some people say that the IANA function should be separated from the policy side of ICANN and the work that ICANN is doing. And I personally think that it's not a good idea.

Now, that said, some in my community, in the ALAC and At-Large, believe that it is a good idea because you have a conflict, a potential conflict of judge and jury, of the operations being somehow not accountable to the level that they should be if the policy can be modified to make it accountable. A bit like changing the goal post to make sure that the ball goes between the goal posts.

So that's the position at the moment, and I'm not quite sure which direction one can take on that.

PHILIP CORWIN: I'd like to jump in on this.

I think they have to be intertwined. I mean, ICANN's mission statement is technical manager of the Domain Name System. I don't know how you do that without intertwining the policy with the operational. The whole creation of the new TLD program would have been a meaningless exercise if ICANN did not have the technical authority to delegate new TLDs at the completion of that process. But I think the fact that, to me,

they're inseparable makes the need for continuing enhanced accountability all the more important, if you combine those two functions without -- And it was the renewal of the IANA contract and the fact that that could be used as leverage to enforce the Affirmation of Commitments that made it so important. And my concern, I know the concern of many in this room, is what's -- whatever the new arrangement is, how will that accountability function be preserved and strengthened?

MICHAEL PALAGE:

So, Phil, to follow-up on your question. ICANN operates the L-root. When a new TLD such as dot guru gets added in through the process, IANA delegation goes, the NTIA says yes, the instructions are given to VeriSign through the cooperative agreement to add it to the root, that propagates throughout. There are other root server operators other than the L-root.

So whether ICANN operated the L-root or not has no impact.

And I guess that's the operational. So ICANN coordinates. Obviously you can't have two people saying they want to operate dot guru as a top-level domain. So that is a policy and coordination function as opposed to actually operating infrastructure. And that's what TLDs and root servers are. They're infrastructure.

PHILIP CORWIN:

I understand that. And the way it's operated from the beginning, in 1998, is we have not had a fractured root and we don't want a fractured root where we have two different registry operators for the same TLD,



and that's an important technical and policy and political objective in the ongoing discussion.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks, Phil.

Talking about operational perspective, I think we have Byron and Suzanne, they want to reply. So Byron, please.

BYRON HOLLAND:

Thanks. Personally, I don't think there's an issue with having policy and operations together as long as there is strong accountability and very strong transparency.

If you look at CCs, for example, as a smaller version, many of us run policy and operation shops and have done so successfully in spite of the fact that we deal with contentious issues, too. WHOIS, I.P., all of those things within our domestic jurisdictions.

So it is certainly possible to have and to do it well policy and operation shops run together. I think it bears, of course, note, as NTIA steps away, there will be an accountability space to be filled in, and hopefully that will be a significant part of the discussion in the coming days.

But that said, with the right accountability and the right transparency, I don't think that there's any issue, inherently, with having policy and operations housed in the same place.

But one comment I would just like to make is this is only Friday. ICANN hasn't even -- the meeting proper hasn't even started yet, and you can already see people jumping to solution here.

MICHAEL PALAGE: Oh, I don't have a solution.

BYRON HOLLAND: I'm not commenting on you, per se.

MICHAEL PALAGE: It was a high-level question because it's something I have struggled with for about 15 years. And as I said, the topic was -- the U.S. was always there. So if there was a breakdown -- And I guess another question that one would sort of say is, assuming this transition happens and ICANN -- the training wheels are off and it has the keys, what happens if it breaks or if it fails?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Just so maybe we take three minutes. We have Suzanne, and you will reply Adiel. And also for the queue, we'll cut with Marilia.

So please, Suzanne.

SUZANNE WOOLF: Sure. First of all, to fully support what Byron was saying but also to say you were around 15 years ago and remember, perhaps, that the discussion at that time, there was a strong feeling, at least among some



of the folks considering some of those specific operational and policy issues and how they sat together, that, in fact, having them in close proximity has some advantages as far as informing each. And if -- you know, if that's no longer how the community wants to do that, if that's not how people feel about it now, that's a discussion worth having. You know, I think that is something we have to consider.

But there was the rationale that it actually helped. It actually made things work better in some ways.

