
TERRI AGNEW: Good morning, good afternoon, and good evening. Welcome to the At-Large webinar on the ITU Planning Plenipotentiary Conference Debrief, on Monday the 24th of November, 2014.

We will not be doing a roll call, as it is a webinar, but if I could please remind everyone on the phone bridge, as well as the computer, to mute your speakers and microphones, as well as state your name when speaking, not only for transcription purposes, but to allow interpreters to identify you on other language channels.

We have Spanish and French interpretation. Thank you for joining, and over to you Alan Greenberg.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Terri. This is my first webinar that I'm hosting, so you can expect a little bit of lack of smoothness that we're used to with Olivier, but I'll do my best. We have a large number of speakers today. And I must thank Olivier for doing the organization. As I was watching the agenda, day by day, the speakers kept on changing and we have significantly more than we thought we were going to have.

So I hope we'll have enough time to do all of this without cutting our speakers off too short, and making sure we have some time for questions. It looks like we have, speakers have, between them, divided up the work, so I was going to give a bit of an introduction on what the plenipotentiary conference is, but it looks like we're going to have Tarek

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.

who is going to be doing that. So I will just immediately turn it over to Tarek Kamel.

I hope he's still on the line.

TAREK KAMEL:

Yes. This is Tarek Kamel. Good evening, good afternoon, good morning everybody. Thank you Alan for the invitation, and I'm delighted to participate with the team on this webinar related to the ITU plenipotentiary. I will start by an introduction about ICANN delegation to the ITU as a background, before I then hand over to my colleagues for them to talk about the plenipotentiary conferences and its role, as well as what happened in [inaudible].

And first of all, as you all might know, ICANN Board decided a couple of years ago, to embark on, or to support a strategy that will open a dialogue with the ITU, and we have participated in the [wicket] at that time. Our president and CEO, Fadi Chehadé, gave as a first speech as the ICANN president at an ITU global event.

And we started really a dialogue with the ITU leadership that is based on a mutual respect of a remit, mutual respect on areas of cooperation. Indeed, we were all clear that we don't have an agreement on all topics, but at least there is a mutual respect on the remit and the areas of coordination. Since we have established the office in Geneva last March, we have also intensified our dialogue with the ITU.

As such, we are participating in several committees, as well as several regional preparatory meetings for the plenipotentiary conference.

Plenipotentiary conference is the general assembly, so to say for the ITU, it happens once every four years. And since Minneapolis, actually since 1998, since they started to discuss the WSIS, and the importance to introduce the world summit for mission society in Geneva and Tunis, the Internet started to be an important issue at ITU plenipotentiary, and we started to see the first revolution back in 2002 in Marrakesh, as well as in 2006 in Turkey, and 2010 in Guadalajara.

Indeed, ICANN was active in the different plenipotentiary meetings at this time, very special involvement in cooperation with ISOC, a sister organization, ISOC that was coordinating the overall effort of technical community as well as the RIRs as such. We went to Busan quite open-minded as ICANN staff, and with the support also of the rest of the attending ICANN communities, I think we have reached a quite satisfactory result that we are quite satisfied with.

We don't necessarily want to draw a rosy picture for the outcomes. My colleagues will talk about it in more detail, and once the effect and once the impact on ICANN with the outcome that we have seen. But indeed, we have emphasized the remit of ICANN, seen more acceptance in general for ICANN's role and ICANN's remit. We were not the enemy anymore, as we choose to be in the past, but the people, the members just realized that there is a dialogue, and there was definitely a by far better overall atmosphere in the plenipotentiary 2014 in Busan as the previous, which reflected positively on the overall results of the conference.

Indeed, it is worth a very intensified discussion, in light of what has happened, where the different member states stand, what the different

positions are, what do we need to exert effort on more engagement with member countries as a government engagement and IGO team. What do we need more community support and effort as well to help us with this overall engagement, while we are moving forward to 2015, which is an important year for the global IG debate and for ICANN. Very specifically, move to the IANA stewardship transition and move to the UN WSIS ATLAS review process, as well as the IGF renewal mandate, and many interesting issues.

So I think the Busan has very helpful to show up, the latest update, what were the new positions. And we have been quite pleasantly surprised to a great extent by a new positions from different players that has been, and will be helpful to guide us forward while we are moving forward. We would like to stress that we would like to work closely with the community, who has a lot of experience to guide us in the different regions while we move forward, within our engagement strategy, whether in the regions as well as the IGO's in light of Busan, which has been a very helpful event for all of us.

