

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: So welcome, everybody. This is the Post-WCIT – the World Conference on International Telecommunications – Webinar on the 17h of January, 2013. The time is 14:07 UTC. I want to welcome everyone to this call. I see there are a lot of people so it seems to be a very popular subject.

The first thing I guess is we'll hand the floor over to Gisella Gruber who will be providing us with the house rules. Gisella, the floor is yours.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thank you very much, Olivier. Just a reminder that today we have the audio connected on the Adobe Connect room, and the microphones will be enabled at the end of the meeting. And also if I can remind everyone to state their names when speaking not only for transcript purposes, but also for our interpreters on the Spanish and French channels to allow them to identify the speakers on the language channels. If I can also please ask everyone to speak at a reasonable speed.

All lines will be muted except for those of the presenters during the presentation, and we will open all lines at the end for questions. Please do use the chat feature as well if you have any questions and just start your post with QUESTION:. Thank you, over to you, Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gisella, and I could also add that this session is completely recorded and I believe it will also be transcribed. So welcome again, everyone.

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.

We have an interesting session here with various perspectives post-WCIT from several people who have been at the World Conference on International Telecommunications in Dubai.

Joining us are Nigel Hickson, vice President for Europe, ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement; Bill Drake I guess will be joining us soon – he is the Chair of the NCUC and he was a member of the US Delegation; Avri Doria is the Civil Society member of the US Delegation as well and her WCIT and WTSA trip, which is the World Telecom Standards, was completely supported by .gay, LLC. And she lasted not only the two weeks of the WCIT but another was it one or two weeks before that, so well done to her. Then we have Andres Piazza, LACNIC Public Affairs Officer; and myself as Chair of the ALAC but I was representing my company Global Information Highway in the UK Delegation.

After that we'll have questions from the community. The times which are provided on the agenda at the moment are approximate so we'll spend maybe a few more minutes depending on what questions we have. And then we will be looking at the challenges and opportunities for At-Large and for ICANN.

So without any further ado I'll hand the floor over to Nigel Hickson, Vice President for Europe. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, well thank you and good afternoon, good morning or good evening to everyone depending on where you are. And thank you very much for this opportunity. I'll be fairly brief because I know there's a lot of people to speak and also I think it's valuable that we have a discussion.

So I'm going to say something about what we took as the outcome of the WCIT and then a couple of observations on the challenges ahead and on the opportunities.

So first of all to the outcome, and I think anyone that wasn't at the WCIT and read the extensive media coverage after the WCIT might have been somewhat confused. I must say I have never read so much rubbish online for a long time. I think the coverage during the WCIT generally was quite positive but I found the coverage after the WCIT to be somewhat less analytical and less factual.

It wasn't the start of a new cold war; it wasn't a disaster; it wasn't a success. It was a process and I think those of us that had been involved in ITU negotiations before were not surprised at what happened at the WCIT. I'm not saying what happened was good or bad but it was a process and it was a process that failed. It failed for a number of reasons, and many people will have different perspectives on that but I think it's important to grasp that it didn't fail because there was a fundamental divide over those that supported the internet as a free, open, and sort of innovative force and those that wanted it closed down. I mean clearly there is a divide between countries but the outcome of the WCIT was rather more complicated than that.

It failed really at the last moment, and those of us that were there would have recognized – and no doubt Olivier will say more about this – that had not a proposal been made during the last plenary session concerning nondiscriminatory access, which was a proposal that had been deleted from the compromise and then came back through an African proposal into the preamble; had that not been put forward then

it's likely that the discussion post-WCIT would have been different because we might have had a handful of countries reserving their position and saying they probably would not sign the treaty whereas the vast majority would have signed including the majority of European countries. So often in these negotiations a lot depends on sort of relatively small events.

So the outcome is where we are of course. The factual outcome is that the treaty will come into effect on the 1st of January, 2015, the new Treaty of the International Telecommunication Regulations. For those that have signed up to it, it will have effect if they give it effect in their national legislation; and for those that don't sign up to it, it might still have an effect because of the impact on international telecommunication companies. The associated resolutions came into effect once the treaty was signed so to speak by the countries, and therefore the resolutions including Resolution #3 concerning the internet comes into effect.

So on to the challenges, and I think the challenges are fairly clear; and you might say the challenges are linked to the opportunities. The challenges are to address the concerns that were raised during the negotiations. Unless we want to enter a somewhat protracted "cold war" so to speak on the internet then if we are going to move forward together, if we are going to maintain a single, interoperable and open internet, then some of the challenges that were raised by the developing countries and other countries have to be addressed. And some of these challenges can and will be addressed no doubt by the internet community and by other parts of the global community.

And these challenges include fairly sort of basic telecommunications issues concerning the security of networks, concerning the access to networks, concerning the cost of broadband and various other issues; and of course some of the more complex issues concerning countries' security in terms of what is said and what is not said on the internet. And of course those issues are more difficult to address.

It is clear that one of the challenges is the polarization of those countries who perhaps felt that their concerns and aspiration and views were not taken account of during the WCIT, and that of course could lead into further negotiation and further conflict if you like at the WTPF and other multilateral discussions going forward into 2014 and 2015 – culminating in 2014 with the Planning Potentiary and in 2015 with the final Summit or the final meeting in the UNGA on the WSIS Review. So a lot of challenges for the future.

But to finish my remarks let me just say I think there are also opportunities. I think the openness in some of the discussions at the WCIT showed us that there are indeed opportunities that we can address – opportunities with those countries that took a different view from the “Western” view so to speak, or a different view from those of us supporting an open, interoperable internet; but also the countries that were undecided, the countries that may sign or may not sign and were basically undecided in terms of the multi-stakeholder approach. And those countries I think there is a lot of work to do with to ensure that they do recognize or to try and allow them to recognize what indeed the multi-stakeholder approach can bring to innovation and economic growth. So I'll leave it there, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel – it's Olivier for the transcript and the interpretation. Thank you for this summary of what your views are. What we'll do is we'll go through all of the speakers and then we'll have the questions afterwards, so if you do have questions please save them for later. I understand that next on the list is Bill Drake but he has a few audio problems at the moment, so Avri Doria, the Civil Society member of the US Delegation – Avri, are you ready for your summary of what your thoughts are? You have the floor.

