
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the post 2014 IGF debrief call on Friday the 19th of September, 2014 at 14:30 UTC.

On the call today, we have Rfik Dammak, Fatima Cambronero, joining us a little later will be Marilla Maciel. We have Nigel Hickson. We also have Murray McKercher, Roosevelt King, Tijani Ben Jemaa, Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Wolf Ludwig, Oksana Pryhodko, Siranush Vardanyan, Cheryl Langdon-Orr, and Ron Sherwood.

We have apologies from Jean-Jacques Subrenat and Pastor Peters. From staff we have Heidi Ullrich, Silvia Vivanco, Nigel Hickson, and myself, Terri Agnew.

Our Spanish interpreters will be Veronica and David. Our French interpreters will be Aurelie and Camila.

I would like to remind all participants to please state your name before speaking for transcription purposes. Thank you very much and back over to you Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Terri. I'm Olivier Crépin-Leblond. And I just realized that this is a webinar so we didn't really need a roll call, but it will certainly help with regards to the transcript later on. So that's fine.

Welcome everybody. This is the post-IGF webinar. So we had one just before the Internet Governance Forum that took place in Istanbul,

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.

where we had some heads up about some of the hot topics and the important discussions that were going to take place in Istanbul. This webinar here is a bit more of a debrief session, post-IGF, was what happened there what we expected, did things turn out otherwise, were the sessions well attended, and pretty much reflections on what happened at the IGF.

For those of you that were at the IGF, you will remember it was a very long week with a lot of meetings, a lot of staircases, and a conference center that was very difficult to navigate through, thanks to some interesting disposition of the rooms that didn't follow each other. So one was next to eight and seven next to two. But nevertheless, we went to many, many different sessions there.

ICANN had a particularly strong presence, and when I mean ICANN, not only ICANN as in sessions run by ICANN staff, but also sessions by members of the ICANN community. And with this, we have several members of the ICANN community that have either been involved as a participant in the session, or actually organized sessions themselves. And pretty much like in the intro of our pre-IGF webinar, what we'll be asking them here really is, how did it go? And what their overall views and feelings were about what happened at the IGF.

So without any further ado, I have a list here, I'm not quite sure who is on and who is not able to speak. Let's start with the top. First we have, it says here, a presentation by Rafik Dammak. I'm not quite sure whether there is an actual presentation as such, but in any case, I believe Rafik has joined us. And oh, there is a presentation, great stuff.

Rafik was involved with a webinar called, “Developing Participation in Global Internet Governance.”

And well, I guess I can just hand the floor to Rafik Dammak.

RAFIK DAMMAK:

Thanks Olivier. Well, there is no real presentation but what’s on the screen, the description of the workshops. So, we had that workshop and surprisingly we had decent attendance, around 30 people. Quite, I think, more people from developing countries. And we tried through the panel, to kind of go through more experience from, I mean, by region. So we got the panelists from Africa, from Latin America, from the Caribbean, and small islands from Asia, and so on.

So, what was I think, first point, was that the challenge was, how to expand about ICANN and talk about engagement, at the same time, to avoid choosing acronyms that can be hard for those in IGF who are not really familiar with what is happening inside of ICANN. And so, we talked about engagement, we discussed about outreach. It was clear that outreach is not enough.

I mean, we can try to reach people, but it’s the barrier to get involved within ICANN, is quite high and there is a learning curve. So some, I mean, we got questions, even though we talked about everyone’s participation, and so on. I think that kind of, we tried to drive the discussion mostly around how to do the policy making and get people involved.

And so there was, I mean, we talked about the current strategic, strategy outreach or engagement, and strategy within ICANN. Since we got [inaudible] from the ICANN staff. But, I mean, it's mostly, I think, we find that people have a lot of questions. There are quite, talk to us about what's happening and what they can do in ICANN. So for us, the workshop is just a starter, and also kind of, for us, what is involved in participating in ICANN, kind of learning experience. It's what we can do outside of ICANN to bring people, I mean, just outreach programs is not enough.

It's how to, what kind of investment we, what work we need to do to get people, I mean to help people to get involved with. And so, some people talk about language, I mean even, we think that we are speaking English, and in ICANN the usage of a lot of acronyms or kind of ICANN jargon, can be a barrier for many people to participate. And so, I mean, this kind of [inaudible] sometimes to try to find practical solution and concrete solution.

So, good to work on outreach. It's good to work in engagement, but what we can do after that to support people participating in the policy making process. So, we talked about what exists now, but we still have to do a lot of work on that area. So this, I think, kind of what the workshop tried to do, but apparently it's just the starter. We may need to have this discussion within the ICANN community, and in the GNSO, and also with the ALAC, to see what we can do.

I mean, there are many [inaudible], but there was question about how we can, if we have the metrics, or quantitate way to evaluate or assess those initiatives. And it sounds as if it's not enough. I mean, just that

think that, for example, we participated some events, one is not enough. There was some like, maybe we can try to track how many increase of the number of participants in the working groups, and other processes maybe can have, but we don't have the metrics or the tools now to do that.

So we've got more questions than answers. And I think the indicator, it's easy for us to work more and to go beyond the outreach, if possible. With the outreach, yeah, we can try to reach people, but when we bring people, there is much more work to be done in turn to prepare them and get them participating in the processes.

So just for example, the languages, it's not just not about speaking English and translation, but it's really how to make it in plain language and [inaudible] language. So I think it's kind of [inaudible] for everybody involved with ICANN, and who interested to bring new faces, and to bring the diversity. So I'm looking to respond to all questions and to clarify. Yeah.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Rafik. It's Olivier speaking. What about next steps?

RAFIK DAMMAK: Next steps? First I'm going to make the report for this workshop, and to list kind of questions and inquiries. So that feedback. And I guess maybe if we, having that report, we can start kind of maybe [inaudible], I'm not sure if we can go, for example, to start our working group, whatever. But at least to start from somewhere. I mean, something I

hope that we can work from that and maybe, hopefully next year, having a kind of follow up workshop we can [present to company?].