So I will stop here with this introduction, and I will invite my colleague, Nigel Hickson, who sits next to me in the office in Geneva, to continue the overview. But as I said, I look forward to constructive dialogue at the end of our presentation, and guidance from the community as well to be heading in our engagement strategy, not only in this call, but also via emails or in future calls. Thank you very much Alan and with that, I hand over to Nigel Hickson.

NIGEL HICKSON: Good evening and good day everyone. Can you hear me okay? Is it too loud, or too soft, or about right?

ALAN GREENBERG: You're just fine.

NIGEL HICKSON: That's not what most people say. So I won't take too much of your time because other people would want to ask questions, and I know you want a discussion on some of the topics. But I thought that, in case there are some newcomers to the webinar, in terms of the understanding of the ITU, I'll just put up a couple of slides about, as most of you will know, the [inaudible] of the UA in terms of telecommunications.

And of course, it has its 150th birthday next year in Geneva. So anyone in Geneva, please come along and wish a happy birthday for 150 years. It is [inaudible] a role in telecommunications over that time. Of course, we're going right back to the days of the telex and the telegram, etc. and now up to date. The plenipotentiary conference is a yearly affair, as was recognized by the name, that takes places really to define the work program for the next four years, and also to elect new officers into their respective posts in the ICU, and we'll come on to that in a minute.

It's the only [inaudible] conference in that every four years, the ITU has the opportunity to change its constitution and convention, which means it can effectively change how it works, what it does, what its membership criteria, etc. If we go to the next slide, very briefly, the

following slide just really gives you a brief representation of the three parts of the ICU.

So as I said, at the top, you have the plenipotentiary conference, which effectively contains the constitutional convention. You then have the ITU council, we're going down, I see that, thank you very much. You have the ITU council, which is, if you like, is the governing body of the ITU. It's made up of representation of governments from each region. And then underneath that, we have sort of three operating legs of the ITU, sorry, of the ITU. You have the radio sector, which deals effectively with spectrum allocation of spectrums for various purposes, and has its own conference, the World Radio Conference, the WRC, which is a fairly major affair.

You then have ITUT, which is I suppose we have most to deal with, that deals with standards, and technologies, and Internet issues. And then you have ITUV, which is the development side of the equation, concerned with access and development of broadband community. And here we also have a [inaudible] in terms of our work on multilingualism and the IDN, etc.

So go down to the next slide. What happened in Busan? Really, to give you a snapshot, as I said, the plenipotentiary is an opportunity to elect the ITU official leadership. And at this plenipotentiary, there were quite a few elections that we'll look at in a moment. To improve the ITU strategic plan, and the financial plan for 2016. This is very much like ICANN from time to time, having meetings to improve the strategic and financial plan.

The ITU has a strategic plan that they consult the membership on [inaudible]. And the strategic plan really outlines the high level of work objectives for the ITU. And the financial plan, which was approved in Busan, but interestingly has to be opened up for modification during the meeting because the financial contributions, the ITU, as most of you probably know, is financed through contributions from member countries.

Member countries give various amounts depending on their will, so to speak, and also [inaudible] members, businesses, other members also contributes. So at the start of this conference it became clear that some governments were giving less than expected, and therefore the financial plan had to be redrawn. There were no changes to the [inaudible]...

...the ITU or the members might call for a change to the constitution, could have, if you like, expand [inaudible] the work for the ITU, but that did not happen. So the main business in Busan, as the last slide shows, is agreeing new resolutions, and modifying different resolutions. And these are the resolutions that really need to find the work of the ITU. These are the resolutions that are general, there are [inaudible] various parts of the ITU to carry out the work.

Briefly, the next slide, is the outcome of the elections, and many of you would have seen this before. So we had elections for this plenipotentiary at the ITU secretary general, he was unopposed. [Inaudible] secretary general show [inaudible] of the UK won that slot. The [inaudible] and the [inaudible], and Mr. [inaudible] and Mr. [inaudible], unopposed. And in the ITUT, that's why Malcom Johnson come from, if you like, [inaudible] disappointed [inaudible].

I want to just briefly touch on coordination that we had for the plenipotentiary. As you can see from these two slides, the coordinated, as agreed, to ISOC, ISOC [inaudible], yeah [inaudible] coordination. We coordinated with ISOC and other ISTAR organizations, the RIRs on the ground. I think it was a good collaborative effort. We were a number of people, obviously there, including plenty of people from the At-Large community that were able to be there as well.

And also during the conference, we produced an ICANN and ISOC blogs. In terms of the ICANN contribution, I think the staff there, and I mentioned the team on the ground there, Michele, [inaudible], Kelly from the [inaudible] and myself, and we had different roles, depending on what delegations we were in. As you know, ICANN doesn't have a delegation as such, it doesn't have a flag as such, some of the governments and some of whatever institutions.