AVRI DORIA: Sure, this is Avri Doria and of course, I'm always ready to prattle on about myself. In listening to Nigel, the first thing that comes up is the statement that it failed. I don't think WCIT failed. I don't think so at all. I think what has failed a lot is a lot of people's views of WCIT, and I wouldn't go so far as to say that what I've read is rubbish but I would certainly say that I disagree with a lot of what I've read.

I don't think it failed first of all because WCIT was really just one event in a long string of events starting from WSIS, extending through in this current phase, through the Planning Potentiary in 2014 and so on. There are many skirmishes. What was really actually quite successful with WCIT is for the discussion about internet governance to have sort of opened up to a full view of what a festering pustule this discussion really is.

We could see it. We could see the various points of view. We can see how seriously they're taken by various people. We can see the sort of

back room feeling that's going on with it. So in that respect, in the respect of sort of opening up a discussion once again to the full light of day I think WCIT was very successful.

I think WCIT was successful in another way. As a civil society activist we once again managed to make the point that ITU has no validity because it doesn't include us. Now, I don't believe that anything will change, not this time. In fact we've gotten our answer back from the ITU in a very diplomatic middle finger note, telling us that "Thank you, civil society, it was very nice talking to you. It was very nice you were here but no, we're not going to change any." So that means that that battle goes on. But again, that was-

HEIDI ULLRICH: Avri? This is Heidi.

AVRI DORIA: Yes?

HEIDI ULLRICH: Could you please slow down and-

AVRI DORIA: Yes, I can slow down, thank you very much.

HEIDI ULLRICH: Thank you. And is there any way that you can speak a little closer to your mic or a little louder? There are people who are not-

[crosstalk]

AVRI DORIA:

Okay. So I won't bother to repeat what I said, so I'm almost finished anyway. Now in terms of the Treaty, we talk as if this treaty was a done deal. It isn't. This Treaty certainly has been negotiated, there will be signings, there will be other people signing it along the way. A lot of the countries that did not sign it will eventually sign it. There's a lot of good stuff in that Treaty that shouldn't be ignored in terms of access for the disabled, in terms of access for landlocked countries and other things that are important and should not be lost. And I'm very much hoping that the countries that didn't sign it are still willing to follow those patterns.

We have not only the WTPF in the near future that's going to actually directly address internet governance – but still exclude civil society, it appears. That is an important discussion and we have argued that internet governance was off the table at WTSA and WCIT but it is certainly on the table at WTPF. We also have the Planning Potentiary in 2014 which certainly for civil society becomes one of the bigger meetings because that becomes a time where we once again get to fight in an environment that actually can decide to let us in.

So as I say, to call WCIT a failure at the moment, it's too much surrender for me. The WCIT was just one instance. It was a skirmish in which both sides have lost a little and I think both sides have sort of strengthened in position a little. And I think it really needs to be looked at in that

context, not in the context of we lost, they won; we are good, they are bad – but rather an ongoing tussle between two very pervasive world views.

I think one of the things we have to avoid is sort of the hyperbolic discussion of internet cold wars. We have to really remember what a cold war is. A cold war is what you do when you're not firing bullets at each other. I do not believe that what is happening in this internet governance tussle in any way resembles a cold war and so I think we have to avoid that kind of inflammatory FUD – fear, uncertainty and doubt about this discussion. I do not believe this will lead to a shooting war. I do not believe failure here will lead to a shooting war, etc.

So this is not a cold war. This is a political tussle, a tussle of various points of view. I'm unabashedly on the side with ISOC and those who stood firmly in terms of "We must defend the multi-stakeholder internet" – at least that's their argument if not necessarily their practice. But it would have been nice had ICANN been there, had ICANN actually managed to find a way to participate as opposed to just having a few of its people inside other delegations. I think it was nice that the ITU invited ICANN's CEO to speak and I thought he gave a very nice conciliatory speech. But if ICANN really wants to have something to say about all of this then they need to participate, and basically being on the outside and just getting in through governments is as bad for them as it is for civil society.

So they have to find a way to participate, perhaps even work with civil society in terms of trying to open it up though that would be a new

development. So I think that's pretty much how I got a start. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Avri, for this other point of view and other angle to the WCIT. It's certainly interesting to see some of the points made as to it not being a cold war, not being a war at all – being just a process and work going on. I think we can move to our next panelist and that's Andres Piazza who is the LACNIC Public Affairs Officer. Andres was also present at the conference representing LACNIC, so Andres, you have the floor.

ANDRES PIAZZA: Thank you very much, Olivier. Good let's say afternoon here in Montevideo and evening or morning wherever you are. It's always a pleasure for me to be part of an event held by the ICANN At-Large community. I feel like home when I am in the ICANN At-Large and I feel I've been involved with this community for more than five years, so despite the fact that I now represent a registry, an IP registry, I feel part of the community also. So it's very good to be here.

With that said, I want to also... Well, it's good that Nigel and Avri have spoken before me because most of the facts that they addressed in their previous speech I would have liked to emulate as well, so now I have to agree with them and it's easier. I felt personally, and I will speak personally in this matter – I felt kind of [uncomfortable] with what I saw after the WCIT, especially the whole lot of press and messages regarding what was the outcome to the WCIT. And we who

have been following the process from the inside, even I was at the [WTSA meeting in brief] to the WCIT, the process was much more complex and interesting than what the press and most of the internet activists also took as the outcome of the WCIT.

Of course I would agree that this is not at all a cold war moment and this analysis wouldn't be at all factual. The Latin American region, the region I represent, is also... This is the example, I think the most concrete example about how this is not a polarized scenery and not at all cold war scenery as well because the Latin American region with the Americas – the whole Americas region with the US and Canada and the Caribbean – were part of the [CITEL] block. The CITEL meetings were (inaudible) in the WCIT and there was also a lot of inter-American proposals. And I've been following the previous years' preparatory meetings, and there were three different preparatory meetings a year before and some months before the WCIT, and also the Caribbean had preparatory meetings. And during the whole preparatory process, never during the week was there a single proposal from our region that could threaten the multi-stakeholder model or the open internet.

But most of the countries ended up voting for the Treaty, most of them. And the night before some of the Latin American countries were not, who ended up not signing the Treaty were supporting the text and their Foreign Affairs Ministers didn't allow them to sign the Treaty but you never know if they are going to sign the Treaty in the future. This wouldn't mean at all that this Treaty would threaten the open internet and the multi-stakeholder model, and it wouldn't mean at all that – at least in my region – there is a lack of understanding of the purposes of the multi-stakeholder model. I also feel that it's behind the way that

ICANN and the other organizations are running the internet right now – ICANN, the ITF, the RIRs and the [other] bodies and every other single ccTLD and other organizations. They are understanding this multi-stakeholder model but they are also considering that this treaty could be good for them, so we have to go forward for this polarized scene and we can [analyze] the Treaty.

