

**NCPH Intersessional meeting, January 30th 2013  
ICANN & Internet Governance 09:30 Local time**

David: Okay, could I ask people to please take their seats, grab your coffees and waters and come back. We'll be starting in about a minute. Tarek Kamel is here and we will start the discussion that we have planned for ICANN and the Internet Governance Landscape.

Okay, thank you very much. I'd like to introduce our next speaker, Tarek Kamel recently joined ICANN as a Senior Advisor and he will be talking to us about ICANN and the Internet Governance Landscape. I'll turn it over to Tarek. Tarek, please.

Tarek Kamel: Thank you David, and good morning everybody. And thank you very much for inviting me this morning to talk to you. Sorry for being a bit late.

I'm going to be talking this morning about ICANN's IGO and IO engagement, very specifically to share that with you and get your feedback about this non-role of ICANN within the overall Global Internet Governance Ecosystem.

The reason for that is clearly to collaborate with inter-governmental and international organizations to promote an open, secure and interoperable Internet to the multi-stakeholder model. And indeed this is a very difficult mission when we're talking that this is required to happen on a completely global level. But we are definitely working very strong with our (unintelligible) partners and allies to promote multi-stakeholders and make sure that we bring the right voices to the overall global ecosystem of Internet Governance.

And within this plan that (Sally) has started to promote yesterday about the Global Stakeholder engagement, I am taking care of the government engagement and the IGO engagement, the (I-Star) engagement as well as the international and other international organizations in engagement very specifically.

I work closely with the Vice Presidents, the eight Vice Presidents that (Sally) has mentioned yesterday, that they exist within the various regions whether in Africa or in America or in Europe or in North America or in Asia and Oceania and other parts of the world.

And in addition to that, I have support teams also that is helping me in this outreach strategy very specifically for the government engagement as well as the IGO engagement as such.

But let's look clearly at what our goals are when we talk about government engagement and IGO engagement within the Global Internet Governance Ecosystem.

With the IGOs, very specifically we want to achieve mutual recognition of roles and responsibilities between ICANN and many IGOs within the Global Internet Governance Ecosystem. And this is a very important objective - strategic objective that we are focusing on because it is important that we get a clear recognition of ICANN's role in the overall Global Internet Governance Ecosystem by the different IGOs.

In addition to that, we want to promote in full coordination with our allies, the involvement with the different international organizations in the Global Internet Governance. And we want to preserve for the and through the international community open, secure and globally (inter-operable) Internet.

So Fadi has mentioned yesterday, the whole multi-stakeholder model is a new concept for many leaders of the world, from the business community as well as on the government level because for the first time, the world is managing together a shared resource.

This shared resource are - is the Internet. And it is definitely removing the bound that is a geographical bound that is and the territorial thinking that use to happen in the past when we were talking about resources. It's a shared resource like in other business environment and maybe energy and other global resources.

So I think the world has a challenge - a global challenge - for the first time to show how successfully we can develop a functional multi-stakeholder model where the business community, the civil society, the governments in addition to other players are include in managing this shared resource keeping it up, keeping it operational, keeping it as secure, and keeping it developed in the future. Taking care of innovation is driving really the growth of the Internet and keeping really sure that the private sector is doing the right investment in the growth of the Internet and the growth of the industry.

This is a new challenge, a new global challenge. And when we talk to many government leaders very specifically in the world, very specifically in the developing world, they see this as a challenge that they have not been faced with in the past.

They will use, when it comes to typical communication, to talk about the plain old telephone system that is very territorial but is structural in numbering very hierarchal within the numbering system. When it comes to the only shared resource that is global, that they need to talk about which is a spectrum to some extent, then they come together and handle it within a frame like you or governments are doing that because of many security agents and other challenges.

With the Internet, all these concepts have been blown up as we as know. I mean I'm not saying something new to all of you. But the boundaries are not there, the system is not hierarchical in numbering. The system is not based on agreements when it comes to international telecommunication.

Although the government is changing completely, they are more catalyst for development, not necessarily investing in the infrastructure and to the various concepts of coasting of business aspects of growth models of regulatory aspects have been completely blown up. And we are facing a new challenge.

If we add in addition on top of that, not only the regulatory issues in the telecommunication world, but also on the application that it's bringing new challenges on multi levels, it's bringing new challenges in cyber security. It's bringing new challenges in a full double access and a full double broad access.

Then definitely the overall landscape of Internet Governance becomes very complicated and people start really to feel there is a vacuum. There is a vacuum in the world that handles all these aspects all together and packages all the aspects all together a place and a platform where people can go and talk too and think they are getting directly.

This debate - and I know that most of you know that - is not new. And it started all ready in the WSIS process back in 2003 and continued back into 2005. And the world at that time has decided together to - on a couple of fronts, that the Internet should continue to rule based on multi-stakeholder model and that recognized for the first time the multi-stakeholder model in the agenda of the WSIS.

But in addition to that, it also created the IGF as a platform for the multi-stakeholder community to come and talk about the development of the Internet Governance model and multi-stakeholders.

What has happened since then, since 2005 until now in the last seven years?

The debate has continued. The problems became for some countries more and more acute when it came to cyber security when it came to resources specifically in the developing world.

The IGF definitely has been accepted as a model by the various players in the developing countries, but also in the developed world. But the U.N. did not support the IGF to grow - the U.N. did not support the IGF was the right resources in order to (become really the legitimate) platform to these issues.

It kept on the side for many tactical reasons probably more than strategic reasons. I'm not sure whether the reasons behind not supporting the IGF are very strategic on the level of the U.N. Secretary General or more tactical on the lower levels of (unintelligible) and the people that are monitoring that.

But we ended up with the situation that the IGF is to some extent successful. But it is useless without funds and the content is becoming more and more static. It is not evolving and it is not improving.

Although from another point of view, we have to see the positive aspects that buy-in of the developing countries and the developing countries for the IGF has been very strong. And in addition to that, we have seen the success for a number of regional initiatives, regional IGFs - successful IGFs - in Africa, in India, in Latin America, in the Arab World and in various parts of the world.

What does this say that there is a need for this platform? Although the U.N. is not putting one single penny, is not putting any political support, and is not sure of providing any help to provide the IGF with the right lead.

But the community together was able to float the IGF one way or the other because there is a need on a global level for a global debate. But there is a need as well for the regional engagement, and we saw that the IGF is getting

children on a regional level and empowered by the regional communities and coagulate extend to us success on that.

But this is also a signal but also an alarming signal. An alarming signal that there is need for a platform to discuss the issues - the issues are becoming more and more acute and becoming more and more interest and visible to various governments. And they want an address; they want to go somewhere and talk about these issues and addresses this concern.

So this is definitely one of the challenges and aspects that we have to consider at the multi-stakeholder community and definitely ICANN and its constituencies have a very crucial role to play in the development of the future of the IGF. We have to ask ourselves, "What do you want (BM) to solve in 2015?"

In 2015 we have the vision of the WSIS agent, and part of it is a renewal for IGF who was the same model, was the same structure or was different structure. That's part of the milestones we have in 2015.

We have in 2015 as well, the vision of the WSIS agenda, and we definitely as a community going to open the debate again about the multi-stakeholder and the function of the multi-stakeholder model. Because this would be dangerous.

There are many players from many parts of the world that want to say, "The multi-stakeholder model is not functioning, let's look for an alternative." And I think we have the duty and the responsibility, as a community that is leading the global community in this aspect, to show and to demonstrate variably, not only as ICANN and its constituencies, but with the rest of the players.

No multi-stakeholder is functioning and it's not functioning only in the U.S. and Western Europe. But it's functioning as well in Africa and it's functioning

in Latin America and it's functioning in the Arab World and it's functioning in other places in the developing countries.

This is the common real challenge. And what I think is that the polarization that happened during the Wicket rules are a clear reflection - the existing polarization that is happening and the debate that is happening all over the globe.