But all in all, I think the team equipped itself well, and as I said, worked with ISTARs, worked with other governments, and worked well with the ITU staff. So, finally, just a few other observations, from the conference, strategic messages. I think as Tarek has already mentioned, if you go to the next slide, thank you. As Tarek has already mentioned, I think it was a success for the ITU. One down, you've gone two down. It was a success with the ITU leadership. It was a well-run conference. Can you go down one slide?

Sorry, we've just [inaudible] one slide, no, the other way. Keep going, you've got it. Yeah, yeah. So yes, it was well-run, a well-run conference [inaudible]. So it was a good overall atmosphere. Tarek touched on that, not [inaudible] [wicket], or even like the previous plenipotentiary

in Guadalajara in 2010. The chair, the Koreans, were actually determined to run a good ship, and they did run a good ship.

This wasn't to say that the issues were non-political, there were some taxing issues, in terms of the financial plan, and some of the Internet issues, which many would mention, and also political issues such as Ukraine and [inaudible]. But generally speaking everyone cooperated well, [inaudible] compromises in different ways forward.

So I think it was a success for the ITU on that basis. And as I said at the bottom there, we adopted a slightly new multistakeholder approach on Internet issues, which we will then perhaps catch on later. So just finally, if we can have the next slide, I just outlined some [inaudible] and opportunities there, my 10 minutes is up, so to speak, so I'm not going through that in any detail.

I think you can see that, as Tarek said, you don't want to be complacent about this. You think [inaudible] to resolve, we think there was greater recognition for the role of the technical community and other stakeholders. But clearly, we've got a lot of work to do. An interesting development on the [inaudible] involvement of stakeholders [inaudible] account of work to do on the Internet public policy, and that's something that we'll be tracking very carefully, no doubt with others in the ICANN community.

So I'll finish there, and be very glad to be involved in questions later on. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Nigel. There is a bad echo from somewhere. We do have some extra time, so if you would like to go over the slide that just disappeared on the threats and what happens. It turns out the whole agenda did not add up to an hour and a half, so if no one else is going to be doing that, I wouldn't mind spending a few minutes on reviewing what was on slide 10 if it ever comes back on the screen.

NIGEL HICKSON:

So thank you very much Alan. I don't want to take too much time, so very briefly, I think, as I said, one of the opportunities that we put down... This slide is a slide which I suppose I should have outlined. So the black text we wrote before the plenipotentiary, and I'm just added on the [inaudible] text, to what I wrote before the plenipotentiary.

So, one of the opportunities is to clearly have a recognition of the role of ICANN and the ISTAR organizations. And that is realized in a sense, especially the role of ICANN in terms of international domain names. There was also an opportunity to, if you like, balance out the role of the ITU and other organizations. In the existing text that was agreed at Guadalajara, there was a recognition that ITU had a leading role, but this was in the text, if you like, and we would have quite like to, if you like, got rid of that language to say the ITU has a role and other institutes have a role as well.

So that wasn't the [inaudible]... The threats, of course, came from a number of different proposals. There was, as you can see, the Russian area, the old sort of Soviet bloc area, proposal to ask the ITU to setup a regional Internet registry, or to setup an Internet registry, and that

wasn't accepted. There were proposals for the ITU to be involved in a whole range of Internet governance issues, both the issues that ICANN are involved in, but also issues like surveillance and privacy.

And again, that's scope has not changed, so the ITU having got, haven't got that remit. And finally, as I said, we, a number of countries had proposed that the Internet council working group, is a working group that the member states [inaudible] just encompasses member states, we hoped that might be opened up. And there has been a compromise, which Veni will probably go over when he talks about the ITU resolutions. Okay, thank you Alan.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Nigel. Veni, we'll turn it over to you. Is Veni here?

VENI MARKOVSKI:

Veni is here, but the phone is not so quick to unmute myself, sorry. iPhone, what can I say? So, thank you very much. It's really an honor to talk to all of you guys. Some of you have been engaged with what has been happening around the ITU plenipotentiary, maybe some of you are engaged with the [inaudible] four years ago, and maybe some of you eight years ago, and maybe more.

I also wanted to thank, to use the opportunity to thank ISOC for bringing some of the people who are on this call actually to the plenipotentiary, the first time ISOC has done something like that. So, I'm supposed to talk about the Internet resolution, number 101, 102, 133, and 180.