Two other aspects: Avri mentioned that this Treaty is good in many matters such as the access to the disabled and the access of landlocked countries for example – and I agree with that also. I would say that there are some concerns regarding the two articles, one in security and the other one in unsolicited communication that could refer, it's not clear but could refer to SPAM. And the reason why it is not clear is it doesn't say SPAM. The definition of telecommunications doesn't apply to the internet but when you read the document it could remain referred to SPAM. So that lack of clarity is also some of the problem.

Another point that I wanted to stand out is regarding the openness and transparency of the process. There was a lot of discussion previous to the WCIT regarding how this event would be or how the threat is – that this is a closed discussion and the future of the internet would be discussed in a multilateral [3D] conference that is closed for the public. And there was a lot of progress.

International organizations, we have to accept that the WCIT was a huge program in a multilateral environment and there has been, I must say – and this is also personal – I've never seen, and I believe there was never in the whole history a Treaty conference, a multilateral Treaty conference that has been this open. But with that said, we see this

phenomenon from the perspective of the internet discussions, the internet organizations and the way we develop our policy development processes, and this huge step forward in transparency and openness with webcasts not only for the main stage but also from the (inaudible) and we had captioning and a lot of attention that the conference was getting. But this is not enough for us because our standards, the internet standard is much higher in terms of transparency and openness.

So we as the community, we need to highlight that and keep pushing for these types of governmental conferences to be even more transparent and open, even from the previous process because the problem with the WCIT is that the governments were available at the conference but not before. So okay, to sum up this last part, I think it's very important for our community in terms of the challenges that we have in the future, but also Nigel summarized those challenges very well – the WTPF and also the WSIS+10 process. And I would add to that the IP addresses discussion that will be held in the Study Groups 2 and 3 of the ITU because the outcome of the WTSA Conference was, one part of the outcome was a discussion regarding the possibility of creating an ITU IP addresses registry; and this discussion was postponed to those Study Groups at the ITU so that will be interesting to watch also.

But regarding openness and transparency, I would sum up that okay, that was a great step forward. This is the way for the governmental conferences but it's not enough at all compared to our standards as the internet community. So that would be my main point to highlight. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Andres. It's interesting that yes, the ITU has conducted a successful multilateral meeting but moving towards full stakeholder and multi-stakeholderism is something which is still far away on the radar. And of course anything to do with the internet is all multi-stakeholder.

Just a reminder, the questions will be coming afterwards when we've heard from all the speakers. So now, next on the speaker list is Bill Drake who is the Chair of the NCUC and member of the US Delegation. Bill, are you able to speak now?

BILL DRAKE: I am able to speak. Are you able to hear?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Fantastic! Go ahead, Bill, you have the floor.

BILL DRAKE: Alright, great. Hi everybody. Well, I was asked to talk for five minutes about the WCIT and the ITRs, and that's a subject that normally I talk at much greater length about so for me, it's always difficult to decide exactly what to highlight. I guess I'll just do five quick points in five minutes, eh?

The first point I guess would have to be Avri said this is one step in a larger process that began with the WSIS and so on. I would put it a little bit more broadly. To me, and I say this with my academic hat on as

somebody who wrote his doctorate about the ITU and has written extensively about the history of international telecommunication arrangements and so on – for me, this trajectory starts in 1850. It starts with the Treaty of Dresden which created the Austro-German Telegraph Union. And the reason I say that is because the fundamental principle underlying that agreement was also underlying the ITRs ever since and was incorporated into the ITRs ever since, and was very much in play here.

And that is to say there were basically two aspects of this. One is the money. The ITRs are fundamentally about the money at some level. We have a history in international telecommunications of having what are called joint service provisioning, where you have an accounting and settlement system and you count up all the minutes exchanged over telephone lines or telegraph lines in different directions and then you apply various formulas. And you have carriers compensating each other according to this framework.

And that was built into the international telecom regime since 1850. It was fundamental to it. It was the political glue that held everything together because no side was competing against or winning over another side. Each set of national carriers was cooperating and mutually benefiting and that framework has fallen apart in the last decade or two. And essentially what this was, was an effort by countries to try to recover lost ground because developing country administrations in particular have taken a real financial hit since the collapse of the accounting and settlement system due to the World Trade Organization agreements, the actions of the Federal

Communications Commission in the United States to benchmark rates for compensation and so on.

So they were trying to recover lost ground economically by establishing a framework that would give them an internationally-recognized right to essentially apply this kind of approach to telecommunications traffic once again; and by extension also to the internet. And the ETNO proposal made that very clear and of course the ETNO proposals were very influential on the thinking of a lot of the African and Arab and other countries.

So it was very much an issue about how the money gets divided up at the global level, and that doesn't go away with the end of the WCIT. The countries whose governments were unhappy before are still unhappy. The operating entities that are struggling to pay for bandwidth rollouts and everything else and cover all their other costs still are doing that and are still unhappy with the situation, etc.

The other aspect of this model going back to 1850 that's worth highlighting here is the notion that everything is done by mutual consent. That was really as I say key to the whole joint service provisioning approach. You didn't have national carriers taking actions against each other and trying to trump each other. They were working together in a collaborative manner, and this is sort of viewed as the natural right of sovereign states to be able to expect certainty and clarity in all the actions of their corresponding countries.

And what happened of course over the past twenty years with liberalization is that a lot of telecommunications now is not by mutual consent. We have a lot of stuff, a lot of means to deliver transmissions

into countries over international networks that are not agreed to by the inbound carrier – whether it's internet telephony or callback services, or international simple resale or hubbing or other kinds of approaches for sending traffic around the world. And so that was really I think important thing because a lot of countries that are upset with the US and other industrialized countries about the outcome of this still kind of feel like the world is, the powerful players are basically acting in a way that ignores their interests and just does whatever they want. So that's an issue.

The second point quickly on the ITU, I think the ITU really misplayed its hand. I think that's very clear. They mis-positioned themselves by aligning themselves with the Secretariat, by aligning itself with the particular players and their agenda vis-à-vis others while constantly insisting at the same time that they're a bottom-up representative body that is there to simply service the needs of members. That had I think a pretty negative impact, the discrepancy of the perception of a lot of actors, and I think it has not done the ITU any good. I think the ITU has been damaged by this event.