And if you come up for lessons out of the Wicket, I see the first lesson is the following. A; that many people realize that ITU is not the right place to address the Internet governance issues and many Internet governance issues.

B; that there is a need for a strong engagement and a strong dialogue with the global community from the developing countries that have needs and have concerns and want really to be part of that. And see that we have a responsibility as a community that is leading that to reach out to these people by a civil society by their constituencies in order to make them a part of the process.

And honestly, if you want to talk and close the room of our self-criticism, yes there are issues. How many accredited registrars do we have in Africa out of the 1000 accredited registrars within the DNS business? Four.

How many accredited registrars do we have in the Arab Regional 350 million population? Three out of the thousand as such.

These numbers do not reflect at all the population there and the growth of the Internet that is happening in this part of the world. So there is something wrong when we talk about their contribution and such.

The conclusion that they are coming (unintelligible) when you talk to ministers and government, and they start to ask, "Why are we not represented within the GNSO as we should be? How many players are coming from them?"

We tell them, "Well we are open; come. Nobody has prevented you from joining us and joining the constituencies."

But this answer, honestly, is not enough anymore because they want hand-held to some extent. And we have, as a global community, some responsibility in this aspect. I mean it has to go both ways and engagement has to happen both ways.

But still, they expect that we help them in this process by hand-holding in order to help them to become part of the debate.

And honestly, and if I say it very open, will internationalization, will inclusion, will having more participation from the developing countries, this provides multi-stakeholder model. And ICANN was more and more legitimacy.

The picture is very clear. If we want more and more legitimacy on the global level, we have to be more and more inclusive and we have to include more and more people from various parts of the world. And they have to be part of the process, part of the constituencies as such.

Whenever they're part of the constituencies, they see their interest being reflected, they see themselves represented, they see their voices heard, they see that they're part of the debate, part of the dialogue, then definitely many of the existing sensitivities will disappear. I'm not saying all of them, but many of the existing sensitivities will disappear.

I'm not claiming that people who voted in the Wicket against the multi-stakeholder model are all motivated by marginalization or that they are not part of the multi-stakeholder model. Some countries have other political areas

in order to make sure that they control the Internet and suppress their own people. This motivation exists as well.

But let us focus on those countries who are willing to engage but they don't know how. And we call them sometimes the middle-players or the middle-countries. Because there will be always extreme countries that are known - won't mention name, many of us know them - that is very difficult to convince them to be part of the model because they have political motivation not to be part of that model.

But there are other countries who might want, but they don't know how as such. And honestly, engaging in ICANN is not - and its constituencies - is not an easy process for a civil society structure that is (unintelligible) that last structure that is in Africa or in the developing world or a small startup that wants to be an accredited registrar within the overall process and wants to be included within the gTLD process. And it is not easy.

And it has also been reflected within the new gTLD program. The Board was kind enough, even before this new team joined, and provided the Joint Application Support Program, the JAS within gTLD program to support the developing countries' registrars.

And the big disappointment that nobody applied. As such we were at the beginning saying, "Well, the two million that were there are not enough in order to support a sufficient number of accredited registrars in the region. We need to double this and triple this finance."

Our big disappoint that very few people applied. As such, what does this say that there is something wrong in the communication, in the outreach. The message is not reaching these people. So it's not only a financial barrier, it's skills, it's capabilities, it's many other aspects.

So these are - I know that we are working on within our Global Stakeholder Engagement team together with (Sally) and the Vice President because we want to tackle the issues within our engagement plans with the government, but also with a civil society and the community based on the problems - the real problems around there.

And the answer, "Well, let's do some fantastic building programs here and there." That is not enough anymore. This was the message in the 90's and maybe earlier in this decade. But it is not enough anymore.

We have to engage with them, we have to develop the industry, we have to build the constituencies, we have to make them part of the process, we have to reduce the barriers for them to be part of our constituencies and involve them.

And again, I'm not claiming that we'll be successful with all of them as such because there are other political motivations to some extent that are driving some of them. But let's try, at least, to the middle countries that are ready to be part of that.

So in this aspect, very specifically, we are developing an engagement plan with a key government; with Russia, with Brazil, with India and with (Unintelligible). And we selected the four government peoples - to some extent we think they play a major role within the overall debate of the Internet governance and developing our plans, engagement plans, with them - with those governments, inviting them to be a part of the ICANN process strengths and participation at ICANN constituencies and strengths, and ICANN presence as well within these countries very specifically.

And part of that is the INF fellowship program that (Sally) has suggested and is promoting, because many of them think, "What?" This secretive INF thing that is happening here in the background where they are not being part of it.

So Fadi reached out to them whether in (Bakur) or even during the Wicket in (Dubai) and told them, "Send your people, send your most senior engineer or junior engineer or whatever to sit here with the IANA team and see what they are doing."

And this process is starting to and we're putting together - (Mandy) is putting together rules, (unintelligible) and a legal team a fellowship program for IANA fellowship and IANA sabbaticals in order to invite. Then we'll start with the skeptical countries to come and look at the IANA. We'll continue to have definitely the debates about the location of room service.

But at least that they - the skepticism that is there should be done away.

The other thing that we are doing in this direction that we are reaching out to those countries that have been educated by IGO and many other players for many years so that ICANN is even as such. So we're reaching out to these people and telling them, "Well, here ICANN is engaging, ICANN is reaching out, ICANN is internationalizing, ICANN has a globalization plan, and ICANN wants to strengthen its presence in the developing world and also make sure that it increases the participation of its constituents.

And as (Fadi) has mentioned yesterday, the internationalization is not opening regional offices here or there. This is over, with the Internet this is over. And with the virtual communities and the virtual societies that are being built, this is old.

If there is a need for an office, fine. Now let's consider an office. But the most important thing are the programs; the programs for outreach, the programs for inclusiveness, the programs for a better education and the programs for industry into inclusiveness into as much as we can.

And whatever the situation is, we need to put maximum effort and defend our model and promote our model and really make it successful as much as we can.

So we are reaching out definitely within the overall debate that exists at the time being. We are protecting the multi-stakeholder more than as much as we can. And the Wicket is not the end of the world, it's only a strong signal and a strong alarm that the multi-stakeholder model is at risk.

We are participating within WTPF, we are participating as well within the WSIS plus ten follow-up processes in Enesco. And in February and in May at the ITU and next year in Egypt in order to ready and show and to demonstrate that the multi-stakeholder model is functioning, is operational, and we don't need to revisit.

I'm not saying it's perfect and it's rosy, but at least it's operational and it's functioning and it is delivering as such. And let's keep really the innovation as a driver to continue to develop the multi-stakeholder model.

I want to add here that many people have been critical of questioning the participation of ICANN at the Wicket as such. And honestly, we see this as a positive contribution.

And we try to reach out to our allies and really explain why the CEO - why the ICANN CEO, probably (Josier) together with Stakeholder Chairman at Wicket and spoke and addressed Wicket simply because many of the middle countries that existed there and were there for three weeks have never heard about ICANN. Some of them have never met an ICANN CEO.

And as I said, they have been told that this is really the evil (unintelligible) of bad people. These are people that don't want to engage and reach out. They neglect the interests of the developing country and they are only connected to

the U.S. Government and are related to the U.S. Government. And they don't have the intention really to work and to open up to the rest of the world.

So the mission was there and Fadi's message was that we want to reach out and we don't want to exclude anybody from (unintelligible). And here ICANN is represented at the Wicket event reaching out as a multi-stakeholder model and sending the right signals to the community and the right to radically engage with governments.

And he met with many players who normally they don't come to ICANN meetings. They don't come to (I-Star) meetings. They don't come to ISO meetings. So the opportunity really to connect with them underground was they are there for talk about Internet Governance, and that was definitely very important.

And honestly you also have to say that ICANN, critical other sources, have not been included within the agreement - the legal agreement that has been signed at the Wicket. There has been a resolution about one of many other resolutions that existed before in the (unintelligible) potentially and in WTPF in Johannesburg.