What you guys can do, if you go to the main ITU plenipotentiary webpage, and I'll put the link in the chatroom, you can download the text of the resolutions. It's right there on the first page, in PDF, and see it for yourself.

The general observation.... So first of all, these are Internet resolutions which were introduced at the previous planning part. And there was the one which was the most debated Internet resolutions until almost the very last moment. An agreement was reached on them after many, many hours of discussions. This time, the conference discussed for 61 hours in [inaudible] group chaired by the Italian representative Fabio [inaudible], who is one of the old school guys that the ITU knows a lot of external and internal issues.

So it was overall a very good discussion. The four resolutions, and I'll talk about the key issues in some of them, but the four resolutions... The first one, 101, is about Internet protocol based network. 102 is about the ITU's role with regards to international public policy issues related to the Internet and the management of Internet, including domain names and [inaudible].

133 is about IDNs, and 180 is about the transition from IPv4 to IPv6. The first, Nigel already mentioned talking about the attempt of certain, insert resolutions to include language which would increase the role of the ITU. These were the resolutions also that had potential to increase the role of the ITU in a way which would have clearly taking the ITU into some of the things that other organizations are doing, not necessarily ICANN but also ISOC, IETF, W3C, you name it.

Just to give you an idea, for those of you who have not been at the ITU, what the whole discussion is about, for example, there was text in one of the resolutions which was talking about the work on domain issues and other [inaudible] issues, taking into account the geographic nature of the Internet. And there was a proposal to change this geographic to the global nature of the Internet.

However, if you think about the policies that define how the regional Internet registries work, they actually work on a regional basis. If you allow us a work, like an innocent work like global to replace geographical, then the next question which could be asked is, well where is the global Internet registry? We have regional, but where is the global?

And that opens a whole new discussion. So what we were trying to do in Busan was basically to try to make the language better than it was in the previous one, and the previous one was known for [inaudible] the recognition of ICANN RIR, IETF, ISOC, and [inaudible] in a footnote, which [inaudible] all of these resolutions. But also not to allow some bad language to show up.

And indeed, we actually were able to do that. The biggest challenges, even some text were introduced, new text, which made the resolution better from the point of view of the government, without necessarily endangering the Internet, multistakeholder Internet governance model that we have. So, again, it's, I'll take it one at a time. The IDN resolution, by the way, completely old, not necessary. IDNs were already introduced, much bigger care of them, the idea of thinking a few years ago, so that really was a decision to keep it rather than try to

remove it because some people think that the ITU is using its role within the Internet ecosystem...

If any text is withdrawn from the resolution, from the plenipotentiary resolution, it's withdrawn. By the way, this is also clear in the sense to change a little bit of the text which was mentioning ICANN, ITF, ISOC, and the other, where the ITU resolves that it should explore ways and means for greater collaboration and coordination between the ITU and these organizations, involved in the development of IPV based networks, to cooperation agreement is a process, and the thing which we decide to change in order to increase the role of ITU in Internet governance.

So there were suggestions to change that a little bit, to fulfill the role of ITU in Internet governance. And some countries thought that means decreasing the role of the ITU in Internet governance. For the old kind in these discussions, they know that, and actually that's [inaudible] public, and it's good for you to know, we on several occasions, there were questions about studies which ITU have been doing the IPv4 IPv6 transition, or IDN.

And Nigel can correct me, but I think we have a representative from the secretariat who basically said within the last four years, they haven't done any study. And the conclusion that the government reached was that they don't have the funding to do study, and even if they have the funding, there is not necessarily have the funding that not necessarily have the skills to do [inaudible] studies on Internet related issues. So while I think the, it was not, I think, while the general observation was that the ITU has a role to play in the global Internet ecosystem, there

was a desire to increase this role, but this desire was not facing even understanding from within the ITU.

There was not a single member of the ITU staff and secretariat, who when asked publically like, “Do you people have available time to allocate for this?” They would say yes. They’re all pretty busy. The budget of the ITU has not been in fair shape, and they don’t have the necessary skills to do that, and they cannot commission this outside expertise because then the whole relevance of the ITU becomes under question.

So, I’m not sure, I’m actually not sure which one I should, whether I should go [inaudible] by resolution, or maybe you have questions. So feel free, if you have a question, I’ll give a chance to ask now.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Veni, not go over the resolutions in detail. Just, at this point, remind us what the main substance is and then we’ll cover specific questions at the end.

VENI MARKOVSKI:

Well, the main substance is reflected in the title for each resolution. So, the ICU, the ITU role with regards to international public policy is defined in a council resolution, which basically says, the ITU has a role in every international public policy that exists. However, this is confronted by a number of governments, which will, international public policies is the work of the governments, who don’t necessarily agree that the ITU

should be doing it. But the ITU is trying, you know, there is a council resolution facing [inaudible] which is discussing what areas.