Third I would say there's an outstanding issue that we have to deal with over the longer term, which is the boundary line between telecom and the internet. That was the underlying problem throughout all of this. With the convergence to IP core networks it's very difficult to say really for a lot of carriers where telecom begins and end vis-à-vis the internet and whether or not these rules that they've adopted are going to apply to the internet irrespective of whether the word "internet" is associated with the rule.

I think if you look, and Andres made the point about the SPAM provision, it's very clear to anybody who was there even if the article doesn't say the word "internet" that the unsolicited bulk communication or whatever it was, that's about the internet, okay? That's what's intended. And that's true of a number of the different provisions. People say, I've heard a number of different times "Oh, the word 'internet' is not in the text; therefore what's everybody complaining about?" But anybody who was there and who followed the whole legislative history understands fully that it was the intention of the parties that put these texts forward that the texts do apply to the internet.

So how that's going to play out going forward is going to be a very interesting question, which leads to the next point very quickly which is the impact of all this. I think we could see some fragmentation as different blocs of countries begin to follow different rules in organizing their mutual relations. I would keep an eye in particular on Russia and the CIS countries, and some of the Arab countries and how they will go about interpreting and implementing this agreement irrespective of the fact that 55 other countries didn't sign it.

And lastly I would say the World Telecom Policy Forum that's coming up in May will build on a lot of these discussions. The parties that were aggrieved by the outcome are putting forward a lot of texts for this upcoming event that the ITU is holding, and I think people really need to pay attention to. In particular there's opinions, draft opinions that have to do with establishing the ITU as a vehicle for enhanced cooperation on all internet affairs and so on. And that meeting will be held the week prior to the IGF meetings in Geneva in May, and it's not clear right now

whether civil society will be able to participate fully or on what terms. So I hope that people will take some action to ask the ITU to live by the words that it's been articulating lately and make this a more open and multi-stakeholder event. I'll stop there, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Bill, for this additional insight and certainly for this historical background to how we reached today. Next on the list is myself and I think what I wanted to do was just to add a couple of points based on our distinguished speakers' interventions. I was part of the UK Delegation – sorry, myself is Olivier Crépin-Leblond. I was part of the UK Delegation and now I'll just make those points, those personal points on what I saw and what's happened, etc.

First, Nigel Hickson had mentioned that the press coverage during the conference was fine. I am not quite sure I agree with that. I think that the way, the process of the ITU is one which really is very compartmented. So the plenaries were accessible to the press; the plenaries were accessible to sector members, to everyone. As soon as a contentious issue came up, and you know, the way that the ITRs were drafted was to go line by line and the Chair of the conference, who was the local host – the Chair of the conference basically went line by line. And as soon as there were some sticky points which showed that there was some disagreement, at that point this would be sent over to one of the main working groups.

Their Com 5 Working Group would be dealing with specifically with some of the most contentious ITRs. Then the Com 5 Working Group would meet, sometimes in the main room, sometimes in a second room

next to it. Again, another Chair would be going through those lines. If those lines, the articles were not agreed on then it would be sent over to a smaller working group, an ad-hoc working group or what they call an informal working group, and those ones were not accessible to the press. They were only accessible to governments, so only accessible to full members.

Now what happened inside there was where the real work and the real discussion took place, and sometimes a very heated discussion I would say but away from the eyes of the outside world – hoping that by the time people left the room things had all been agreed, consensus had been found and one could show a positive face back in the Plenary when it was sent back over to the Plenary. In some cases there was no deal made so at the end of the day it went back to the Plenary, and this is really how the conference became more and more tense as time went on because one could see outside those conference rooms that there had been no consensus in those smaller working groups.

In addition to this, though, the small working groups at some point reached such deadlock that the Chair asked that there would be some meetings of the different regions. Now, the different regions were touched on. There's several regions in the ITU. There's the APT – the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity; there is the ATU – that's the African Telecommunication Union. I'm not listing all the regions, just the main players who were very active there. There's the CEPT – the European Conference of Postal and Telecommunications Administration. There is CITELE which my friend and colleague Andres Piazza had mentioned – that's the Inter-American Telecommunications Commission. There is the LAS – the League of Arab States, commonly known as the Arab

position; and the RCC, Regional Commonwealth in the Field of Communications which is Russia and its satellites. And then there are a number of unaligned members of the ITU so they're not part of a specific region.

And so when things really started going to a head with those articles that were the most contentious or the most disputed, should we say, on several occasions the Chair of the conference called for a closed-door meeting of the Chairs and perhaps a couple of their colleagues of each one of these regions. The feedback that I have from the discussion that took place there... So here we're dealing with just something behind closed doors even to the majority of the delegates, the majority of the government delegates and there's a huge amount of pressure on the Chairs of each one of those regions to be able to hold their ground.

So the discussions that took place were rather heated and well, the feedback that I do get is there was some kind of deadlock because of course no one in both very small, maybe 20-, 25-people discussions – you have to remember, there were about 1500 people at the conference. You then have 25 people behind closed doors that have to negotiate these things which might affect the future of telecommunications – most of the people did not want to move forward without consulting their team, without consulting their governments. So we ended up in a deadlock on several points.

The main sticky points – we have touched on a few of them. I'd like to say that there are about twenty articles in the regulations. There were only a few that were very, very sticky. The first one was the human rights which was introduced by Tunisia, and this was a sticky point.

Initially it was a proposal for the first article but then it was proposed to be the preamble, and that's really what then led to the breakup of the whole conference at the end when some states wanted to add the access to telecommunication networks. In fact, that was proposed initially by Cuba as Article 3.7 and because there was a refusal and it did not go through, at the very last minute several countries tried to push it over to the preamble.

Article 1.1A, the "Use of Telecommunications v. the Use of ICT" – a very sticky point. ICT is Information in Communications Technologies that of course includes IT, so that includes computers. Telecommunications is just the telecommunications part of things, and there was consensus that was found to replace all matters when needed with "telecommunications," not "ICT."