But nothing when it comes to the agreement - the signed agreement that has been since signed by 90- countries and has effected ICANN directly with little mention to the Internet and some cyber securities which we would have liked to see. But ICANN itself was not included when it came to naming and addressing there within the Wicket agreement.

So our reach out is part of the policies that Fadi is implementing. They are not excluding anybody from the debate. Those who want really to work with us and to be part of our work we move forward.

And in this time together was the (I-stars) were working together on initiatives - regional initiatives for engagement. When we are doing a pilot - and that's

the last thing I'm going to mention before we open the platform for debate and for questions-and-answers.

And the last thing that Fadi has initiated a couple of regional events for engagement as a pilot. We'll start with the Arab world and Africa in March. And the first week of March, together with the IGF - the Arab IGF and the African IGF and the (Unintelligible) as well as the (Unintelligible) - doing outreach events.

In case of Africa, it's a follow-up event on the implementation of the African strategies that has been announced in Toronto to tell the world what we are doing in the implementation of the African strategy. And tell the African ministers and tell the African civil society and business players what they are doing in (unintelligible) cultural as well as in other aspects as well related to the development of the DNS industry.

For the first time, there is a DNS industry work (unintelligible) to develop the role of the DNS industry and a program to support the accreditation of registrars in Africa as such.

In the Arab world, it's also an event together with the Arab IGF where we are developing a Middle East strategy in a bottom-up process similar to what we did in Africa as was in full inclusion from the civil society as well as from the business community.

We call both events big words - Multi-Stakeholder Internet Governance Works. They are both pilots that we are piloting with the (I-Star) community as such and we'll see what we get out of the situation and engagement plan.

Because again - and this is a self-criticism - when we go to - as ICANN meetings to Latin America or to South Africa, and I live that in my own country in Egypt as such. We have 2000 people that come together.

But the real interaction was the local community is very, very limited. We come with our agendas, we come as constituencies, we come with our plans, we do our meetings and we are sitting there as such. But except the opening ceremony, the real interaction was the local community.

I live that in my own country. I hosted ICANN meetings for us in March 2000. One of the first ICANN meetings ever and again in March 2008.

And in both events, the attendance from the local community from Egypt, except in the Opening Ceremony, was almost nil; not there. Something's wrong as such. And I was telling my people, "I'm bringing the world's experts."

And in 2008, there were 1500 people. In 2000 at that time, we were still a couple of hundred. "I'm bringing to you the world's experts and to your own location." And the participation was nil.

What's wrong? They say, "We don't relate too. We attend the discussions and we don't think we are a part of that and not part of this industry."

And we pleaded again in Latin America and in many parts of the world. And so we have to do together with the Global Stakeholder Engagement Team and with (Sally) and with the Vice President (unintelligible) events that really address the needs of the regions. And speak about the needs of the regions and try to include them as much as we can.

So I just wanted to mention this event so that if you hear about it, you know, the objectives - the strategic objectives - behind these events, the big works. And if they succeed, then we'll definitely develop them in other parts of the world.

By that I think I have taken more time than is granted. But if David allows me, then we can take a couple of questions.

David: Tarek, would you want to - I'll do the list. Would you want to stay up here for the questions?

I know we have Kathy, we have quite a few people. Okay - hold on. Steve, we have (Jimson) and Tony. On this side, Bill, Holmes, Wolfgang - okay, fine.

((Crosstalk))

David: Thank you very much. Okay Kathy, why don't you go first. Yes, hold on.

Man: The point of order that I'm sometimes finding the descriptions of the sessions to be a little different than the session. This was described as after introductions, introductory comments from each constituency and/or stakeholder group, it would be followed by dialogue with staff.

So are we going to have comments from each of the constituencies and stakeholder groups per se or are we just going to be responding to Tarek's presentation?

David: How would you want to do it?

Marilyn Cade: David, I think - it's Marilyn. I think we sort of tried to prepare to...

David: Talk, okay.

Marilyn Cade: So I agree with Bill. You know, we're here as representatives of groups.

David: Do we have representatives who are designated to start?

Marilyn Cade: Probably the Chairs.

David: Yes, okay. Can we go then with the Chairs. We'll start then with Bill.

Bill Drake: I mean I didn't mean to cause trouble.

((Crosstalk))

Bill Drake: It's a basic format issue because it was the same matter yesterday. We had balanced between briefing and community dialogue I'm not sure about. But the way the description was written made it sound more like community dialogue.

David: Okay, Bill please.

Bill Drake: Okay, I will just make a couple of quick points then.

First again, I greatly applaud the fact that Tarek is here and is doing this and has a team. This is a big progress from where we were a few years ago where some of us were jumping up and down about these issues and trying to convince people on the Board and staff that this was important to engage in the larger IG environments. And we weren't getting very far. So we're really happy you're doing this.

I guess the first point I would make about it is the same point that I raised in a different conference yesterday which is about the relationship between ICANN, the organization, the fiscal organization and its paid staff on one end, and the community ICANN, the community, on the other hand.

And it just seems to me that it would be really important in undertaking these activities to try to really find a way to work with the community closely and take advantage of the people that are here and with expertise and were engaged.

When you go to something like the Wicket and people say, "Well why is ICANN engaging here?" The focus is on ICANN the organization and its senior leadership and is this appropriate.

But yet the Wicket was full of ICANN participants who were there engaging, telling governments that ICANN's model works, that we shouldn't mess it and so on and so forth.

And so the point is clearly, there has to be a closer synergy in the planning and the pack in terms of strategic engagement both with the Board and with your operations so that the people who are in the community who really feel strongly about these things, have expertise and are out there talking about them all the time, can feel like they have some sort of communication with you and coordination on the process. So that's a general.

A second point I guess I would make is I think this is particularly true with regards to the IGF. I think it would be really useful going forward if we could treat the IGF as a much more important strategic engagement than in the past. ICANN has held open forums where it did show-and-tell with varying degrees of success and have co-sponsored some workshops.

I think there's much more that could be done there in part, for example, by supporting people in the community to be there. Not just having ICANN staff there, but by ensuring that people from the community are doing ICANN related activities at the IGF.

And I know last year, I gather at (Unintelligible) - I didn't know this, but quite a few SOs and ACs got funding to do events at (Abacus). Maybe we might want to look at expanding this and making more systematic so that the representation on the ground in the IGF from the ICANN community is working in a coordinated fashion and is representing ICANN as it really is and not as a sort of top-down thing.

The last point I would make would be about the Wicket. I went to Wicket and all I got was this t-shirt. But (unintelligible). We were there though - it should be noted.

If you think of ICANN's presence in the Wicket as the ICANN staff leadership, that's one thing. But I will tell you that NCUC, (Aubrey) and I were on the American delegation.

Wolfgang was on the German delegation. We had numbers on the U.K., Swiss, Thai, (Corrine) delegations, etcetera, etcetera. And Poncelet was there from (Gabi).

I mean we were there on the ground. participating in this stuff in putting forward the ICANN mission and defending it visa via in our meetings with the Secretary General and so on and so forth.

I would just make two observations about Wicket where we are. It seems to me there's a lot of misconstruction going on now.

There's been a lot of talk in the blogosphere and elsewhere that all of this was much to do about nothing. That since the Internet isn't mentioned a lot of times in the agreement, it doesn't really matter and we shouldn't have all gotten excited about it in the first place.

And I think that this is really nonsense. To the extent that the word Internet doesn't appear throughout the text, that's in part because we had a major mobilization of efforts to make sure that that was so. It took a lot of pushback to make sure that the Internet was not mentioned consistently throughout the text.

So to criticize the process is all irrelevant, you didn't have to engage, look at the results. Well the results were because we engaged. So that's kind of nuts.

But it also depends on an inaccurate reading of the text. I think people should not be so (unintelligible) about this agreement; I really do. Anybody who was there and knows the legislative history and the intentions of the actors that were gathered knows that many of the states who were involved view the existing provisions of the ITRs as applicable to the Internet in varying degrees, of all existing provisions and the new ones.