And it's everything, from child online protection to cybercrime, to management of DNS and IP addresses, but at the time, the ITU secretary general, both the current one and the future one, have publically said that they don't feel the ITU should try to take over any of the work that the Internet organizations are doing. In fact, there was a proposal by India, which was a [inaudible], which was such a strange proposal that it was asking the ITU to completely change the way the Internet was working.

It was requesting the ITU to create a new Internet. And this one didn't fly. This one even wasn't discussed. There was no support from enough member states to even be discussed. Somebody is asking about a link to the India proposal, I'll find you a link and I'll post it because all of the documents right away were public, and made public from the first day of the ITU plenipotentiary, so these documents are public.

I think, oh, Oksana is asking also if there is anything [inaudible]. Well, no, Oksana, there are control ICANN, when you say Internet related studies, ICANN doesn't do necessarily studies in the context of the ITU. The ITU studies, they do it for the study groups and stuff like that, which is the way they're working. And they have tried to do, a few years ago, a study on Internet governance, or a case study rather, and it was published by the ITU. It was about 50 page document, and many of the country members of the ITU find, I think, 12 or 13 countries signed a council report saying that there are so many errors, that this paper is, so many wrong statements that each would be withdrawn.

So, there is no clear record of the ITU with regards to studies related to Internet governance, let's say. Okay. I see Alan is, okay. I just note from Alan to keep the questions [inaudible]. Nice to mention, I think, the proposal for the ITU to become original Internet registry. That's why I mentioned the word geographic compared to global. By the way, we ask some of the ITU folks there whether they could become a registry, and they said that several years ago they discussed the original policy, which is approved by the [inaudible] Board, who can become a regional Internet registry.

And they said they cannot. First of all, they cannot respond to the current policy. Possibly somebody can initiate the change, but the current policy does not allow any global Internet registry to show up, it's geographical, it's working, there have been no complaints whatsoever, so far. And to end on an anecdotal way, really the understanding of how the IPv6 [inaudible] is being allocated is based in certain cases on the old knowledge of IPv4, which is, as we know, is [inaudible] by now.

Too many people think that IPv6 are also [scary] so they have to somehow make sure that there is some governmental organization that will keep [inaudible]. So then when we talk to governmental officials and we explain what is the actual [inaudible] IPv6 [inaudible] compared to IPv4, they're really surprised to find out there is plenty of IP addresses, IPv6 addresses for everyone.

And even some have been asking questions, "Well, why do I need 65,000 IP addresses if I connect to the Internet?" That's the smallest number you can get to get [inaudible] environment. And then the conversation going into connecting your refrigerator and every

[inaudible] etc. etc. So it was, I think it was a good idea from the point of view of talking to governments, but it also shows that many governments do need a lot of education, because they come with some ideas which are based on old facts and they don't know the new facts.

So maybe the At-Large community could be helpful in reaching out to these governments and trying to work with them in educating them.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Okay, thank you very much Veni. And we've managed now to make up the extra time we had, so last from the staff side is Anne-Rachel.

ANNE-RACHEL INNE:

Thank you very much Alan. Hello everybody. Good afternoon, good morning, good evening. So I'm going to be talking to you on the last two slides that we have. The road ahead, in terms of the ITU role in [wicket] review, for example, on United Nations General Assembly. But before I continue, I would like to say one thing that I think is important here. We complied, under ISOC's coordination, an outcome matrix. And it's posted on the ISOC website, and if you go look at it, it's really, I think, a pretty simple way of [inaudible] all that we have talked about today.

And if you have even more questions, we can, again, either individually or later on, [inaudible] talk about the rest of the resolutions and how we [inaudible] to develop them. So the one that, the ITU's role on [wickets] review basically is catered for, in the resolutions, by resolution 140 that used to have the title of ITU's role in implementing the outcomes of the

world summit on information society, and whose title, which title, has been changed to ITU's role in implementing the outcomes of the world summit and information society.

So basically, some countries wanted to give the ITU a little bit more say into the basically the whole situation of [wickets] [inaudible], basically the [inaudible] event, and go on to even say that ITU should continue coordinating all of these activities and actually even put them in-house. But in the end, the community basically that was there, resolved that the ITU should continue coordination of things like the [wicket] forum, WTD, [wicket's] project [inaudible] and maintain [inaudible] that they have been doing.