Article 1.2 was the "Operating Agency v. the Recognized Operating Agency." The recognized operating agency was what was in the 1988 ITRs. It has a specific definition in the ITU Rules. An operating agency includes a lot more people and a lot more organizations that would fall under these regulations, so that was opposed by Europe and by North America and by various other countries as well because of course that would have brought in line any internet service provider and even corporate networks, virtual private networks and perhaps even – because the term was ill-defined, the "operating agency" term was ill-defined, it might have also even include yourself at home operating your own Wi-Fi network at home. So thankfully there was a consensus found on this with an "authorized operating agency" although now the question is what is an authorized operating agency? It was clear that to some countries, keeping the term "recognized operating agency" was

not possible for them – either the case of Russia who explained that they have many different operators and many different commissions and departments; some of them are recognized, some of them are not recognized. So they needed another term for this.

Then Article 3.8 was the “Management of Internet Resources.” That never made it to the final proposal. There was a bit of a drama I would say on the weekend in between the two weeks when this article was proposed by, well had been proposed by Russia; was then somehow left on the side. During the weekend the Arab group said that they would be reintroducing it, and then it was leaked over the weekend because they were going to introduce it on Monday. And right after it was leaked, a couple of days later it was again retrieved and taken up. But then Russia always kept this article, the “Management of Internet Resources” which was very explicit in taking over internet management – this was always kept lingering around, saying “If you do not agree to some of the other articles then we might have to go back to this one and we will ask for the full article to be included.”

And then as it was mentioned earlier by my colleagues – Article 5A on security and Article 5B on unsolicited communications. This article in two bits remained in the ITRs and this was really one of the strong problems for most European countries, and I would say also for North America and many other countries as well. Some European countries thought that with some wordings, maybe some added wording the security part might be acceptable. The unsolicited communication part was definitely very strange because it said in there that it was not dealing with content but it was obvious that the subject of it was SPAM. And I’m not quite sure and I think many people were not quite sure how

one would be able to detect SPAM without actually reading the message itself. The way that SPAM is detected is to actually look at it.

So you cannot know whether a communication is solicited or not unless you read it, and that, if taken with a recent regulation Y-2770 which asks for de-packet inspection to be put in place in all future networks, that opened the door to having a future network – and call it internet, call it anything else – the future network actually being filtered and scanned by states; not scanned by your private organization that you ask to scan your emails if you wish to have SPAM or security in your network. It really is a case of governments taking care of that.

Article 6 was on charging and accounting – a lot of discussion went into that and actually consensus was found. So it was not all just negative. Many of the articles, well, the ones that I have not mentioned here have actually passed quite easily and there was consensus found and success, and everyone agreed. Article 6 took quite a while for it to be discussed because of course, charging and accounting, there was a proposal that a sender-paid system would come in place and if that was the case, and if this was not related to content then how would the sender be paying if it doesn't include content? So there were some questions on this but thankfully consensus was found.

Then finally the really contentious part, and I think that the mood of the conference did change somehow, was when a “Resolution to Foster an Enabling Environment for the Greater Growth of the Internet” was passed through a vote that was not a vote, or technically not a vote. In fact, there was never any actual discussion as to the contents of this resolution and what many of the countries – and I'm saying the

countries that I'm aware of by having been in all the EU, so European Union meetings – many countries were unhappy that the discussion in there on this specific resolution did not include multi-stakeholderism as we know it and did not include the promotion of the current multi-stakeholder internet such as the RIRs and ICANN and the IETF and the W3C, etc. It was something that should have been discussed and might have passed had it been discussed, but here it was just somehow pushed through with a very, very confusing process.

Now ultimately there were a number, as you've just heard a number of points which countries were not happy with, but I think that some countries that have not signed could have probably signed but with a very strongly-worded reservation about the articles that were not acceptable to them; and just pointing out also the resolution that was unacceptable to them. However, the nondiscriminatory access was really the deal-breaker – the feather that breaks the camel's back I guess one could say. It was a tense meeting and unfortunately it just came to a head a lot faster than some thought that it was going to come.

One thing of note, the European Union kept as one bloc. So the discussions behind the closed doors in the European Union were very sustained and there were a whole range of views from those who were adamant about not signing to those who thought that the majority of the articles were okay for them. However, it was clear that in the last session when the nondiscriminatory access of countries to telecommunication was equated with human rights – and you have to remember, Europe is very strong on human rights. When this was equated, and one has to remember that some countries have lost or

have disconnected access due to their poor record on human rights, it was clear that this was not going to fly. And so Europe unanimously decided to not sign.

Now this is not to say that there might not be some European countries that will sign in the future. It is unsure at the moment and I do know that the European Union are going to meet and are going to follow up on this. But for the time being I certainly have not heard that there has been any movement in that direction until everyone actually meets up and sees what one can do, because it is a problem.

The main problem today is that no one knows what happens when you have a vote. Chairman Touré, the Chair of the ITU had said “If the WCIT ends up at a vote it will be a failure.” And yet, so he wanted consensus to rule and yet consensus was not found and it ended up with a vote which split totally the membership. And now one really doesn’t know where one goes because if only half or maybe two-thirds of countries decide to ratify something and one-third does not, does this mean the one-third is still subjected to those regulations or not? It’s a big question.

So I’m not quite sure what the answer will be and I don’t think anyone at the moment knows what the answer will be. But what is clear is that we do have two blocs, and I’m sorry to be saying that, but clearly on the one hand Western countries are following an agenda of market liberalization. This is an agenda that has been followed for a long time and the internet is an example of market liberalization. On the other side, other countries have a much more conservative top-down model where the nation state has more control. And it is of course their right

to whatever model they want but these two models appear to have problems mixing with each other.

So I'm sorry to have taken a little more time than perhaps being allocated here, but now we have another half an hour until the end of this meeting. I wanted to now move to the next part which is the questions from the community. How are we going to do this? Gisella, are we having the questions written down or is it possible to open the mics and then let people put their hand up to ask questions?

And I don't hear anyone answering me at the moment, so...

HEIDI ULLRICH: Olivier, sorry, this is Heidi.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: [laughing] Sorry, I thought I might have been disconnected for the last half an hour and that would have been a real problem.

HEIDI ULLRICH: It's as you wish. We have a lot of questions in the chat if you want to start with those, and then we can follow up if we have time by posting those questions into the Wiki page – that would be great.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, so if you have questions you can do it in two ways. Either you type the question into the chat or you can put your hand up. On the top of your screen you will see there's a little person with a hand up – it says

“Set Status,” and you can raise your hand and the system will automatically queue you up on the side.

I’ve recorded a few questions, one which was to Avri – and I’m not sure if Avri has had to go already, but it was “May you elaborate on the WTSA?”