MICHAEL PALAGE:

And I totally agree with you, and 15 years ago that was Louis who was ICANN's receptionist, secretary, L-root operator doing all of that.

So again, the organization has changed in 15 years.

ADIEL AKPLOGON:

Yeah. I don't think the issue is about having policy and operational role in the same organization, which is the issue -- is the process, and how those two are separated. I am an RIR. We facilitate and coordinate policy in our region. But our board and our organization has no say in policy. Policy are developed by the community. Our board ratified those policy. Not even the content of the policy. They ratify only the process of the policy. So that you have a clear demarcation between the policy development process and the operational aspect, which is the organization side. And maybe that's where the concern is, how do we clearly separate the policy development from the implementation and have a clear accountability between the two, maybe is the way of posing the question.

RAFIK DAMMAK: So Marilia.

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you very much, Rafik. My name is Marilia Maciel. I am a researcher and coordinator of the Center for Technology and Society in Brazil. I have actually have a question and a comment to make.

My question is about the panels that have been created. I feel that we have not discussed them enough in this session and I think they have an important role in setting the scene of discussions that we are having here.

My feeling was that creating this high-level panel, CGI panel, the ICANN panels, they would be places where some of our brightest minds and skilled politicians would come together and present contributions that the community could not present. But my feeling is they have been put under so much pressure to present reports before NETmundial or as soon as possible, even to take some of the publicity that Internet governance is having on the current moment, that maybe we are not taking enough advantage of the roles that these panels could have in building discussion and really having breakthroughs on the debate.

So for those of you who had the chance to participate on the panels, either as members or an observatory capacity, what do you think would be the role that these panels could have in the discussions? And how to make these different panels and initiatives communicate with one another? Because so far, we see some disconnected reports and it would be interesting to see how these panels could dialogue.

And just a quick comment on what Olivier has said about the agenda of NETmundial and the focus that the roadmap has adopted on ICANN things. I totally agree with you. I think if we focus too much on ICANN, we will really fall short on expectations of many people that are hoping that NETmundial would be a place to discuss some pressing orphan issues or issues related to the use of Internet, as Bertrand put it very well. But for historical accuracy, I think it's important to remind everybody that there are a lot of people that have tried to discuss these other orphan issues or the use of Internet or public-policy issues under the very bad label of enhanced cooperation for many years now.

It took us almost eight years to create a Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation. So there are many people who are pretty much wanting to discuss that. And if this is what the wants to do, and I think there is growing support to discuss these other issues of Internet governance, which I think are very important, let's go to NETmundial and discuss it there.

But I don't think, as well, that this should be used as a reason not to discuss ICANN in NETmundial because this is something very important on the agenda, and I think we have grown and we are mature enough to move forward with this institutional improvement.

So it's not either/or. Let's discuss both together.

Thank you.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thank you, Marilia. So I think maybe if someone will volunteer to respond, and then we can really say -- or wrap up this session.



I don't want to compete with lunchtime.

Yes, Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Rafik. Olivier speaking. In response to Marilia's points here, I think it probably will be down to the organizers of the meeting to see how they structure the sessions so as to set specific topics rather than just opening a discussion, an open discussion and we'll find out after 24 hours that it's all about ICANN.

RAFIK DAMMAK: Okay. Thank you.

So -- Okay. So you will have the last intervention.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: No, I just want to say that I recognize few steering committee member of 1net here so please meet with them and to discuss with them if you want more about 1net. Rafik is one of them.

RAFIK DAMMAK: And also Suzanne and Bill.

Okay. Thank you.

So a lot of question, interrogation. So hopefully we have the recording of this session, so we can come back -- people can come back later and try to think. And it's just the start, the beginning of probably a busy ICANN meeting and a lot of talk about IANA.



So I thank -- thank everybody for attending. Also the panelists for -- how to say -- their intervention. And so --

>> Closing statements?

RAFIK DAMMAK: From whom.

BILL DRAKE: Okay. Thank you, Rafik. And it is the -- We are ten minutes over. Lunch is waiting. There is a whole panel in the afternoon about IANA, so people who didn't get a chance to get their yayas out can come back to that later.

After the break we talk about principles. Looking forward to seeing you all back here then.

[LUNCH BREAK]