I think quite a few of you are on that [inaudible]. And all of that should happen [inaudible] the UN [GA?] review that is programmed for December 2015, that one is normally supposed to be an intergovernmental process, but again, hopefully, we will have a few events that will continue towards a multistakeholder opinion and dialogue that will go into the UN [GA]. Organizations like [inaudible], and a few others are here in Geneva.

We have [inaudible] and others who are going to probably make sure that they have meetings that feed into the process, so that member states can take opinions to the UN [GA] next December. We also have a new multistakeholder arrangement for Internet public policy working group. I'm pretty sure, Judith can tell you a lot more about this, but basically what will happen is that at the beginning of this council working group, they will have one date, multistakeholder input day,

whereby everybody will be discussing some of the themes that that council working group should be talking about during the year.

So that's good progress because we never used to have a say. So that's really interesting, and the next one is going to be probably at the beginning of February. We don't have yet the date of the council working group meeting, but I guess they will be after. Through the work on IP address and numbering. Again, if you go to that matrix that we did and look at resolution 146, you will see that, I know this is not 146.

146 is about ITRs, actually, 133 as Veni said, that is about [inaudible], and basically, they have said that we would like to continue studies on IPv6. So we're not too sure if this is going to end up in, historically this is one that happened at ITU [T]. So we're not too sure though, given that a lot of people said this is really about capacity building nowadays. We think that, one of the twists that they were given is probably put it into ITU [inaudible], so that ITU does a lot of capacity building initiatives for not only government operators, but any governmental network operators in general, in collaboration with RIRs and organizations in this process.

An expert group has been established, I mean will be established by council to review ITRs, and this is about [wicket]. Resolution says that, it resolves that there is a periodic review of the ITU, and this one should be carried out every eight years, and the review should start in 2017. So, and this could be convened by an expert group open to all to ITU members and section members. And the terms of reference of this expert working group will be developed by council.

So, we shall wait to see what council basically says in terms of reference of the working group, and see how we can participate. Traditionally, our participation has been [inaudible] basically the folks who are [inaudible] members of ITU, I think I saw someone saying, is ICANN member of ITU? Or ITU member of ICANN? ICANN has never been a member of ITU, so we go with our friends, the ISOC or the RIRs in terms of participation.

So that was the first slide, if you can move to the second one, the road ahead again, the last one basically before the questions. So yes, thank you very much. The regional ITU meetings, as Nigel and Tarek told you, are the ones that happen in regions and that basically collate all of the issues, if you look at all of the resolutions that went into plenipotentiary, all these discuss all of those before they get there.

And one of the things that was really interesting was that, when they go to plenipotentiary, members all have what they call regional meetings. So negotiations happen around language and resolutions, basically, first by region and people kind of give and take on what is happening. And in a lot of this regions, where people, for example, who were from civil society that were in delegations, it was the moment where they could have input into the processes into their regions and say, you know, what they wish to convey, for example, on the resolutions that were on Internet governance, that was really where people have an effective role, because on the floor, on the member states can speak.

Certain members can only speak with the chair's approval, and it basically it has to be negotiated in advance. So it's pretty important, I think, going forward that we allow people from our communities, and

civil society, and others, to be part of this delegation, because it is important for people to listen to you during the regional meetings, and arguments can be done, and you can convince governments, and I can tell you we didn't start the process for quite a few years, it didn't work.

And of course, to get to that point, you have to build relationships with governments, both regulated and communities at home. It is important that at home, they recognize you as someone who can have input on all these subjects, on all of these resolutions, and whether it was us or with ISOC and others, RIR. If you can get into the subject matter and make sure that you understand basically how to build relations at home, and be with people at home, it's the best way to get onto the delegations and basically be able to be part of the discussion in influence the process as we wish in terms of either multistakeholder, or the resolutions that were specifically directed to Internet governance at the moment, or even others like, the international member resources that will probably come into play in a few years' time.

So I think I will stop here and I guess I will turn it back to Alan so we can start questions and answers. Thank you very much.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Anne-Rachel. All right, we'll start a queue. I'm going to start off with a first question though. We went into this, with some people having a fair amount of fear and trepidation for what would come out of it, or what might come out of it. Were we misreading the card or has the overall tone changed significantly? Anyone who wants to answer.

TAREK KAMEL:

Thank you very much Alan. This is Tarek. I want to touch on that, but before I want to comment on what Anne-Rachel had said about the relation between ICANN and ITU. Indeed, ICANN has never been a member of the ITU, but we have been participating in several consultations. On the leadership level, we have invited to the ITU leadership to ICANN meetings and vice versa. ICANN has been invited, leadership has been invited to the [wicket], to the WTPF, and to the WSIS, [inaudible] a conference that took place in June here at the ITU.