And also I think what we, the kind of comments, we need to really work much more and determine how to present and introduce ICANN initiatives. Even if it was more the community I was talking, in that workshop. This is still, I think, it was not easy in that time to really form many and the participants and the audience to understand what we are talking exactly. Even if we try to be really kind of more, to introduce, to avoid to talk in jargon, or to be – talk insider, but it ought to be done.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

And it's Olivier speaking again. And the attendance in your meeting, you mentioned 30 people. Was it mostly ICANN insiders? Or did you have a lot of non-ICANN?

Now we've lost Rafik. Okay, it's one of these days. Never mind. I guess we can then move on to our next presenter, and we will come back to Rafik afterwards if any of you have questions. Certainly a lot of, as I mentioned, a lot of sessions that were run by people, members of the community and ICANN. The next person is Fatima Cambronero. She is on the Spanish channel.

Fatima, I gather you're going to speak to us about your experience at the IGF, but you are also on the MAG. And so we'd be interested to obtain an insight on how the MAG has rated this year's IGF. I have been living up to its promises... Yes? Sorry Rafik, we've now moved on over to Fatima. I was going to come back to you immediately afterwards. Well actually, Fatima, if you just allow me then.

Rafik, I just wanted to ask one more thing, which was the composition of your audience. Was it mostly ICANN insiders? Or did you have a lot of people from outside of ICANN? And in a way, does ICANN still suffer from this stigma that it suffered a few years ago where people would say, "Oh no. It's an ICANN session, we're not going to be interested in this."

RAFIK DAMMAK:

To be honest, I think that the fact that we changed it the title, it brought really new faces, many people. Many from Asia and so on. Not our insiders from ICANN. There were a few. I think just one ICANN staff and also a Board member, Olga. Really few. But most of the attendance were, I think, they had never the chance to attend an ICANN meeting. So that's a good surprise.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Great. Well thanks very much Rafik for this. Let's go now to Fatima Cambroneiro, who has a post 2014 IGF debrief. Fatima, you have the floor.

I'm not able to hear the interpreter. I'm not quite sure whether Fatima is speaking right now.

Can I just check with the interpreter please?

DAVID:

Can you hear us now Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, now I can hear you. Before I couldn't hear anything.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: So let's start again then. This is Fatima speaking for the record. And I was telling you I want to give my impression of how we saw this from the MAG, and what were our impressions, and the comments we received. As for participation, this comes from the report that we had from the MAG, the ambassador from [inaudible].

By the end of the IGF, he gave us this report. So that we can get a summary of what has happened. And this is how we know now that the participants of the IGF were 2,374 and 1,163 remote participants. This is a record really. Then we can divide this by the number of representatives in the... I'm sorry, I'm going to go back to the previous slide. You can see there that this is divided by region, this is the region where there were more participants.

There was a very high participation from the Western European countries, and then from the local host, there were 206 participants. And in the last, in the past positions, there was Latin America and the Caribbean. Then as for the stakeholders who participated in the meeting, well they were represented as follows.

There is a high participation from Civil Society with 873 participants. And we needed to also mention governments. There were 432 government representatives. And in the last positions there were the NGOs with the lesser number of participants. Now as for the resources,

we got, once the IGF finished, we can see that those who want to see the sessions again, because they could not attend, we know that there are lots of parallel sessions at the same time.

So in this screen we are seeing now the transcriptions of all of the IGF sessions. Some of them are still in the draft version. They need to be reviewed, but they can still be seen. There is also a repository of IGF videos, the link is also there. And somebody in the chat is asking what M-A-G means. This is the Multistakeholder Advisory Group that comes from the United Nations for the Internet Governance Forum.

Another resource we have is the report from the sessions. As Rafik was saying just a moment ago, each session organizer will upload the report for the workshop they conducted, and the main sessions in the MAG will cover also the reports there so that they can be seen. Now, what can you do as participants? Or we as the community as participants? What can we do if we participated in the IGF?

Well, we can complete a survey on an assessment of what the IGF was like. There is also a link that you can see at the end of screen, to access the different aspects of the IGF. You can also access the workshop. This is the workshop evaluation link that you can see there at the end. And you can go and actually complete a survey of the workshops that you have seen.

There is all of the information right there, so you can [inaudible]. Then as for the comments of IGF 2014 that we received, we as members of the MAG, as soon as the IGF was finished, we had a meeting with all of the members present there, to make a first assessment and receive a

first, fresh comment from the meeting. And we had a very positive comment on the, [inaudible] the feedback on this meeting. And we also had a, thanks to the local host, but there were some complaints, some comments that we received, and this will be used as a basis to improve next year.

As to the logistics, those who participated in person, as Olivier was saying, this was a very large convention center. We had to move large distances from one place to the other, to reach the sessions. And the signaling of the convention meeting room were confused. They were like workshop room eight and they were all mixed up, and this was something that we need to improve for next year.

All the rooms need to be more clearly identified. Another important aspect was the Internet connection, which was very unstable. We dropped the connection all of the time. And the thing is that the IGF does not only happen at the meetings, but it also happens in parallel, it's developed in the social media. And so people wanted to interact, people who were in the room wanted to interact with those who were outside, and they could not do that because the Internet connection was not working.

Now in connection with that, there were very full plugs for you to plug your device in, for you to know your batteries, charge your batteries, and this complicated the interaction and participation. These two aspects, they were aspects that were really mentioned, and probably they will need to be included in the agreement with the local hosts, which is signed when it comes to organizing the IGF.

And of course, to improve for next year addition, because we know that we need to have adaptors, the room is very nice, very comfortable, and we had no plugs. So many people had to go out, plug their devices that they had to lose part of the session. Another comment we received is the fact that this year the food for this event was not provided by the local hosts as other years.

There was also some criticism about that, because we had to go out of the room to get some food for the mid-day, for the lunchtime. We also received some criticism about some external events that were included in the IGF agenda, in the IGF website. And this gave rise to some confusion. We didn't know if it was an IGF event within the IGF agenda, or another event that was no relation to that.