And so when you have expansive language about authorized operating agencies, when you have language about a preamble that says there is a right of access to Internet, basically it doesn't say the word Internet, but it's clear that that's what it's all about.

When you're establishing a state right, as opposed to a human right, when you have language about the telecommunications traffic exchange points which nobody knew what they was. We Googled it and all we could find was mention of Internet exchange points, but that's in the agreement.

When you have provisions saying that, "Members shall endeavor to ensure that not bringing resources specified in the ITOT recommendations, use only for assigned purposes." Well it depends on what's in the ITOT recommendations. And guess what? There are mentions of names and numbers - Internet names and numbers in the recommendations.

Tarek Kamel: This part has not been part of the treaty.

Bill Drake: It is in the treaty. I just copied it out of the final text.

Tarek Kamel: Yes, yes.

Bill Drake: No, no, but the final text. This is 3.5.

Anyway, the point is I could go on with other provisions, the stuff about the security, the stuff about STEM is clearly about the Internet.

But you know, when it says, “Members shall endeavor to take necessary measures to prevent the propagation of unsolicited bulk electronic communication.” What do you think they’re talking about?

Okay, so there are provisions about the Internet in this text now on top of the expansive resolutions, the (Unintelligible) thing in order to ensure a wonderful a harmonious development of the Internet, the IT shall do lots of things going forward.

And it’s not over. We’re going to see variable implementation of this agreement around the world in different regions by Russia and the Arab countries and the CIS and so on. And this could impact traffic flows, interconnection agreements, all kinds of things like that.

And looking down the line, we’ve got telephone networks that are all moving towards IP cord networks so that the next time we come back and do this, the debate about whether or not these agreements apply to Internet or IP base networks are going to become very obscure.

And we have an agreement through the resolution saying that this should be done again in eight years. It said the “Plan of the country should take this up, mandate this to be taken up in eight years.”

So all I would say is this is part of an ongoing process. The governments that were unhappy with the results are still unhappy. The pressures are still there. Whether it’s all manifested in this particular agreement doesn’t mean you can go to sleep on it. It’s a larger engagement.

And ICANN has to be there. But it has to be there in way that’s just not the staff meeting with the Secretary General and having nice (unintelligible). It also has to involve the private sector people, the technical community people

and social society who participate in ICANN, being engaged in multiple levels and in a coordinated way with you. I'll stop there.

Tarek Kamel: I will respond in question by question or how do you plan to take it?

Woman: I think because there are lots of questions, what we might do is group the topics and then respond. Does that make sense? Otherwise we're going to keep people going for a long time and we won't get to the questions.

So might be useful is if we could just summarize the key issues that we raised there. And I heard engagement. Tell us what you're doing so that we all join up which is the same thing we talked about yesterday.

So that's the first thing. The second thing I had was just because the (unintelligible) at Wicket doesn't mean that everybody else wasn't at the Wicket. And actually that's the same point actually, that's about coordination.

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: You are a redundant person - I'm teasing.

Then having - and then the second thing is really focusing on this issue about - now it's gone completely out of my head.

So it's the point you were making just then though. What was the last point?

Man: (Unintelligible).

Woman: Yes, thank you. So if we could just summarize that, I mean we could put it on the whiteboard. David, (unintelligible) because they may come up again. And we'll respond to them more at the end.

Is that okay?

Man: That's fine.

David: That was Bill Drake of the NCUC. Marilyn Cade from the Business Constituency?

Marilyn Cade: Thanks. I'm going to take an approach that's probably going to add some great consistency with what my fellow chair, Bill Drake mentioned. But maybe say things a little bit differently. I don't think we're saying to you just tell us what you're doing.

We're actually, what I think, giving a different message. And that is embedded throughout the non-commercial stakeholder house, constituencies and stakeholder groups are veterans who have been engaged in the WSIS more deeply and with more expertise than the ICANN staff.

And that the new activities that ICANN is developing are very, very welcomed. But it is actually - and I'll just say Tarek - there's very thin participation historically from the contracted parties in the - I can name every one of the contracted parties who participated in the WSIS and has participated since then.

So I'm, you know, some of them are now being helpful in the IGF. But they - the contracted parties are much newer to this space. The CCs have been here and involved, just like many of the people here, but also people from these communities.

And I think one thing we're trying to say is, we're not only assets but allies and partners. And as you're moving very fast and need to move very fast, I think some of us probably are giving the message of we not only don't want to be left behind, we think we are very strong contributors and in some cases, have deeper and richer contacts and history both within the governments that are perhaps hostile to the freedom of information and an operable Internet, and to the governments that are in the middle phase.

Some people in this community have contributed to pooling some of those governments into the middle phase through hard work they've done and continue to do.

I'm not going to say a lot about the Wicket other than to say I did an analysis of the governments who were going to sign and the governments who signed and continued to work with a number of the governments who didn't sign in their activity in the IGF, in their activity at the ITU, and in their activity in the GAC. And everybody - there's a lot of people in this room who have those kinds of contacts.

So I think the question may be for - that I would just pose is you have significant ideas and strategies in mind. And ICANN is putting resources out and proposing resources. And I hope - I hope we can count on the richness of involvement from these constituencies and stakeholder groups and all the people that we want to work to bring into ICANN to be part of this partnership.

So one final point; the concept, the term, the Internet Governance Landscape is a term that we thought over very hard in a - at a CSTB Meeting to make sure that we had a term that we could refer to that made it clear that Internet Governance is not about ICANN. It is much more than that.

And so the real exciting thing I think...

((Crosstalk))

Marilyn Cade: But I think the really good thing is - and I think Bill reinforced this - as ICANN is partnering with IGOs, there are also relationships you can use here. But the regional organizations are growing in their importance as well.

And so again, I would just say we're probably looking for feedback earlier and an opportunity to engage earlier as you progress on your planning.

David: Thank you for the BC. Do you want to - okay, I think Tony, for the IP people.  
Please Tony?

Tony Holmes: Okay, thank you. Tony Holmes for the ISP.

Along with many other people here, I was fortunate enough to certain (unintelligible). It was amazing for me that it wasn't only ICANN, it was friends of ICANN that were there in great numbers all singing the same thing.

And one of the amazing things was that so many of those people they were there, but during the formal sessions they weren't around to speak. But boy, didn't they make a difference outside of that. It really counted.

And from my own perspective, I was fortunate enough to be there with the U.K. delegation and a number of us were given formal status to speak during the sessions which was somewhat a privilege as that went through.

But the way the ITU works, it tends to be just governments that count, that they have the vote, they have the voice.

And we all start to applaud when ICANN is doing in terms of reaching out to those governments. And we all who the major suppliers are on both sides - the one that showed the space. And a lot of the strengths of the ITU is of course now from developing countries.

And one of the things that has been amazing for me over the past year is that wearing a different hat to the one where here, I've been involved in some trucking activities that have involved governments from some of those developing countries, but also ISPs and (Telco's).

And it's been a really good experience, and I've managed to sit down and have discussions about Internet Governance and ICANN with those people.

And quite often you come at it from a different perspective because the industry suppliers, the business suppliers, and civil society, they don't always share the same views as those governments. And that's something I think we've got to work on to facilitate more of that dialogue.

I don't believe ICANN can do that alone. You mentioned yourself Tarek, that ICANN has been portrayed in some parts of the world as the bad guy. So although you need to try and put that right, you started at a disadvantage.

So of us that are part of the broader ICANN community, is we don't wear that ICANN hat, if we wear industry perspectives or civil perspective hats, we can have that dialogue a lot easier.

And one of the strengths that ICANN should be calling from is to marshal that and actually use it. It'll pass to use what we contribute to that. We've all got the same name, and there's some real challenges along. Bill started to go down that path.

So all ready, there's other events coming along. WTPF is the first one in the ITU window and it's going to be followed by plenty (unintelligible), and boy, that's going to be a really tough call.