So there are cooperation, variations, in working relations. ITU has been a member of the TLG group that includes W3C, as well as other players, and that is providing also input to the ICANN Board as well as to the various other constituents at ICANN. So, as I said, it is a relation of mutual respect.

Let me get to your question now directly, we exaggerate of the feeling of the threats? No. Things have changed within the last four years since Guadalajara. Guadalajara, the relation was tense, and I think the [wicket] has been a clear [inaudible], the remit is clear and the word cannot evolve anymore. [Inaudible] as it happens in the [wicket]. So the ITU leadership was also smart enough to realize that, and to work together with the host, the Korean host, that were really committed to end [inaudible] for conference.

So they worked on a policy that really supported to avoid the worst from our point of view, and the technical community. And they helped in that, in the background, and the negotiations, and through the

corridors, and negotiations as such. Our community was also very active and helped in that.

So we have been seeing this time, and this was the difference compared to other plenipotentiary. A committed ITU leadership and a peaceful conference that comes to consensus and the respect for [inaudible] the remit of other organizations, including because they could not avoid another [inaudible] happened on the [inaudible].

From another point of view, we have also seen an active participation from IANA regeneration, from the member states delegation, as well as from ITU staff, who are maybe now in their 30s, and who want to be a part of the global community. They realize that this divide or this delegation will get them nowhere, so they are ready to reach compromises and to talk, and to open the ITU to do part of the global dialogue and the global community.

Also there is a shift that is happening in China, as well as the [inaudible] position to some extent, has helped us from a geo-political level drastically. We haven't seen [inaudible] as in the past, China was very moderate, as well as Brazil, as well as several other [inaudible], who started to embrace this multistakeholder model. Although they are active members of the ITU.

So from a geo-political point of view, from a pragmatic point of view, to what happened with [wicket], and also from other developmental aspects as well as the new leadership wants definitely, at least from election, I think this was the main reasons why we have seen, at least from events more than [inaudible].

But there is agreement on some issues still continue. We shall not receive ourselves about that there are disagreements, and that they might pop up in the council working group later on, in the role of the council working group, and in other occasions. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tarek. The first hand was Olivier, that was Olivier one replaced by Olivier two, but [inaudible]...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: Olivier?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: [Inaudible]

ALAN GREENBERG: I heard Olivier 'arfing' but I didn't hear anything else.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: It's Olivier speaking. That was not me. I had no idea who that was, and I was a bit taken by surprise because I have, I didn't note that I was first Olivier one and then Olivier two, and had been demoted. I thought I was in second place, but anyway. Thanks very much for this Alan, and thank you for this presentation, it's been very helpful.

And certainly it's great to be able to relive three weeks of heavy discussions and work and so on, and avoid those three weeks, sorry, and have it all in three quarters of an hour is really a good way forward. Nigel mentioned one thing that raised my attention.

He mentioned there was a new multistakeholder approach, and I'm not quite sure what that meant, and I wondered whether he could expand on that, because that sounds interesting.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, thank you Olivier, yes, and it has already been explained. It was just to do with the council working group on Internet public policy where, as Anne-Rachel [inaudible] day of multistakeholder dialogue before the governments get together and discuss themselves. I think we just called it a new approach. It's an interesting approach.

It's something that we didn't particularly expect, but we will embrace it and no doubt, with others we'll see where it leads. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay. Thank you for this Nigel. It's Olivier speaking. Yeah, I was wondering whether the ITU had become fully multistakeholder or whether we're just dealing, okay. Obviously, for a future call, in a few years perhaps. And I had a second question, if you would allow me please, Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG:

Go ahead.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. So it's Olivier speaking again. This one is for Veni. Veni mentioned the apparent lack of appetite from ITU staff to start a new working group on Internet governance, and I wondered whether that meant that the creation of the working group itself took place without a clear understanding on how this would be funding.

I also heard that the ITU was faced with problems on funding.

VENI MARKOVSKI: The problems of funding are clear. They were widely discussed [inaudible]. I think you, maybe I misstated something, although, anyway. So I didn't say a new working group on Internet governance. There is a council working group on international Internet related public policy issues. That's one thing. That's where member states. So we are talking about a study which the ICU should take upon, and these studies they take upon need funding because people meet, they organize, this is a lot of work.

The ITU secretariat itself, when they were doing their Internet governance data, show that the organizations are not as tough, secretariats are not quite in accordance of global understanding of what Internet governance means. So, but they concern that they haven't done studies which the member states commission them to do four years ago, and they didn't do it because they don't have the funding and the resources.