I'm referring to a Google event specifically. It was also in the afternoon. And some people didn't know they had to enroll [personally?] for these events, and they would go to the IGF registration and they would not be allowed, and finally they did allow them to get in. This is what the organizers told us, but they had to give priority for those who were enrolled, to people who were enrolled for the Google event if not the rest.

And this is something that is a bit confusing, that should not happen. And we recommend that these external events are not included in the IGF agenda, in the IGF website. Probably there will be some other comments, so I am glad to receive any comments you may have regarding the logistical aspects for the next MAG meeting and the aspects that are improved for next years.

Now for the substantial aspects, there were some criticisms also. Another important issue was the specific number of panelists in each session. This presented as, from participating with the audience, with the community basically. And we could not reach our aim of really talking to the community, having discussions. We would all the time go back to the panelists, there were a lot of panelists, so they had to give the floor to all of them.

And the limit of two to five minutes in each presentation was not respected either. We also received some complaints that panelists did not have their names with the name tags that we usually see. And because there were so many, we didn't really know who was who, and we couldn't understand what they were saying.

One other criticism was that one of the moderators in this main session was not adequately trained for this role. And some of them got lost in the agenda. They didn't know who to go to, who to ask questions to, when to give the floor to the audience. And especially when to give some room to remote participation.

The MAG was actually expected to have a very interactive participation, taken as a model what happened in the NetMundial meeting, but unfortunately this did not happen. The moderators forgot to give room to the remote participation moderators, and in some cases they demanded to give that participation. So this is an aspect that we need to improve. We need to have a more interactive participation.

Another criticism we had, an internal criticism for the MAG members, was the fact that some MAG members did not really participate

throughout the whole process, throughout the process of preparing the main sessions. And they wanted, in the last moment, to change what we had done, and if they wanted to have invited other people when we already had some confirmed panelists.

This also caused the fact that we had to invite everybody, and in some sessions, there were up to 20 panelists sitting in the table. This is very difficult to handle because it's hard to have a better communication with the community. Now as for the substantial aspects again, I can bring some other comments for next year, well I am just happy to receive your comments.

As for the preparatory process for the IGF 2015, as many of you know, the undersecretary of the United Nations has already published a call to renew the MAG. The MAG is renewed on a yearly basis. One third of its members are renewed every year. So now we would have to renew just a part of the MAG members, not all of them, just one third.

So this call is published in the link that you see right now on the screen. All of you who are interested can apply, and this usually happens through a self-nomination that the process of having the support from the stakeholders that each of them represent is very important. As for Civil Society, the different organizations and initiatives that are part of this process are united so that we can have their support, a block support, of the civil society.

The society supporting these as one thing, so you can go to those links, and you can manage your interest and try to get support for participation. This is open until October 20th, so please consider this so

that you don't miss the deadline. And there is also a call for comments that is open until October 27th, and this is related to everything that we have said just now.

This is regarding the IGF process in 2014, and all of the improvements that you want to make for the IGF 2015, regarding format, attendance, distance, etc. All of these can be received, you can send it to the email that's right there on the screen. And all of those comments will be considered as input for the discussion we will hold, I mean the open presentation and the MAG meeting this year, instead of being in February, will be held in December. From 1, 2, 3 December at the ITU session in Geneva.

And the process for the 2015 IGF will start there. We will include the new MAG members that have been selected in this new process. So, those of you who want to be part of the MAG for 2015, should consider this space, and you need to make the necessary arrangements. One of the questions we usually hear is whether the MAG members receive some support to participate in this meetings.

Well, there are some supported cases that the UN provides for members of less developed countries or emerging economies. And people who have a commitment with the IGF as well as active participation within the MAG. So do consider that because one of the main reasons why we don't want to apply this, because well, we would not be able to be there in person. In some cases, there are some, there is some UN support, and some other cases, some stakeholders do get support from the stakeholders themselves.

The IGF has just launched a financial support initiative. Avri will probably be able to tell us about that, so that we can support the IGF financially. So you're all invited to get involved in this process. I am open now to any questions you may have, or any comments. And that's all. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Fatima. And I was [inaudible], yes. Any questions regarding the MAG, regarding the process? Seeing no one put their hand up, and having noted that Avri Doria has joined us on the call, I think we can certainly move over to Avri, who has been indeed involved with many, many different workshops, and has been leading in many of these, and of course has been involved with other aspects of the IGF. Avri, you have the floor on your feedback, and on your general thoughts about the IGF, and the sessions that you were involved in.

AVRI DORIA: Okay. Thank you. I assume I can be heard, I see my little microphone acting like I can be heard. This is Avri speaking. So yes, I apologize for being late to the meeting and for not having a presentation. And I'm sort of going to wonder through things, and I'll start with a couple that Fatima brought up in the last conversation.

As she was, she or at least the translator, was, it was horrid. It was far worse than disruptive. And one of the things that I really think that the MAG needs to think about is looking at parts of the host country agreement. And perhaps on things like connectivity, saying that while

it's the responsibility of the host country to provide it, it is the responsibility of the IGF secretariat to approve it.

And perhaps even to recommend who can do it. There are very few people who can do it well. You know, we've seen that at the IETF and ICANN, and a couple of organizations, have worked with one or two different provides [inaudible]. So I think that, you know, for the IGF to not have a working network is not acceptable, and it's something that the MAG in its ability to go beyond its nature as a pure programming committee, should put their foot down on.

So that's one thing. In terms of meetings like the Google tent, I actually think one of the great things about the IGF, and one of the things that is showing its reality, its importance, is the fact that it is forming a fringe. That it is forming a set of independent but related activities, whether it was the un-governance forum, the Google tent, you know, the APC book launches, and various others.

It's developing that. I agree with Fatima with putting it in the main bulletin as if it was a regular event is probably not a good idea, but I think that perhaps helping and pointing away to where this fringe either self-organized, or help them in some other way, can actually be well documented and people can know, and people can know when they do need to sign up early versus because a tent has a limited five, versus being able to just show up.

So I think looking at this wonderful opportunity that has happened, that I'm calling the, you know, IGF fringe, and trying to sort of make it, make it real, make it work. So that's one of the things that has been talked

about. I very much agree with Fatima on the whole participation notion, and the way so-called panels were set with so-called audiences.