And we haven't got long to do this. So the strength of the approach from ICANN should not only be ICANN staff with these initiatives that are doable, but finding ways to get leverage from the rest of the community as well. And I don't believe enough attention has been given to that.

David: Thank you Tony. The IP has passed, thank you very much Steve.

Do you want to speak for the NPOC or - please.

Man: Just as an introduction, this is a subject that has interested NPOC a lot. But I had to go for a doctor appointment, a little emergency this morning. So having missed your presentation Tarek, I apologize and I wouldn't want to intervene at this stage not knowing the context.

But Poncelet was a new (unintelligible), Poncelet was in (Baku). Poncelet is a leading African thinker on these issues so I'm really pleased he's here. Thank you.

David: Poncelet, you have the floor.

Poncelet Illeleji: Thank you very much. I'm Poncelet Illeleji. One thing I would like to comment and thank ICANN personally for this new initiatives that leadership has taken and engagement and foremost especially in developing countries.

And if I could share my little bit of experience with what's happened, I've been one of the few Africans - there are only about five - that were in different African delegations at the Wicket.

And what came up discussing with them, governments including governments of the Gambia and the Congo, several African countries, was that we want to really take part in ICANN meetings. But they don't invite us.

I say, "No, you can go online," and they said, "No, the ITU invites us. We are governments, we have to be invited. You know, we have to have a physical letter. You know, then we come because that is how we operate."

And you know, it was interesting to hear when it's also on (unintelligible). And our Prominence Secretary who because the President are the term of the Gambia was the Minister of Information and Condition of Infrastructure. He said the President told or asked me, "How come when Gambia was (unintelligible), we had more than 200 Gambians benefiting from it because the Gambia government were involved in the process from the beginning."

When I was in the local organizing committee and when (Unintelligible) came to engage the Gambian government, we (unintelligible), and they said, "Do that sort of thing." They want to see happening within GAC. Gambia's never attended any GAC meeting.

My (Center Gali) counter that said, (Mani Jobe) who was very active in GAC knew (Center Gali's) government is out. So (Center Gali) is not involved in GAC.

So how does this happen? So this is something I really want to see in terms of the engagement because governments also get all these players. All of the players, the (Telco's), Africa is one of the biggest growing markets in the telecommunication industry globally.

I know the (Telco), they're ready to do something and ready to sponsor our young people. But most of them they take it back when the governments have a know-how and say they're the ones (unintelligible) is governments and Africa in most cases. And Tarek will notice more.

They will like being seen as they want or we are the ones doing the show. But actually they have people pushing the ground. And that is how Africa operates.

So my perception, not a lot of African countries, they want (unintelligible) or (unintelligible), they all have their own issues and they're also being controlled on their own (unintelligible). But they want to be more involved.

And how do they get more involved? They have to have the know-how, you know. And that's why I think ICANN should try to use the community, and that's why this community is very important.

You have a lot - ICANN has a great community leadership that brings the business constituency or non-commercial group. They have very great challenge that can really take out (unintelligible) instead of only - because in some cases you have the ICANN staff that deal with it. They have a role to play.

But who are the champions of what ICANN does in the community? So I want to see that leverage, how the community help ICANN in getting this internationalization which doesn't really - which to me has happened but can happen in a much better spirit.

And I look forward in this endeavor. Because I was talking to (Pare), he came to the Gambia during the lunch of the African (Unintelligible). And he said, "All the registrants are common." And I said, "No."

You also have to get the ICANN communities to come. So that was then, because they are the people who know how to engage with civil society, engage with governments to be involved, you know. Thank you.

David: Poncelet, thank you. Would you - yes.

Tarek? Very good. And we'll go back to the other questions.

Tarek Kamel: I will start from the end and from Poncelet and your comments.

And yes, we definitely know that the African community is strong and the African ICANN community is even better structure than other parts in the region.

And I want to ensure you within the development of our African strategy that has all ready initiated back in Prague last June, the African community has been completely involved within the development of the structure for our laws there. The AFTLD was there and the African cities as well as that. And even

the African measures are strong although there are very few; two or three. They have been part of the process.

And when it came to the implementation of the African strategy, it is happening while the African community. Again, the workgroup that developed the African strategy, (En Equine) or (Alice Moonia) and many others, (Mohammad Diop) and (Miamona) from (Synagol) as well are part of the implementation of the direction.

The event (Addis) that I have mentioned and big works that will take place in early March is completely supported by the African community. And we are bringing and inviting as much as we can, people from the African community to be there and to participate from the various constituencies and from the various structures to showcase the implementation of the African strategy as such. And the training that I have mentioned, the work up about the DNS training is just an example.

Not only that, but in addition to that we are also having the African Union in order to make sure that we have as much in government high level participation as we can. Civil society is important and private sector is important. But as you know how things in the developing world, without the high level of presentation from the government, we don't really get a push for the development of the agenda on a national level.

We want to promote the multi-stakeholder Internet Governance on a national level. Not only a regional level, but also on a national level. And therefore, we need to go straight to governments and high level representatives that it is there and it is functioning.

So I want to show you the African strategy and implementation. And the big works, Africa and the event in Africa, and this is completely carried by champions. (Pier de Angeno), the Vice President is just one guy. He will

never be able to carry this alone without the full championship from the community.

This does not mean that we should not add more. We have definitely room for other people to come and play and contribute further along as such.

In addition to that, Tony was talking about the same issue that has been mentioned about the Wicket. Yes, you are right. The debate about the Global Internet Governance and the future of the Internet is not going to end with Wicket.

We have it with the WTPF, we have it in the WSIS, and we have it in the Planning Potentiary and in the future and many other events. We didn't mention the Enhanced Corporation and the fuzzy world of Enhanced Corporation and the various interpretation of Enhanced Corporation. Nobody really agrees on one single interpretation on Enhanced Corporation.

We will have this year's (unintelligible) starting the workload very soon about Enhanced Corporation and see what will come.

We need to stay alive as a community within the CSTD Workgroup and ready to stress our vision of Enhanced Corporation and the promotion of the multi-stakeholder model.

So the answer is yes, we follow-up together. That's not the end of the process. And the more we can use, definitely championships, this provides the overall model of legitimacy. It's not ICANN, it's not the 150 people in the staff or 160 or whatever the number is and the 20 board members.

ICANN is community more or less with the various constituencies. And when this really is more or less made visible and ISA on a global level - I add on a global level - this provides definitely the message was a by far more stronger

legitimacy than if the CEO or the Chairman or the Board member or senior staff member.

So I agree with you as such and we are moving forward to coordinate our efforts and to make sure that we're, after the transition, at the beginning that we have more and more involvement within the plans that are beginning implemented.

Marilyn Cade, dear friend, was talking about definitely the assets that we have within the community. Yes, that's so. We have a lot of know-how within the community. As such we need to build on that and we need to make sure that they are being utilized.

But let me also tell you that when you talk to sometimes to some government representatives, they want to see a staff member at the end of the day. They want to see someone who is officially representing the organization.

So it is both; you need to have staff and you need to have the community to support the message and to provide the message with more legitimacy as such. And the richness of constituency definitely is a fact; it provides ICANN with its strength. And we need definitely to build on that while we are moving forward within the overall global debate.

Bill Drake was talking about several issues. Yes, in Wicket there was a presentation - the Wicket was not only from the ICANN staff. But it was for the first time, and this was maybe the attractive news is that ICANN is being implemented by the Secretary (Urnina) and speaking at an opening.

So we talk from a press interest point-of-view as such. This was the news; having ICANN, community members within government delegations or was in sector membership players from the private sector is definitely something that has happened also before and will continue to happen.

We appreciate it, we'll build on it and we know that they are doing ground work as well. And (Mandy) has been in close contact with the community that was there to orchestrate, extend, during the process as much as we could in order to coordinate efforts. And we need to continue that in the WTPF and in the planning and in future events as well to make sure we stay coordinated as such.

But we know the ground work that is being done with the middle countries more or less to change their position as Marilyn has mentioned.