AVRI DORIA:

Okay, I’m still here because I haven’t been able to get into my other phone call. This is Avri. To elaborate on the WTSA would take a lot longer than this phone call, but basically it was about the new standardization work that would be going on – everything from looking at which study groups would continue and what their tasks would be, to electing the Chairs of those groups. So it was two weeks spent more looking at issues about what technical issues. One of the issues that did come up in that was the request to initiate work on creating an ITU Registry. Now that did not go through. ISOC and ARIN and the RIRs played quite a strong role in that as did several of the national delegations. The US Delegation was actually quite active in trying to stop that.

Now I don’t believe that it has been completely stopped and there were intermediate thoughts about “Well, perhaps they can’t be a registry but perhaps they can do something to broker IPv4 legacy address... The ability to obtain IPv4 legacy addresses or something.” So I think we have yet to see what they’re going to do based on that.

In other aspects it was more the nitty-gritty of various technical issues and should the ITU work on these or not. There was the approval of the

de-packet inspection work that had been going on for years, etc. So that was... The WTSA though is a group that meets periodically, and I believe it's a four-year cycle, to decide on the technical work that the [ITUT] will be doing over that next cycle. I hope that helps a little, thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much, Avri. So I see Tijani has put his hand up, Tijani Ben Jemaa, but he has just dropped offline. So next we have Gideon from .connect-africa. Gideon, you have the floor.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Okay, I am on the bridge now.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, Tijani. Sorry, I've given the floor to Gideon; I'll come to you in a moment.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Yes, okay. Thank you Olivier...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Hello? Tijani, first there's someone else before you.

TIJAINI BEN JEMAA: Okay, thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: If we're able to get Gideon... And you might be muted. Okay, while we have, well Gideon is not able to come through at the moment so let's go for Tijani in the meantime and Gideon, we'll try and see if someone can help you to get connected and be able to speak. Tijani, go ahead.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA: Thank you, Olivier. It's only to say that I am so happy by this presentation, by the positive and constructive presentation done, and I do agree with Avri that ICANN must participate in the future in all those fora of ITU, and participate and speak, participate in full delegation. And I think that ICANN must try to have this status of full delegation in those fora so that ICANN can speak up.

If it is accepted I do propose that the delegations must be constituted by all the constituencies of ICANN so that the voice of ICANN will be heard at those fora. I think with that it is not too bad, the results of the WCIT. People were very frightened by this (inaudible) but I think that it wasn't a catastrophe as you said, as you explained. So we need to do more to make the multi-stakeholder model work everywhere, so we have two things to do at least for us as civil society: first to lobby the UN [arrangement] because the problem of the multi-stakeholder is not a ITU problem. It's a UN problem. So we have to continue to advocate there that we need the multi-stakeholder model to be working.

And we have another way to work. It is inside ICANN so that ICANN will be recognized by the ITU as a delegation that has the right to speak, to negotiate; and the delegation must be constituted by all the constituencies. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Tijani. Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much indeed. Just to very briefly respond, and thank you very much, Tijani, for that comment. I mean ICANN's participation in the WCIT as you know was at two levels: one, Fadi Chehadé addressed the opening and we were very grateful to the ITU for that invitation, and we also conducted a number of bilaterals while we were there; and then thanks to the generous hospitality of APNIC myself and Bahar Esmat were in that sector delegation and also Veni Markovski as many of you well know was fortunately in the Bulgarian Delegation.

Now I'm not suggesting that that was an ideal scenario. ICANN are not sector members, therefore we could not if you like have a sector member flag like ISOC or APNIC, etc. That is an issue that the ICANN Board has been addressing, and certainly colleagues as members of the ICANN community, please bring it up at Beijing or at any other suitable fora. I mean it's an issue on the table. If we were sector members we could have been there behind our flag – whether we would have been able to speak or not is a different matter. I don't think any sector members, and ITU sector members actually spoke in the main Plenary sessions. But it is an issue for their future.

Let me just say while I'm on two very brief points in terms of the conversation. I should have said before that when I said that the WCIT was a failure I agree with Avri – I think it certainly wasn't a failure in

terms of what we got out of it. Indeed, the ability of many of us to work together as a multi-stakeholder force, so to speak, between governments, between ISOC, ICANN, the RIRs and other players together to try and create a consensus I think was very important indeed. And Avri was certainly instrumental in that. So I don't think that aspect was a failure, but clearly the outcome does create uncertainties. Thank you very much for this opportunity.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel, for your answer and your contribution. So now we have a question from [Letrand Donnell], and his question is as follows: "During the WCIT 12 Closing Session, the ITU Secretary General said 'I look forward to the opportunities that lie ahead and all that can be achieved by ITU and ICANN together in a positive spirit of collaboration. So let me repeat once more that ITU has no desire or no wish to play a role in physical internet resources such as domain names, and the work of ITU and ICANN can be and should be fully complementary.' In other words, it seems like the WCIT 12 was definitely about the ITU controlling the internet but not the ITU controlling the work of ICANN. Is that a result of the diplomatic work of the ICANN-leading team or a result of a secret arrangement between the ITU and ICANN? Can panelists please share their views and thoughts on that?"

Who wishes to answer this? Nigel, is it a secret arrangement? Well, Bill first and let's see if Nigel can think of his secret arrangement. Bill, go ahead.

BILL DRAKE:

Okay. I'd have to say neither. The, you know, ITU has bigger fish to fry than running the domain name industry to be quite honest. The domain name industry is a pimple on the ass of the telecom industry. The telecom industry is huge in comparison. They would have liked to have had a bigger role in that but it's been clear for a long time that politically they were not going to be given that possibility. So they're looking for other aspects of internet governance that they can squeeze their way into and they've been pushing very aggressively on a number of different fronts, and that was manifested in this negotiation. But it was never a real possibility that they would somehow seek to take over ICANN's functions – I mean the Russians like to say things like that but nobody seriously thought that was an issue.

With regard to distribution of IPv6, yes, there's still a fantasy that they could get some sort of a role there as a global registry, but I think that the reality is that that's not very likely either and I think they should know that. So I think that they're more focused on other aspects of internet governance.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Bill. Nigel?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thank you very much. I mean just very briefly, the process was really as follows, that at the IGF in Baku we arranged – the staff and myself, as in ICANN staff and myself and ITU arranged a meeting between Hamadoun Touré and Fadi Chehadé just to say hello because there's no reason that we shouldn't all talk together – we're all sensible

adults as they say. And that meeting was very good at the IGF and it led to an invitation that the ITU offered ICANN to come along to the WCIT.