The whole notion of a forum that has never succeeded at, and one that I think is on the MAG's plate is, how do we forget about the notion of audience? Now maybe there is a keynote speaker at some point that, yes, everyone really is an audience. Or a starlet panel that, you know, is so important that we do sit there as an audience and get the wisdom.

But by and large, the IGF should be a participation space where there are people that are enabling the participation, are leading it, are feeding it, are, you know. And there are participants, those that are there in the room and those that are there remotely. So not only does MAG need to think about its programmatic, its substantive, but it really has to think about how to make it a forum. A forum is a place where people interact, people talk.

And there were some sessions where there were attempts made, and you could see that various people were attempting. And it's still a very experimental thing. I think, you know, and this is a silly trivial thing I do, but I really think that we shouldn't speak of people as an audience. People at the IGF are participants. You know? They have different roles and responsibilities, at different times in the meeting, but they're participants in forum.

So how do we make that participation real? I'm probably already talking too much, but a couple of things I want to specifically wanted to get to. I'm being one of the, I guess, subject matter leads or something, in the best practice effort. Now the best practice effort, which is

different from a dynamic coalition, one of which I chaired until this meeting, is trying to achieve a specific outcome that we think is close in real time.

A dynamic coalition takes a subject and works on it, and perhaps has various goals, but it's basically a long-term effort on the subject. These best practices, to differentiate them because I heard a couple of people, not on this meeting, but in the past say, "What's the difference between a dynamic coalition and a best practice?" Now the best practice is something that we have been talking about for a long time in the ICANN.

And we think we're kind of ready to sort of write something down, to put out something that we can call an outcome, which is you know, inputs to other groups perhaps. It's a general recommendation, it's perhaps even a specific recommendation, but to put something down. On a couple of the best practice efforts, and I'm just going to go ahead and pick up on them, I heard they were really close.

And they were going to sort of follow on IETF process, that they got close to the face to face meeting, but they want to take it back to the list, they want to take it back to the discussions, make sure they really are ready for an outcome. In the one I'm working on, which is best practice in sort of enhancing multistakeholder practice, we think we have a set of things.

There is a document, the document needs a lot more work, so our goal is to basically work through the year, and try and basically have an outcome that's ready to be discussed a proposed outcome at the next

ITF. So the one in Brazil. And this is really two things. One, this is getting some work done, an outcome done, but this is also sort of learning, this is something new for the IGF, it's sort of you know, we can't call it a working group because that name has baggage in the UN context, but you know, a best practice team, a what have you.

I think there were some names suggested, that would... And how does something like that work? What are its modalities, and of course, you know that's very self-reflective, when the best practice we're talking about is multistakeholder practices. So that's an ongoing effort. There is a list on that. People that want to participate are encouraged to participate and so on.

So that one. The last one is, I was elected, selected, it's kind of a complicated process, to the IGF support association executive committee. And the whole point of that is to give another way for people to make donations to the IGF effort. Now this is meant to cover, you know, putting funds into the IGF trust, which funds the secretariat and some that's the overhead. And also to possibly, depending on – there is no real money yet, but depending on when there is money, to also other IGF regional and other IGF type events, or processes.

You know, still very much to be determined. And there has been some discussion of once it collects funds, can it do anything to help travelers to events. And that certainly falls within its possibilities. But again, it's still very much in startup mode. I think they just opened the bank account yesterday, but you know, all the papers aren't done yet. So it's still very much in formation, and you know, I'll update people on that as time goes on.

There is very little I can say at this point. I'll stop there.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Avri. Are there any questions or comments from anyone on the call? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. It's Olivier speaking for the transcript. NO, I see Fatima Cambronero has put her hand up. Fatima, you have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima Cambronero. Sorry I was muted, and I was trying to unmute my phone. I wanted to add some brief comments regarding the activities, the sessions, and the idea forum. There were also discussions about, I don't know if you can use the other word, agreement, but there was an agreement to focus on those activities. There were intercession activities, because this year, these best practice efforts were kind of experiment.

And they allowed the participation of the whole community by means of providing input and drafting documents. On September the 15th, the deadline for comments was closed, and now we have to see the best way to keep on working throughout the year. And from my point of view, this is very important. And I would like to add something else, but I will post it on the chat. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you for this Fatima Cambronero. Next, I see Avri you have put your hand up again. So Avri for a response.

AVRI DORIA:

Yeah. Just to note, in the one that we're working on, basically the 15th happened, from what I understood that was going to happen, was that the IGF contractor who were working on those documents were going to update them in terms of our group, we're basically going to bring it in, and start working on that document. So, you know, we'll start talking about it on the list.

Just to let you know where I'm going with it, we're going... Very much what [inaudible] we've all seen here. We're going to start talking about it on the list, I'll send out a couple of notes to people, letting them know that we're going. By the way, I share the leadership of this with George Sadowsky, and oh dear, I'm losing the name at the moment. I'll remember it in a second. But anyway. And then, you know, from the list, then we'll try to see whether we're getting the work done on list, or in whether it's [ether-pads] or dives, or what have you.

To basically work on the document, perhaps, to see where we're going with it. I'm not sure we've sort of requested that there be some continuing staff, consultants effort applied to this, but again, that's a financial issue, and try to actually make it work so that we do have a constant work between now and then. And understanding that it is still indeed experimental, and we're going to try to take picks further and further.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Avri. Olivier speaking. And certainly that's a big, big new development, since thus far the IGF was 100%, or I thought 100%, on the hosting country and on the United Nations for its funding, wasn't it?

AVRI DORIA: Yes and no. Basically, there has been an UN trust fund since the beginning. And there is a website that I can find it and give you, that shows who has donated what over the years. And some of it came from governments, some of it came from corporations, but all the money funneled in through the trust, that's still going to be the case.

Now while the IGF, as they may decide to fund other things directly, and these discussions are still so early so it's still purely speculation of hypotheticals, but if they were to decide to give money to a particular region's IGF, that would be done through different means. If they would decide to assist travelers, that can either be done through the UN, and its efforts to fund, you know, travelers from developing economies.