This is not just an outcome or a result of an effort of a couple of people from the staff. This is a real genuine community effort that really has the position to move it forward and brings the message.

In addition to that, we talked about the IGF. It isn't important for them that we shouldn't let them pay. Because if we as a community let the IGF or global IGF on a global level pay, we only have to blame ourselves at the end if someone comes and later on and says, "Well, the multi-stakeholder is not functioning. We have provided you with the platform and you didn't support it enough."

So I think we need to provide it more with financial support, more and more, and logistical support and also help them to renew their messages as such. Yes, we agreed that Internet government is not only management of critical Internet sources; this debate is over. There are many things as well within the overall IGF landscape as such from (unintelligible) to security to privacy issue to many other issues as well.

But the IGF needs definitely to be expanded and that's what we are doing in Africa and the Arab world. We are corporating with the regional IGFs and trying to empower them as much as they can as such.

And there are definitely some - still some concerns about the interpretation of the ITRs as you have mentioned while we go forward. And that's not the end of the debate as we all said. This debate will continue about the interpretation of the ITRs and recognize operating agencies and operating agencies and where are exactly the limits.

But I think the message was clear that we need a new model and the existing telecommunication model is not fitting for Internet Governance.

David: Thank you very much. We are being constrained with time with our two guests. But I have on the list Steve DelBianco, (Jimson), Tony Harris, Lanre I think and Mikey if those are the ones...

Man: (Unintelligible).

David: Avri and Wolfgang, thank you. And Tony again. Steve DelBianco, quickly please.

Okay, then we move to (Jimson); sorry.

(Jimson): Thank you very much. I would like to echo the presentations of Bill Drake, Marilyn, Tony. We got to the work of Tarek and (Unintelligible) for their outreach strategy; highly welcome. I'm personally glad about it.

So I'm (Jimson BC). I also happen to be the Chair of the Africa ICT Alliance, the Alliance of 550 industry organizations in - (unintelligible) right now but ten countries in Nigeria, South Africa, Egypt, Kenya, Gambia, Uganda, (Unintelligible), Mozambique, Mumbai, and it's great.

My first focus is on the outreach for Africa. The initial point I found out that the business is really part of it. Because I know I'm in business and I can relate. And (Pier) got connected, (Baha) got connected and we are engaging - (Pier) is engaging right now.

And I think that is to say that the Outreach Program is living organisms, a living process so which is good and that's what you've underlined.

We want to support it, the community in Africa we welcome it and will give it our total support.

Then the second point is we got to the United Nations. I had the privilege of being the United Nation's commission for Science and Technology Working Group on the idea of improvements, yes. And of course it's very lean with Tongan and then the number of members for the constituency.

I need therefore to (unintelligible) to ensuring that the (unintelligible) will remain in circles and (unintelligible). And the point is is this. A lot of this hall agreed that this is the best (unintelligible).

Bill, you mentioned in your statement that the U.N. has not really given it all its support perhaps. So my question in that is how are we addressing this issue for the United Nations support? This is my point of view of the multi-stakeholder model which has been well pleased - very well pleased.

So how are we - we didn't just (unintelligible) the strategy. Yes, I know you are (unintelligible) IGOs and all of those. But United Nations in particular are the (unintelligible), (unintelligible).

And lastly, also I have the privilege of being in the Nigerian Government delegation to Wicket just like Poncelet and a number of other members. I had at halftime started to get members to understand the multi-stakeholder process. But many that know of ICANN.

Also about 80 people in the delegation so you name the only business of members to the state.

So the challenge is awareness and getting the government in part of your (unintelligible). And this also to further (unintelligible) as Poncelet say in Africa if government does not move, not really move.

So if we're able to focus more on governments doing that now with our leaders, I think we are going to get it. The business environment is growing, the business environment has to be more - much more provided. And the government only that can do that, so that is why the focus on government is the key. They are interested.

And lastly, how (unintelligible) (unintelligible) (unintelligible) to bolster the need where we need to have the excellent (unintelligible) in place of engagement. Now the (unintelligible) of delegation (unintelligible), although it was quiet. It will give you another totality to negotiate, to take any position because there was over (unintelligible) majority against, you know, my point of view to, you know, it prevailed sort of (unintelligible).

So if you were not a part of ICANN, so we're not saying that - we had the privilege of meeting with Fadi and we discussed Internet progress and so on and so forth. So we now said, "Okay, we want to be engaged in ICANN." And he said yes, he's interested.

Well we need to get a letter supporting as Poncelet just mentioned, that we need to get a letter. It's got to be a letter to the Minister and so on and so forth.

And I go to tell (Baha), and (Baha) going to tell (Pier), and (Pier) is where we end now. So I don't know where he's going to direct me to get a letter because the government needs a letter so they will activate their own process at the top level. Not at the medium level, at the top level of engagement with ICANN.

So I've counted all ready, really, you're right. But we need to have that (unintelligible). Thank you.

David: Tony Harris, please.

Tony Harris: Yes, this is Tony Harris. I will try to be brief.

Actually my comments will not be so much on what happened at the Wicket; I wasn't there and it's been covered by all of you practically.

But perhaps it would be useful in the light of what Tarek was talking about just to briefly comment on the experience of someone who works in South America and specifically in the Internet access industry.

And I think that one of the basic problems is you can do a lot of outreach which is of course important. It must be done and people should understand what ICANN is about.

But the thing is, once you've done the outreach, how can they engage with what ICANN does? And basically the products that ICANN has to offer, let's say becoming a registry or becoming a registrar basically because all of the addressing is done through RIRs and they are channeling their own outreach and let's say everything they do is parallel to ICANN practically.

So if you get down to the fact that we're talking only about domain names, if you want to become a registry, the opportunity basically comes up when you have an application round. I don't know how many registries have analyzed it - came up with the application round.

I know in our case when we applied for Dot (Unintelligible), our partner in Mexico which I think is the first in South America where we have the academia and the private sector combining on an application. And the

registry services will be performed by a university in Mexico which is also a ccTLD.

Getting to the question of the registrars, we have one in Argentina which is struggling. And you have the problem that the registrar industry is pretty much based in the United States and Europe and perhaps in Australia and some places like that where you have extreme - excuse me, not the word. We have a lot of activity on the domain industry on reselling and recapturing names and shuffling them around which is not something which would normally be undertaken in an area like that in America.

The problem with becoming a registrar - I'm currently evaluating making my organization a registrar which is (Cavasy) in Argentina. But to have the fixed costs that ICANN charges which has to be recovered, and the fact that if you offer gTLD domains in a country like Argentina, you have to compete with the established registrars who have - they take a markup on a sale of a domain name of maybe one or two dollars.

So it's a little complicated to say, "Well with Outreach we can have a lot more registrars." It's not all that easy to make a business model out of a registrar with the way the industry is entrenched today.

And finally, so I don't make this so long, with regards to engaging governments in what ICANN is about, I tried to get four Argentina provinces to apply for a gTLD in two cities - two major cities - in the application round. As soon as they heard of the costs involved, even those involved in the JAS, they just lost interest completely because they cannot associate investments of that order in something which to them is just getting an identify, and the Internet in which they normally resolve is through their ccTLD.

So I think - this is just a suggestion - we should probably consider adding to looking at Outreach also looking at how a model can be developed where developing countries can find a way to participate in being a registry or being

a registrar. For me, that's one of the problems that has to be solved. Thank you.

David: Thank you Tony. Lanre.

Lanre Ajayi: Thank you very much. I'm glad that ICANN is finally doing what it needs to engage growing into IGOs.

One of the vital applications in the IGOs is the ITU. And I was told that ITU was no longer participating in GAC.

David: ITU is no longer participating in GAC?

Lanre Ajayi: It's no longer participating in GAC. And I think the process and main emphasis we need to impact to get ITU back, to get IT their critical and know these things you're talking about. That is (unintelligible).

David: Thank you Lanre. Mikey?

Mikey O'Connor: I will be uncharacteristically brief since I know how short the time is.