Now, that invitation was not trivial. I mean it was an invitation that we considered very carefully. Some countries and some community members in ICANN thought that collaborating with the ITU on this issue was not appropriate but others including myself as a member of staff thought that indeed we needed to discuss things and indeed be there; and Fadi Chehadé indeed decided to go along and make that keynote address. And it wasn't a secret deal at all. I mean clearly we were very pleased that Hamadoun Touré then responded with a statement that the ITU had no wish to sort of take over the ICANN role or be involved in critical internet resources. And I know we can discuss what that meant exactly but you know, I think that was important in itself.

And during the WCIT discussions various people quoted that back, and there's a long road to go but certainly our involvement – yeah, there was no secret deal at all. It's just really collaboration and working together. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Nigel. The next question is coming from Evan Leibovitch, and that's a question for all speakers on several points that Bill has made: "At the start of the conference ITU Chair Touré promised decision making by consensus and that the internet would not be brought into ITRs. At the conference both those commitments were broken. Does this damage the ongoing viability and utility of the ITU or is the main casualty just Touré? Now there is talk in some circles of

defunding the ITU – to what extent is the ITU itself threatened?”
Provocative questions.

BILL DRAKE: This is Bill.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Go ahead, Bill Drake.

BILL DRAKE: I would say yes. I would say that Secretary General Touré had some very interesting rhetorical strategies and flourishes throughout this process, and claiming that everything would be consensus and the internet would not be discussed was certainly a central part of that. It was very strange to continually insist on that when everybody in the room knew that that was not true. It was this weird kind of nod-nod, wink-wink thing. The Secretary was constantly saying “Oh yeah, we’re not talking about the internet. The internet’s not covered by this agreement,” and then they would get up and make statements from the podium about how “Well, the internet’s pervasive and impacts everything and of course is central to everything we’re doing.”

So I mean it’s just kind of incoherent, and people did kind of notice that after a while. It wasn’t terribly convincing. I would have to say though that at the end of the day the ITU is not really threatened in any substantial way. There’s not going to be a defunding of the ITU. A couple of hotheaded people have been circulating that idea but even in the US Delegation and elsewhere I think people have been saying pretty

clearly that the ITU serves other functions and we don't wish to deepen the divide amongst the players involved by politicizing this more. So I don't think there's going to be any defunding at all.

I do think that the legacy of the current Secretary General and his leadership is damaged. I mean it's hard to see how that isn't the case. They put a lot of markers down on this thing. They said they were going to bring this to a successful conclusion – they had people walking around in Dubai pretty much pronouncing before the fact that they had it, that it was all going to work out, that the agreement was going to be done, that it was all a big success. And then 55 countries said no. That's a pretty substantial "No," especially since those 55 countries account for the lion's share not only of the ITU's funding but of the global telecom and internet environment.

So I don't think that this is terribly good for the organization or its aspirations but there are nevertheless going to be countries that will continue to try to use it to push their agenda and that's exactly what's going to be seen at the World Telecom Policy Forum in May. I mean it's the same players – Saudi Arabia, China, etc., etc. They're all going to come in with proposals to expand the ITU's ambit and strengthen its role vis-à-vis internet issues. So this will be ongoing, but in terms of credibility with the countries that voted no – obviously there's been some change there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Bill. As some countries have said this is a marathon, not a sprint. Andres Piazza and then Nigel Hickson, you still have your hand up so perhaps Nigel afterwards. So first Andres Piazza.

ANDRES PIAZZA:

Thanks, Olivier. Well, I also am, well Bill's analysis was pretty interesting and I can agree on many of the issues he raised. I want to introduce a couple of points. The ITU's position, I wouldn't say that they are in a stronger position than before but I wouldn't say that they are in a weaker position either. As many said this is a warm-up; WCIT was a warm-up for what should come in 2014. And I was telling Evan Leibovitch that in 1988 22 countries signed the ITR, and now in 2012 there were 89 countries signing the ITR. So the situation and the relative position of the ITU – they got more attention than ever.

And the consensus and the internet talking, okay, there was an agreement that the ITRs shouldn't be about the internet and they kept speaking about the internet. Of course their agreement was broken but there was also an agreement that the ITU shouldn't run, or maybe in concept there was an agreement that the ITU shouldn't run the critical internet resources and this is broader than just ICANN. It's ICANN plus [other] bodies plus RIRs and ccTLDs and all the (inaudible).

And also regarding, okay, I don't want to be naïve – I think that there will be a push in 2014 for making the scope of the ITU broader to include the internet, but the level of discussion was much better and (inaudible) this year compared to the past years. They can be much in a better position now than it was in 2005 or 2003 or at the WSIS Process so the disagreements, everyone understands that the ITU has a scope and the internet community has another scope and we are doing well in what we're doing. And of course the ITU is pushing and will keep pushing, and they are not suffering a lack of legitimacy as I would say;

but on the other hand there is an interesting perspective considering the concepts that were addressed at this conference and the agreements that were made.

They said we can't talk about the internet, because Touré said that at his (inaudible) speech – we can't. And we certainly can speak on [various solutions] about the internet but it's interesting that okay, we would have liked that they won't speak about the internet but this is impossible if they have an interest and the country is a member also is interested in regulating or getting closer to the internet. So I have to say that neither one or the other statement – this is my answer to Evan.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Andres. We are running out of time. Clearly we could have spent two hours on this subject rather than an hour and a half. There is one more question on this subject which I will take and pass over to Nigel, and that's one from Joly MacFie. The question is "Is there a WSIS" – so that's the World Summit on the Information Society, I believe – "a WSIS meeting in Paris in February, 2013? And will ICANN be represented?" And Avri mentioned in the chat it's WSIS+10 so that's ten years after the first WSIS if I understand correctly. Nigel Hickson?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes, thank you very much indeed. Yes, of course as I think Avri mentioned before, let's forget the WCIT – well let's not completely forget it – but the real game in town now is the World Summit on the Information Society and the review of that. So that's the WSIS+10. So this is the requirement by the United Nations General Assembly to if

you like review what was agreed in Tunis by many of the people that are still here – and I'm sure Bill had a part in that and others did as well. The Tunis Agreement, or the Tunis Agenda that was adopted in 2005 in Tunis if you like legitimized the multi-stakeholder approach and the roles of ICANN and other players, and there's a review of this process.