Or it can be done in some other means. There are several groups that fund travelers, maybe there is something else that can be done to do that. So I have no idea how that would be done. But anything that goes to the IGF secretariat, still has to go, as far as I understand, through the IGF trust with the UN. Now, you can probably donate in kind to the IGF services. So that's perhaps another way to funnel donations is to funnel and pay for an in kind service.

You know, I think that's happened in the past, for example, with the scribes. I think on occasion they have been in kind funded by some

other organization. But money to the secretariat hasn't changed. It comes in from donors. And the problem with the UN trust, probably giving you more information than anybody wants, is that it involves establishing a contract between the donor and the UN.

And so what's going to basically happen is the IGF support organization, once it has got money, once it is actually established, will have to then negotiate a relationship with the UN trust, so that it can then give money that way. You cannot just say, "Oh, I like the IGF, I want to give \$100." That's the kind of donations and such, or even I want to give \$1,000 if you're a corporation, that's the kind of donation work that the ITF is a is in, for any of the big institutional donors, or for governments, you know, direct pipeline into UN trust is still probably their best bet.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thanks very much for this extensive explanation Avri. And we are running out of time now. So let's move swiftly over to Marilla Maciel, who is a part of the NetMundial organizing committee, and is going to be able to speak about her experience at the IGF in Istanbul. Marilla, you have the floor.

MARILLA MACIEL: Thank you very much Olivier. This is Marilla speaking. I'll probably be brief, this is good because we're running out of time, but many people have mentioned [inaudible] I was going to comment. I'll just make some brief comments about the IGF, and try to lead with the IGF that is going to take place next year in Brazil.

First thing that I think I would like to remark is that, some news that is happening in the preparatory process of the IGF, there was a true attempt to try and show that NetMundial call for [inaudible] IGF while the [secretary heard?]. This has much [inaudible]...of the recommendations on the working group of IGF improvement.

We've published the report in 2012, and not much has happened with this report since. But political positions have changed, some of the actions that were a little bit [inaudible] to introduce changes to the IGF, suggests strengthen it, making it more [inaudible] oriented, have changed their view.

I think this is related to the fact that we need to show that...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Marillia? We might have lost you. I think we've lost Marillia. Can we just check with bridge please, or was she on the Adobe? Looks like Marilla has dropped. Okay, let's move to Leon Sanchez then, if Leon is on the line, and then we'll come back to Marilla afterwards. I'm mindful of the time. Leon, your experience at IGF, what was it like? I see you were busy everywhere. Give us your feedback.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Olivier. Besides monopolizing a little table in the cafeteria, yes I was very busy, because it was my first time IGF, so I was a little bit lost in the IGF, but I guess I sent a presentation, which I wish could be uploaded. But in the midterm since we are time constraint, I'm going to go on to my comments. What caught my attention on the

idea were some points, like methodology debate, the copyright of Internet governance discussion, the government's role in Internet governance, the mandate [renewal], the IGF supporting association at the [inaudible] world process.

On Net Neutrality, it strike me as surprising and not quite [inaudible], that in terms of something, on the fact that not all packets have to be treated equal. And well he explained, of course, that there were some traffic shaping, time concerns, and different ways of managing packets, that not necessarily were thought to be a threat to Net Neutrality.

And this also led to some comments on whether there should be any kind of legislation or agreements in a more former way than to establish the way that Net Neutrality is [inaudible], and well, my thoughts were, good luck with that, and good luck with trying to get by Net Neutrality as a fixed thing. Because although one of the comments in the discussion was that the net neutrality concept was not something fixed, and not something singular, in the way that different definitions could apply to different contexts, and different situations, and in this way, the Net Neutrality definition should be treated as a flexible and not singular concept.

And also, I remember Alexandro Pisanty saying that the opinion of Net Neutrality was taken like the return to lost paradise at this stage. With regards to copyright on Internet governance, I stepped into some sessions filled with copyright creativity and the discussion with Internet governance. And one of the topics that caught my attention was using local contents, and fostering local content creativity as drivers for

development in those countries that have not reached a certain penetration of wide band services.

And this was thought to be a driver because in some way, the more local content you have to offer to the community, the more interested the Internet Service Providers will be in investing on penetration to carry those contents to the population. Also the global licensing discussion was another topic in this context. And several rights holder representatives just said that this was not an option. They don't think that globalizing of contents is something that can be done at this stage.

And of course they are considering to license their content on a local basis, which carries the problems that we're faced with their regional content only available on a certain geographic region and not globally as the Internet is. And well, another topic was the... copyright reform, which is not likely to happen in the short future, but it's certainly something that is in the interest in many actors and many groups.

And I think this is something that we should keep an eye on, because I don't see just take away copyright away from the Internet governance at this stage. Then the government role, well, we have the usual suspects, and people's, as I see them. But I don't know if it was the usual discussion within hearing about the fragmentation of the Internet, about sovereignty of governments regarding the Internet governance.

And well, this is something that is going to continue I guess, and I think we should also keep an eye on this. And on the mandate renewal, there was a concern, at least that was my impression, that there was a general concern on whether the mandate would be renewed to the IGF

[inaudible] after Brazil in 2015. And of course, the announcement that if renewed, then the IGF for 2016 would be held in Mexico.

And at the end of the meeting, I had the feeling that there was a general confidence that the renewal will be coming next [inaudible] UN. But there is also a backup plan, as I see it, which is the constitution of the IGF supporting organization, which has already been addressed by many of my colleagues previously. And I think this is a smart move in order to not be tied into having [inaudible] by the UN, and for the community to keep the process and the discussion going on Internet governance.

And finally, the MAG renewal, which I think Fatima has already addressed very well, and I wouldn't have anything to add to this MAG renewal process. And of course, now I'm open to questions. So thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Leon. And yes, the floor is open for questions. We've got a few problems with Marillia currently dropping in and out of the call. So as soon as she is stable again on the call, we'll go back to her. But in the meantime, questions. And I see Avri Doria, you have the floor.