This is just my standard plug, but when we're doing the outreach, I just want to echo what Tony said but in a different way.

If we go and do a bunch of outreach, one of the destinations that the incoming folks will probably want to explore, is working groups. We are the constituencies, but the bottom-up process is very important. And one of the problems right now is that the bottom of the bottom-up process is very unwelcoming to new comers.

I've had several hallway conversations about that, but I'm running a working group where the mailing list erupted. We've had a 160 plus, very technical,

very tightly reasoned emails that aren't in most, you know, they're in English. And so as a result, a non-native English speaker is at a huge disadvantage.

And so as you develop the outreach strategy, also think about improving the destination to where those participants are going. You know, I sort of resonated to what you were saying.

But one of the things I want to end on is think about where we've been and where we are today. I mean this conversation three or four years ago would have been inconceivable. I mean this is amazing. You know, fabulous job so far.

But don't forget those working groups. I won't let you.

David: Thank you Mikey. Avri and then Wolfgang. Avri.

Avri Doria: Thank you. I guess I wanted to ask a question that came up a little bit in the reciprocity that you mentioned at the beginning.

And it relates to their being issues beyond Wicket. For example, I was there for the WTSA and there were issues that related to ICANN questions, not to names, but to numbers. But still, there were questions that the RIRs were fielding.

ISOC seems to have a reciprocal relationship, I'm not quite sure of all the details that allows them to fully participate, to be in the various groups, to be at the meetings with speaking privileges and such.

And I'm just wondering has ICANN looked into that, having a similar type of relationship? And if it has looked into it and it doesn't work, why doesn't it?

And it's just a question I've had because I see that ISOC participates completely even though they too have their, you know, separate turf. So that was my question. Thank you.

David: Tarek, did you want to respond or did you want to wait?

Tarek Kamel: (Unintelligible).

David: Yes, Wolfgang and then Tony Holmes finally.

Wolfgang Kleinwachter: Yes. The first thing is it's not very personable to use the terminology multi-stakeholder organization. Everybody uses it because I think a lot of countries which do not like the concept have understood that say, you know, a totally in about - if say do not try to capture it.

I think the IQ has presented itself as a multi-stakeholder organization. I remember, you know, a prep meeting for the (unintelligible) where there were Enesco, UNDP and ITU in the (unintelligible) and asking who these are about the multi-stakeholder conversation.

And he said, "Look, Enesco has NGOs. This is civil society, we have to private sector. This is to private sector and it means we represent all the stakeholders."

So that means we should be very careful and make very clear what the nature of the multi-stakeholder in ICANN is. There's this equal collaboration among the stakeholders.

And the problem is that we have to demonstrate that this is a network and not a hierarchy. Multi-stakeholder isn't with government leader at the top; it's different. On multi-stakeholder model where, you know, people collaborate on an equal footing.

And I think this has to be demonstrated. And so far, it's the challenge of all our stakeholders that we have in all directions. Civil society verse the private sector, civil society verse the government, governments with the private sector that we can demonstrate this brings extra view and produces better results.

The point here is that we should be not naive. If you said, "Okay, the Internet Governance is more than naming and numbering and this will not come back."

You know, I'm not - going to (Tumi Summit) did not settle the problems, it just postponed it. And the risk is (unintelligible) process. All this will come back in the question of oversight over ICANN and control over credit resources will come back.

Countries like China and Russia do not like that they, you know, do not have the positions they want to have. And the instrument they come out to use is the principle of state serenity.

China Minister in the Budapest Conference was very clear that if we talk about principles for Internet Governance, the first principle is (silence) serenity. And then he explained it that in his understanding, (silence) serenity is the extension of national serenity into cyber space.

And if you link this to the concept with Russia introduced in the Wicket process with the National Internet segment, you know, it was far beyond perhaps 63 of the (unintelligible) agenda which recognizes the serenity of the ccTLD.

I asked the Russian guy in Dubois, you know, if a Russian citizen registers even dot com in Russia with a German registrar in an American registry, is this part of the National Internet segment in Russia? And he answered, "Well yes."

My next question was, "This is mean. The Russian legislation has expanded to the German registrar, and the American registry." And his answer was, "Probably."

So I think here we will face a problem and we have to give answers. And the challenge for ICANN is, you know, to double up more innovative interactions with the government to meet on the one hand their interests, you know, to implement serenity but serenity in a collaborative way which, you know, it's not a traditional way where the IQ is based on.

And I think a good test case could be another train where the IQ is pushing for and will not mention so far. We mentioned the business (Unintelligible) telecommunication policy form and the potentially.

But there will be the world telecommunication development conference. And so this will take place in connection with business (Unintelligible) in Egypt. And so - and they have six preparatory meetings. Their first preparatory meeting starts next week in (Motiva) for the CIS countries.

And my knowledge from the IQ is they would say, "Use this regional preparatory meeting to bring concepts in which then, you know, goes by the Telecommunications Development Conference directly in the Plenty Potentiary."

And probably this is more risky and more dangerous for the multi-stakeholder model than the conference in Wicket was. Because in the Plenty Potentiary they negotiate the convention and the constitution.

And if you bring new elements to the constitution of the IQ which extend the IQ mandate to the Internet, this is probably more risky than just (unintelligible) paragraph A or B in the (unintelligible). Thank you.

David: Thank you Wolfgang. Quickly Tony, and then we'll have Tarek wrap up.

(Tony Harris): Just two quick points and then I'd like to ask a question.

The first one was a reminder by something that Tony said that referred back to a point that Tarek made.

You expressed disappointment about the take-out from African Support group for the gTLDs. The reason that failed is because we made one hell of a mess of it. Responsibility for that should lie with all of us in ICANN. It was far too late, it was never going to work. So don't be surprised it didn't work.

The other point I was going to make is that there's been some reference to numbering and addressing in a way that could appear again. Well I can answer that question. It appears this week in the Counsel Working Group where the IPV6 is on the agenda yet again, so it's definitely not going away.

And the question I would like to pose is that we talk about Internet Governance a lot in ICANN and we should because the very future of ICANN rests upon some resolution to that issue. And ICANN meetings, we normally have a session dedicated to that. But those sessions are really an update for the community as to where we are and what's happening.'

Another questions is where in ICANN does the community come together to maximize the resource and to work on this issue? Not report back. Where is the group that deals with this? I don't think there is one.

David: Thank you.

Tarek Kamel: Or the first one or talk, yes? As such after...

David: Yes.

Tarek Kamel: This is the first answer question? You are the first one, okay.

So let me get back to - yes, I heard about the ICT Alliance recently and that you have been putting (Pier) has informed me about it. There are other initiatives for business inclusion from Africa as well. We welcome all of them within the African Initiative and the African strategy and the implementation of the African Strategy. This empowers the role of the private sector within the implementation of the African Strategy and we look forward to seeing you as well in (Unintelligible) among other initiatives as well.

And please, as I said, the (Addis) event to some extent also focusing on the development on the DNS industry in Africa. So this needs at the end a catalyst. So please help to play this role of catalyst within this community as such.

You also have - you said that you were part of the IGA Improvement Workgroup at the CSTD and the U.N. support to that.

I think that we'll not see a lot of support to the IGF although the management of this has changed, but until now the signals that we are getting are very mixed as such. So the legal issue of the previous (unintelligible) is probably is still dominant and still there. I mean let's hope for the best and keep pushing and continue to do our homework, but let's be realistic as well and realize the signals that are directed.

GAC involvement - yes, a part of the outreach that we do as governments as specifically in the developing world to invite and to participate in GAC - actively in GAC, not just remotely or sending a junior representative. No, but being there and active and let your voice heard and try to represent really the interests of your government and the public interests of your country within the GAC.

And I think part of the African strategy implementation, (unintelligible) because at the end of the day, we need (unintelligible), we need measures as this is successful after a couple of years. And what did it really add to the constituencies of ICANN? Did we increase the participation in GAC - active participation in GAC or not? So (unintelligible).