And the first sort of conference to review this is being sponsored, is being organized by UNESCO in Paris in February. If anyone's interested in going I think it's almost open-invitation on the UNESCO site. And certainly ICANN will be involved. We're running some workshops with others or we're participating in some workshops with ISOC and the RIRs, and perhaps Fadi Chehadé might be able to go along as well and speak. Of course it's not an ICANN show; it's for everyone to take part in this review. And of course it's very important because it's not only Paris in February but then again in Geneva in May when you have the yearly WSIS Forum – that's important. And then in 2014 the ITU is going to organize a WSIS+10 Conference as well, probably in Cairo. So there's a lot at stake. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Nigel. And I note that it's now been 25 minutes of questions and we are running out of time. We still had an agenda item which was the challenges and opportunities for At-Large and ICANN. I wondered whether I could ask Nigel to say a few words about the challenges and opportunities for ICANN.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Well, I don't want to delay people – I think I've said enough. As I said before there are clear challenges that we at ICANN have got to do a better job. We've got to step up to the plate. We've got to explain to people what ICANN... We have, as I say to people we have a natural monopoly and we don't need to be defensive about that. Someone needs to organize the domain name system and it's ICANN at the moment. And we believe that through the ICANN community we do a reasonable job, but we have to explain that. We have to ensure that all communities from the developing world and everywhere have an input into the policymaking process; and certainly the At-Large community in ICANN is a key ingredient of that and does such a fantastic job, but other parts of the community do as well.

So we have a challenge but we also have this opportunity of involving everyone. And if you involve everyone into this process then surely they would see that this process is better since everyone's involved rather than a process where it's just governments that are involved. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much, Nigel. And I was going to add that for At-Large specifically, because we are the part of ICANN that has a worldwide footprint – we do have 151 At-Large Structures now... In fact, there has been already certainly some influence from At-Large Structures into the way that things went at the WCIT. We had several members of At-Large who were either in delegations or who actually were basically back home consulting for their government and helping out with their government's point of view. They are working locally and I think that

there's a lot of work for us to be able to incorporate more of these countries into the multi-stakeholder model.

Certainly my personal discussions that I have had with some delegates, primarily delegates from Africa, was that as governments they saw the WSIS and the ITU as being good forums that it was very helpful for them to take part in. They did not fully understand this whole concept of multi-stakeholder model and specifically, although ICANN is very open and as we all know, ICANN is always very welcoming for new members, sometimes we kid ourselves and we tend to perhaps look too much inside and not look enough outside. So as far as outreach is concerned there's a lot of work that this community here – At-Large – needs to do to go out there and liaise with the outside world, and get more people involved and more governments and organizations involved in the model that we all support; and certainly make it more easy for these organizations to take part and for these governments to take part.

I have heard that as we know, the ICANN community has got this glossary of terms and a special language, acronyms, etc., and sometimes it's very hard to make this accessible to people who just arrive. So there's a lot of work on this that needs to be done and I really do hope that there will be full support from ICANN for At-Large to be able to take a big part in this. My plan is to draft a longish review of what happened and to make some recommendations, and I think that this community will also draft a statement over to the Board with some recommendations as to what needs to be done now. How can we make the multi-stakeholder model more accessible to some countries who at the moment don't understand it and certainly have not had the ability to join it?

It's one way to say "We have our doors open." It's another thing to actually go out there and look for these people, and take them by the hand and then bring them in. That's something that's pretty important. So certainly, and I can see some agreeing – there's certainly a lot more work for At-Large Structures at the national level and this is a challenge that I send over to the At-Large Structures. We have a lot of work on our plates but I know that we can succeed at this. And there have been some real success stories out there, so it's been done already. It's not something that is impossible to do.

Any last words from our panelists? Andres?

ANDRES PIAZZA:

Well, I don't think I have anything to add, I only wanted to thank you for the opportunity to be here. I'm going to be at your disposal for anything pertaining to this meeting so I just wanted to point that out – not me but also LACNIC and the RIRs are at the disposal of the ICANN community, of the At-Large community especially. That is my point.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you, Andres. Avri, are you still on? Are you still unable to get into your other call?

HEIDI ULLRICH:

Olivier, I believe she's dropped. She's on the AC, not on the call.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: She has dropped, okay. Well Avri, if you can hear us type your last words and I'll read it to the record. Bill Drake?

BILL DRAKE: I'll just respond. There were two questions in the chat to me about my comments on WSIS+10. If you look at the agenda of the WSIS+10 event it is not really going to be a situation where there's any kind of collective contemplation and dialog about the [matter] of multi-stakeholderism, the status of the global information society, and etc. They've loaded it up with a lot of panels, speakers, and workshops and so on, so it's almost going to be more like a kind of IGF-type event where a lot of folks will be expressing views on a lot of different topics than being one where there will be any collective negotiation or intensive drilldown into taking stock of where we are ten years after WSIS and so on.

And I think in a way that's probably a bit of a pity and a missed opportunity, but it's also the case that it's a way of avoiding political contention. You don't hear a lot of government people worrying at great length about the WSIS+10 meeting and there's a reason for that – nobody is worried. It's not a place where anything can go wrong nor is it a place where anything is going to get much light really shed on it in terms of a collective [test]. So it's worth going and some of us will be speaking at it and so on, but I don't think it's a turning point in any way – certainly not with regard to internet governance.

Bear in mind that WSIS was much broader than internet governance at least in terms of the original agenda that was laid out in 2003; and that there's a lot of action lines and other things to be talked about. So

there will be plenary sessions about eEducation, stuff like that. It's not going to be focusing very intensively on (inaudible). I'll stop.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Bill, and finally Nigel Hickson – any final words?

NIGEL HICKSON: Only to say to you, thank you very much, and to Heidi and everyone else for organizing this call. I certainly found it very useful indeed and it's really great having the opportunity to participate in these webinars. I wish more parts of the ICANN community do it. We can do a good one with the GAC I would have thought but perhaps I better not go there, as they say. So thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel, and with you having stolen all my lines and all the thanks I wanted to do, I just have to thank everyone else who has joined us on the call. It's been very interesting. The recording of this call will be made available and of course the transcript as well will be sent to your respective organizations. And if you are coming from outside then please do check on the agenda page and the recording and the transcript will be on there.

And with this it's good morning, good afternoon, good evening and good night. And this meeting and call is now adjourned. Thanks very much, bye-bye.

[End of Transcript]