AVRI DORIA: Yeah, thanks. I have one question about the MAG renewal. One of the things that I think I noticed in the coordinated group for Civil Society, is that they are also looking for endorsements or whatever, for those who are qualified to stay on. In other words, having worked less than three

years, and that they may indeed see, and we endorse these folks persisting, who can. So I'm not sure that it's just new members that need...

I think I noticed something in their writing saying, and continuing members that want to continue, you know, perhaps they need to take some action as well. And this is just on the Civil Society side. I don't know what the, you know, Internet community [inaudible]... or business, I have no idea what [inaudible]... Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Avri. Fatima Cambronerero.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima. Thank you Olivier. This is Fatima for the record. When it comes to Avri's comment, in the internal list of the MAG, this question was posed to all of the stakeholders, not only for the Civil Society representative. What happened with those who were interested in having a second or third term, because firstly, the term is only for three years. But when it comes to that concrete question, if we are already on board and we want to continue, do we need to nominate someone? Or do we need to be candidates? Well that is not necessary.

We do not have to [inaudible] or be candidates again, but for those people who were not able to contribute, but then it wouldn't be necessary to apply again for that position. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thanks for this comment Fatima. Are there any more questions or comments on this? I've heard a lot about the organizational part of the IGF. Leon, do you have any, I mean you have spoken to us, of course, about the different sessions and the different topics, I wonder with everyone else on the call, what their thoughts were of the different topics. Has the quality of discussion improved, or are we rehashing the same discussion this last year in previous years?

Has there been an improvement? Are we seeing that there are results being gained year on year? Just throwing this question to everyone.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much Olivier. This is Leon Sanchez again. Well the thing is that it was my first ITF, so I don't have a point of comparison of whether we've been improving the discussions and the output itself. The idea. But what I can tell you, at least from my side, regarding, for example, the intellectual property of discussions, I think that most of the discussions are being rehashed, and I don't see any progress on trying to find new solutions to old problems that, of course, Civil Society, copyright holders, and technical community have been facing through the last years.

I think that we need to, of course, redress the abuse of this problem, in trying to find [inaudible]... I mean, at least from my view, we've been discussing the same topics and the same problems, and try to provide the same solutions for at least the last 10 years. So I don't see that the debate level at the IGF, at least on the copyright regarding Internet governance topic is improving at all.

I mean, we feel like we're just speaking to a wall... Speaking to the vacuum on both ends, from Civil Society and also from rights holders. Everyone is just having their own [side?] told again and again and again. I mean, we're not reaching any solutions on this side. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay thank you for this Leon. I see Michel Tchonang.

MICHEL TCHONANG: Good evening, this is Michel. I hope you can hear me.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes we can hear you. Welcome.

MICHEL TCHONANG: I would like to go back to Fatima's intervention. She was speaking on representing Civil Society. It's true that this renewal can be done for two, three terms, but I think we can take part in this process, so that we can avoid having the same representatives of the social, of the Civil Society. Because otherwise, we always hear the same views, and we never hear from other members of the society.

So we get this impression that we follow the same doctrines over and over again, and it's quite redundant so that might be disturbing. And my idea is that we might integrate new players to represent Civil Society in the MAG, and that would be more useful. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Michel. Fatima Cambroner.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima Cambroner. Thank you Olivier. Two brief comments. One regarding Leon's comment in terms of the topics being [inaudible] throughout time. Well, I do agree with you Leon. And this has been detected and this has also been discussed in the capacity building working group within the MAG.

And this is a constant concern because we see the topics are being repeated and there is no evolution or adjustment in the topics to be debated. So every forum that might be implemented, but it's not the only one, and may not be all problems is to organize these orientation sessions for newcomers. This year, we offered, and this was an experience, and experiment in fact, we organized three webinars in coordination with the regional IGF.

There were two for Africa in English and one for Latin American in Spanish. And the idea is to put people on the same page. Put the community on the same page. There was also an orientation, or a guiding session, within the IGF, to let people know about the situation of the IGF for newcomers. But we know this is not enough to solve the problem, and this also is related to the nature of the IGF. This is a discussion, a debate forum. This is not a decision making forum.

We are not deciding upon, or we are not discussing text. And this is something that has to do with the IGF. And the idea is to have new participants, and these new participants may possibly ask questions, good questions, and perhaps those questions being asked have already

been asked. So sometimes it's difficult to coordinate everything, because this is a coordinated discussion forum, and we need to advance in the topics being discussed.

The way we are trying to solve this is by means of training sessions. But this is not the only idea, and if you have better or new ideas, I will welcome them. When it comes to Michel's comments, well, I do agree with her as well. There are members of MAG that are being repeated, and at the very beginning of the year, there were people who participated in the first MAG.

And they have been there since then. So the mechanism for renewal belongs to each stakeholder group, but I know that there are members in the MAG, from the very beginning. So we need to keep on working to achieve the renewal because they are people who sometimes do not work, they do not contribute and they're still there. They remain. So I do agree with that comment.

We need to seek renewal, those who are members of the MAG, we need to offer new answers to our stakeholders for them to support us and to keep on working, and to see if they want to remain there or not. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Fatima. And so we'll move down our list of speakers. We still have Nigel Hickson. Marilla unfortunately hasn't managed to come back to us yet. So, we we'll move down to Nigel and so Nigel Hickson, you have the floor.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, yes. Sorry good afternoon. I've just got off mute, and good afternoon to everyone. Thanks for this opportunity. I certainly won't speak for long because I'm in a noisy station, so you don't want to listen to me anyway. It's a bit noisy here. I'm at King's Cross Station, which is, you know, not a small station in London.

I just wanted to cover a couple of things. I found the discussion so far very interesting. I think there has been some really interesting points made. And one thing I was going to say at the end, but I'll say it now, I think what has just been said about the MAG is just so important because it is the MAG that directs a lot of the content of the IGF, and it's the membership of the MAG that is needed to, if you like, rejuvenate certain types of discussion.