To Tony Harris from Latin America, I'm glad about what you have mentioned. And you've just hit the right spot. It is an issue of the DNS industry in the developing countries.

And as long as we don't develop the DNS industry in the developing countries, they will stay marginalized and make part of the ICANN business is related to the DNS or (unintelligible) or gTLDs or whatever.

And if we do not have a program, a workable business model for the development of the industry and the push of the industry within the developing countries, then I think we will continue to (unintelligible) the building or awareness or whatever and we will have a problem.

The group knows about the whole story that the market needs are there because the potential is there, the growth is there, and the growth of the mobile industry is just an excellent example as such. And so we shouldn't underestimate the market potential. It just needs to be stimulated.

And this is a responsibility of the local and regional industry players, but also of the global players. And this Africa I have to mention that Friday, our CEO has held together will sell you a couple of CEO round tables within the last couple of weeks with mobile registrars and address this issue with them and pledge to them that they need - they have a responsibility as stewards of this industry to go and to invest in the developing country.

And we're not asking them for charity work. No, this is to win relationships because the growth is there. This situation will happen one day in the developing market, but the real growth is in the developing countries.

The (unintelligible) growth in mobile and in broadband access is not in the U.S. and Europe. It is in the developing world.

And so they really should develop a business model and make sure that this happens.

And in this aspect, we have within our African strategy, and also I have heard that the Latin American strategy is including some aspects of that to have an innovation program, to have awards for best practices awards. Start up innovation programs for companies within the DNS industry in order really to become accredited as registrars as such.

And even if they missed as registries this time the gTLD round, there is still opportunity to work as accredited registrars for the approved registries and be successful. And become registries maybe the next time and the next round table.

So yes, we need to extend the credit on the registrars for our new work in the business model in the developing world in Latin America. And this will be done maybe by (unintelligible) program and enhancing into internship and pushing into this direction. And definitely I consider (unintelligible) and play in (Unintelligible), hopefully major role in implementation of this stretch.

Concerning the issue of the course, yes, there will always a problem of course. But honestly, it's not only a problem of financial barrier. It's lack of skills and lack of know-how and lack of ability of how to engage as such. And we should see things as they are.

My colleague from Africa, you mentioned the ITU and the GAC. The ITU - the official presentation of the ITU in the ICANN constituencies is not in the GAC. It is by something called the gTLD, technical liaison group, but understand there is organization. Together it was W3C and the IGTF and they have a representative that is a rotating within the board - a liaison within the board.

So the representation is there. How active this is, this is another question that we can debate. So the real representation of the ITU is not in ICANN. The community is not within the GAC, they must be an observer of the GAC at some point in time or something like that. But the real representation should happen by the real gTLD.

And then there was a question about the outreach destinations and bottom-up and we need to make that the message is really reaching, as Mikey has mentioned, is reaching the community. Yes, and if I may add to their own language as much as we can as such.

But this is not an easy job, this is easy said but difficult to implement. (Sallie) is working on this multi-lingual and interpretation access and multi-lingual communication all over the world. And it's not easy as such.

But yes, we need to include it and do as much as we can. And honestly, we need to recognize the efforts that have been done in ICANN within the last two years concerning at least the Web site and the development of documenting in the different languages that exist.

Avri has mentioned WTCA. Yes, there is a difference between the ISOC status ITU and the ICANN status within the ITU. ISOC is a sector membership within the ITU. ICANN is not as such.

And there has been an internal debate whether we should or we shouldn't be there as a sector membership. It has many issues as such specifically within the standards development and it needs to be considered.

So it's different than the ISOC status and the ICANN status. It's not a matter of money, the \$10,000 or whatever, the amount of money that should be paid for the sector membership.

But this is determined to be here. How is this going to be interpreted and how is this going to be perceived? I don't think this debate has come yet to answer.

Wolfgang, you talked about the equal multi-stakeholderism and the collaborative multi-stakeholderism. Yes, you are right because (Mr. Vale) thinks he's a multi-stakeholder organization as well. And by the way, he thought that 15 years ago as such, that's nothing.

And he's 16 years all ready in ITU management or 15 years. Next year it will be 16. So he's been saying that since the late 90's as such.

But definitely, this is not an equal collaborative multi-stakeholder. And we need to demonstrate that to government and show also the difference as such. And make governments accept that.

And let me tell you that even some governments in the developed world - even in the developed world - we need to confirm this message to them and demonstrate this message to them. And what does this mean, and what are the different terms and what are the different lines and how does this function? So it's not that given even in the developed world. And I don't want to mention countries by name.

You talked about whether the issue of naming and addressing goes away. No, definitely it doesn't go away with the Wicket. And we know that the (unintelligible) agenda is open for revision in 2015 and that's the biggest fact for the month is stakeholder model.

If this is really being revised and people come up and say, "Well, we gave you ten years, educate, you failed to make it happen. And it's not inclusive and it didn't work, there are challenging that are there and you didn't edit them, you didn't provide the right platform. Let's look for the alternative."

This is the biggest - not only naming an (unintelligible). It's the whole (unintelligible), the whole ecosystem. And we'll do a summit or whatever in 2015 and revisit the whole thing as such.

And therefore I always see that the IGF needs to be empowered because that's part of the ecosystem. And if this is being kept weak, this is another argument. "Well, we gave you the multi-stakeholder platform and you didn't work it as a community."

So yes, I recognize the risk and therefore we are reaching out and trying to do as much as we can with the developed world, with the middle countries, with Africa, Latin American, (Unintelligible) and the Middle East - very specifically those who have been very hesitant at the Wicket.

So there's potentially in 2014. Yes, definitely we need to be in tuned and see what will happen. There will be elections as well, you know, so it's not just one, normally there's plenty but there is a change in the management of the ITU so we need to be there.

The WTDC, I'm not sure influential it is. So if you really have specific proposals for the WTDC, bring that to us and we are ready to put it on our development agenda.

Normally ICANN was not that present at the WTDC because it's a development conference in the past in Johannesburg or previously in Turkey or whatever. But if you have as a community, very specific proposals of things that we can actually achieve within the WTDC on a regional level, and

on the global level, we are there, we shall support it. And this is now being put on our agenda.

And I have to say, it was not on the radar of ICANN in the past - on the ICANN radar on the past. But if it's an avenue, if you really recognize that it's an avenue to change things, tell us and guide us and we'll provide the resources and make this happen as much as we can.

Tony talked about the Counsel and our debate of the Counsel of the IPV6. And there's a working group that is even chaired by Egypt in that direction that is talking about IPV6 and this different roles.

And this debate will never end, it will continue. And do we have also the responsibility to make sure that we up to date with what's happening? We are responding, where are the different community players and where are the different allies and show how the multi-stakeholders really works.

With these words, I hope that I have been somewhat helpful to your questions and that to your comments. Thank you very much for inviting me this morning to join you here and for giving me over 90 minutes now or more even, close to two hours, to address this thing which direct the community.

And we stay in contact. For anything (Mandy) from our side, I mean (Mandy), would you wave again so everybody knows? Any suggestions, anything please send it to (Mandy) and she will forward this to (Sally) and myself and we will try to involve them within the Global Stakeholder Engagement plan.

Thank you very much.

David: I know they were having another commitment, but it was worth the discussion both from the constituency leaders as well as individuals. And we appreciate that because that enriched the dialogue on Internet Governance on the landscape.

If you would agree with me and people online, we have to change slightly the program. We had kind of a introduction to the topic of community needs. I thought we would just condense that and resume that discussion at 1:30 following the program as all ready published. That way we can take a break now before we prepare for the lunch at noon with the CEO.

And so if people are in agreement to do that, I would suggest we have a 30 minute break and we resume for lunch at 12:00 and then follow the same schedule as published beginning at one thirty and continuing on as we have it in the program.

So if the people who are in remote participation, if you will excuse us for that slight change, I will not short change the discussion of needs but add it to the time in the afternoon after our lunch.

And so with that I thank you very much.

END