And I absolutely agree there is no point in having a discussion on copyright, it's no point having a discussion on Net Neutrality, or privacy, or any of these, if you like, sort of public policy issues. If we just had the same positions being presented. You need something new. You need some new slant on these issues, I think, to be able to move the topic along. And I have a lot of sympathy with that view, and therefore the MAG renewal gives the opportunity of new people to come in.

I had the privilege of being on the nominating committee for the technical community. I'm not a MAG member. I never have been. But I will certainly do my best, though we choose some good people in the technical community as we have done in the past, and I'm sure we'll do so again.

So on the IGF issue in Istanbul, I was going to mention the ICANN, you know, participation, as I think Olivier said at the beginning. It was quite a strong ICANN participation, mainly because the ICANN Board were there in force, because they, not just because of the IGF, although they do contribute, and made their participation felt, but there was also a retreat in Istanbul the following week.

So a lot of the Board members came early and stayed on at the retreat. So we had Board members and we had ICANN staff up there, organizing certain sessions. And of course, we had community members contributing to sessions and taking part as well. In terms of the ICANN sessions themselves, and you know, we're just a small part of this overall equation. We organized the open forum, which is something we've done over the last few years, which is essentially a sort of opportunity for people to come and ask questions of ICANN.

And I think this year we did manage to address some slightly different topics, so I think that was quite good. We organized a session on globalization, which Wolfgang [inaudible] co-chaired, Olivier was on the panel for that. Again, I think that covered a number of aspects on the globalization of ICANN, which were quite important. We got questions on such issues as the legislative base of ICANN, and where it might be based in the future, etc.

So some quite interesting topics. We then had a session on accountability, which was a session that was organized by Theresa in the community to discuss the accountability process that's ongoing in light of the NTAA transition. We had a session on topic responsibility, which looked at the role that ICANN is taking in terms of public

responsibility and the team in ICANN doing that. And we also had a town hall session, which a number of people were involved in.

This was slightly odd, very odd, not in a prerogative way, but I mean, it didn't fit into the normal IGF time table. But it was a session called to discuss the accountability process in particular, and the concerns that the ICANN community had with the proposals being made by the staff and the Board on ICANN accountability.

So that was I think an useful session in which a number of players on this call took part and contributed to. Looking at the overall IGF, I mean, I don't think it stands to give a definitive view. I mean, I think it was a very useful IGF. I'm not no expert to IGFs, this is only my third. I think it was quite a serious IGF, in that it looked at a number of issues in a fairly serious way. And of course, you know, there are a number of issues that are ongoing.

The first day, the day zero, I think is worth mentioning. This day zero, I know, causes some confusion. It certainly causes confusion to me. I don't particular like the term at all, but that's not up to me. But day zero is supposed to a day when things happen that aren't on the program, but I think the problem is that people come along and see things on the program, and then wonder if it's part of the program or not on the program.

But during day zero this year, we did have the Turkish government had a high level session, which actually I think was open really to anyone that wanted to turn up at it. And this high level session really just included a number of policy statements from government ministers that

were there, and other, not just government ministers, but also stakeholder leaders, and businesses also gave brief policy statements.

So Fadi Chehadé of ICANN was invited to give a policy statement, [inaudible] with the ITU, and a number of other participants. Also during that day, there was a session on NetMundial, the Brazilians sort of spearheaded a session on NetMundial, looking up the processes that led up to the NetMundial conference last April, or this April.

And also the output from it, how the document on principles, how that was formed, how the roadmap on an ecosystem was formed as well. And I think that was quite an useful session, and also allowed the audience to reflect, and people to reflect on what had happened a few days before the IGF, at the world economic forum in Geneva. As many of you know, there was an initiative hosted by the world economic forum called the NetMundial initiative, which was essentially trying to take forward some of the ideas from NetMundial in a fairly interesting sort of situation.

And that's going to lead to a [inaudible] of world leaders and other leaders that gathers in January. And there are various other initiatives to do with that as well. So I think I'll stop there. I'm happy to answer any questions, but again, ICANN are only one of the inputs to this. I think it's important that some of the points that have been made about Internet and other practical issues are taken into consideration.

I do, I can fully understand... I have problems on the Internet access. I mean, it is something, and the remote participation I think is something that we can always do better on, because it's just so important that

people are able to take part. And thank you for the opportunity. I apologize for Baher. It's a holiday for him today, and I knew he wanted to join, he would have given a much more lucid presentation than I could do.

But I think he, in the end, couldn't make it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Nigel. Are there any questions or comments on Nigel's feedback on the IGF? I don't see anyone putting their hand up. It's Olivier speaking. I have a quick question for you Nigel. There has been a mention earlier of the IGF fund, and you've mentioned in the chat that ICANN has been a supporter of the Internet governance forum.

Does that change the relationship between the IGF and ICANN, if a fund starts being put together?

NIGEL HICKSON: No, I don't think so. I mean, this initiative on this new association to raise money for the supporters, which is partly to do with raising money for the IGF, is something that we're supportive of I think. Tarek [inaudible] is on the Board of Trustees, or on the Board of something. So I mean, ICANN have always been a supporter of the IGF. I mean we talked to the UN about it. I mean, it's no secret that we would like the UN to support it in a bit of a stronger way.

You know, in terms of staff resources. I think the, I mean the UN do obviously back the, they provide staff resources in [inaudible] would like them to be a bit more supportive sometimes on this, because it's so

important. And [inaudible] say is that we are vigorously pushing within our mandate, if you like, the IGF the renewal of the mandate. The UN [inaudible] committee in New York this fall.

And as part of my sort of my role in Internet governance for ICANN on lobbying, you know, member state and other countries so we can get a 10 year mandate or whatever out of the UN. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for this Nigel. Olivier speaking. So the floor is still open. I haven't seen anyone put their hand up. I've got another question which might be a bit provocative in some way. We're seeing the NetMundial initiative have a follow up with the world economic forum, we're seeing it, hopefully, funded in the long term thanks to the new home [inaudible]. We're still seeing some question as to the IGF's future, and we're also seeing some repeat in the debates with participants being entrenched in their position and not actually moving forward.

Is NetMundial set to replace IGF?

NIGEL HICKSON: Well, I'm sure it's not. I mean, it's not for me to.... No, certainly not. NetMundial is an initiative. Was of course something that the Brazilian government decided what was needed, and we, ICANN certainly supported it in that. One looks at the output from NetMundial. It mentions IGF as being the predominant forum for discussion and debate on Internet governance issues.

And I think it has to be, and as we said earlier, perhaps sometimes it needs to do slightly better in taking forward the debate, in terms of the subject matter. But it is the predominant forum, it's the only forum that there is, you know, someone can come along for the first time and be involved in a global debate on a range of Internet governance issues.

And I don't think there is any notion that that could be replaced. What it does not do, necessarily of course, is find solutions for individual Internet governance issues. You heard Fadi and other ICANN staff talk about this. What it doesn't do is, it lies on to the individual question of where the, you know, the minister from Rwanda, or whatever can have his problem solved on spam or his problem solved on private security.

It doesn't provide necessarily a route for solving problems on Internet governance issues, which is something that certainly it was discussed at NetMundial. But no, I'm sure the IGF will continue.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you Nigel. And then a final question for you, and for others on the call of course. We've got this small event taking place in a month's time, called the ITU [inaudible]. Have you seen any discussion at IGF that was a forerunner to the ITU [inaudible]?

NIGEL HICKSON: No, no. it was quite a relief actually, given that I'm spending a lot of time preparing for the ITU [inaudible]. It was sort of a relief not to have to discuss it at the Internet Governance Forum. But no, I don't think

there was. There might have been, other people might have heard it discussed, but there was no formal sessions.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Interesting. I'm asking this, of course, because the next MAG meeting will take place at the ITU headquarters, so I felt it was interesting as there is a link on the UN side. But maybe I'll just leave it up to room bookings. But it doesn't have seem to be much discussion about the forthcoming [inaudible] at the IGF itself.

So maybe that's the nature of the meetings. We have a few minutes left on this call. Have we managed to get Marilla back? Or has she definitely off the call?

Okay. Well I'm not getting any answer on those questions, so I gather the question is, yes, we've not managed to get Marillia back. Any questions to any of our presenters actually today? I see no one on this. So I'm going to come up with a shameless plug, just because prior to this call, I shared the call on the cross-community working group on Internet governance, and the attendance there wasn't that great on this occasion, possibly because it is a Friday.

But the working group still has not received any feedback on its charter, and so if anyone is involved in some of the other communities of ICANN, so other than just At Large, then please mention this. It is important as the working group is really a way for the community to make itself not only known, but to discuss some of these issues that we are seeing at IGF, that unfortunately don't have a home at ICANN.

Fatima Cambroneró?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima speaking. Thank you Olivier. Just a brief comment regarding the comment Oksana posted on the chat room. The group for capacity building in demand, has also roundtable for discussion on IGF initiatives. I mean, initiatives related to Internet governance. And one of the recommendations coming from this group, which would be published in the [inaudible], is the fact that next year, we should be able to create a best practices forum as we had many of them this year.

But focusing, in this case, on Internet governance forums, regional and international forum. There are many organizations that are now focusing on holding national IGF in countries where they do not have them, and to try to strengthen the local IGF. So for next year, maybe we could have these best practices forum, and we could hold the process right there to reach the meeting by the end of the year with this result. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for this Fatima. And so, just in closing this call, and the conclusions and next steps, this year the At Large community was present at the IGF, but mostly through any means and through the special budget requests, which we usually manage to have. The two workshops which were proposed, but one by AFRALO and one by APRALO, were unfortunately not allowed, so not kept by the MAG.

I'm not quite sure why or how it came through, but it would be maybe a good idea for next year, since we do have people on the MAG, to make sure that we are aware of the discussion on the MAG's big themes for the year, and make sure that the workshops which are communities present to the IGF fall in line with the kind of workshops that the MAG are looking for.

So we'll have the higher chance, at that point, of being able to have those workshops on there. So, that's currently, I think one of the takeaways that we can have with regards to this year. Apart from this, I was very pleased to see that many chairs of SOs and ACs were able to meet with the Board, and with ICANN senior staff on a daily basis. We were all on the same hotel, and managed to have breakfast on a daily basis.

And that actually helped a lot in other side issues, including the ICANN accountability session, or accountability process, and transition of stewardship, etc. The concern I had with regards to the ICANN led workshops, is that the room was still usually very full of the usual suspects, faces, and I think I will echo also, I think it was Avri who mentioned the lack of participation as far as the audience was concerned.

The audience was considered an audience in the main hall. And not as for participants, and that was a bit of a shame. And in fact, many of the workshops, or some of the workshops, had some very large panels, and therefore gave very little time for attendees and participants to actually participate. And finally, one of the workshops that I was very blessed to

have been able to chair, was one which was organized by [inaudible], who is from one of our At Large structures in Australia.

And the workshop was to do with accessibility for disabled people, Internet accessibility for people with disabilities. We've forgotten a billion people that are around the world and that are not able to access the Internet using the standard means, as one would say. Of course, there was an issue because the conference center was on many different levels, and one of the participants had to take a good lift, so a good elevator, which was filled with tomatoes.

So that certainly showed, certainly in some cases, the provisions for people with disabilities, both on the physical level and face to face meetings, but also as we all know in websites, etc., still needs a lot of work, and this I guess was my take out from this. We take it for granted that we're able to go from A to B, and see and hear and do everything. But that's not the same for everyone.

And that's one thing we probably have to look at further. So, without any more rambling on my part, I thank you all for all being here and having spent the hour with us. So the 90 minutes with us. I thank all of our panelists for having been able to provide us with their insight. And of course, many thanks to the interpreters, Veronica and David on the Spanish channel, and Aurelie and Camila on the French channel.

When we have people on the channels speaking, it sometimes sounds like we are speaking to them directly, and we tend to forget that there is someone who is doing the hard work of interpreting from one language to the other. So thanks very much for this.

Ladies and gentlemen, this has been an excellent session. Good morning, good afternoon, good evening, good night, and have a good weekend everybody. This session is now adjourned. Bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]