So the argument there was look, if we commission you to do studies four years ago, you didn't do it, why should we continue to commission at the same study? Since you already haven't done it. That's the answer to your question.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much. Thanks.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Veni, and thank you Olivier. One more question from Fatima Cambronerero.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima speaking for the record. Thank you Alan. Thank you, I would like to thank our guest speakers because they have compressed three weeks in this webinar. And I think that you have made very significant contributions, and very relevant contributions, but I find really [inaudible] that I couldn't participate in that meeting.

Now, speakers mentioned the remit, and they referred to Internet governance issues. And my question is, whether in this plenipotentiary talk, people spoke about any topic related to the IANA stewardship transition? And if the ITU is interested in participating in this process or not?

And also [inaudible] wanted to be done, a new RIR. How is it going to be, to pan out? Or maybe I'm a bit paranoid regarding that. Thank you.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thank you very much. This is Nigel Hickson for the record. I can be very brief. First of all, on your points on IANA, I believe it was mentioned actually in a couple of delegates mentioned it when trying to explain what ICANN does, not ourselves. But it wasn't debated, there was no real serious debate about the IANA transition. But it was mentioned, but not in [inaudible] for none of the substantive issues.

Your second point about the RIR, I think Veni mentioned that, in that clearly the ITU were not keen themselves on taking forward the studies to become an Internet registry, and the proposal itself was withdrawn. So it wasn't forwarded. So that wouldn't happened. I'm not saying that the issue won't be returned to in four years' time. I mean, there is always concern about the role of IPv6 [inaudible] of the concerns there are generally.

But in terms of the ITU doing work, it won't happen.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Nigel, and thank you everyone for the questions. The next session of our webinar will be the view from the end user's perspective. We have two speakers, and the first one is Yrjö Länsipuro. Yrjö?

YRJÖ LÄNSIPURO:

Thank you Alan very much. My name is Yrjö Länsipuro for the transcript record. I was in Busan, sent by ISOC, one of the people they were sending to delegations. I was a member of [inaudible] delegations as

well. Finland, of course, like United States and many other countries, accepts other stakeholders in their national delegations. So something I would like to say at this stage is that we have to make a distinction between the ITU as an organization, and as secretariat, and ITU member countries, especially in this case, of course, those member countries who are pressing the ITU to assume more active role on the Internet questions, like Russia and some Arab countries, and so on and so forth.

And that being said, over the last three plenipotentiary that I have been attending, ITU has, step by step, come closer to recognizing the realities of the Internet. And also, more willing to cooperate with those organizations that actually do run the Internet. In Ontario, 2006, ITU somehow pretended that it was still running the Internet. It's not.

In Guadalajara, after one long negotiation, ITU resolved to explore ways and means for greater collaboration and coordination with relevant organizations. And even finally, to mention them by name, including ICANN and ISOC, and so on and so forth. And in Busan, there was even more realism and sort of resignation, to a situation that ITU is not running the Internet, and actual willingness to establish cooperation, coordination with those organizations that do.

However, there was such great reluctance to give these relevant organizations, due by name, even resolution 133 about international domain names, we were trying to get ICANN and IEDF mentioned in that resolution, because they have really carried the load, but somehow the resolution just says, in the end, that progress was made by all stakeholders, in particular through relevant organizations and entities in the introduction of internationalized domain names.

Well I guess this is better than nothing. There were, as many already mentioned, they were many proposals from Russia, from some Arab countries, Saudi Arabia in particular, and from India at the end, which would have changed the nature of the Internet as we know it. But somehow I felt that when these proposals were made, and debated, and duly defeated, their proponents were sort of resigned and probably they can now report to their capitals that they tried their best.

So the end result, I would say, was quite positive in the sense that nothing bad was really done, and then there were some good things that already have been mentioned during this webinar, like for instance, making ITU, the CWG, the council working group on Internet questions, making it a little bit more multistakeholder and more open. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much Yrjö. And lastly, we have Grigori Saghyan, of Armenia. Are you on the line?

GRIGORI SAGHYAN: Yes, can you hear me?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, with a lot of noise though.

GRIGORI SAGHYAN: I don't know what to do, maybe [inaudible]... So I will try to speak slowly. If you think that it has too much noise, maybe you will read the report?

ALAN GREENBERG: From my point of view, I think you can go ahead right now. But let me try it for a few minutes. Go ahead.

GRIGORI SAGHYAN: Okay. First thing, it's very hard to [inaudible]... which will be done, which were done by previous speakers. I want to say that my participation was sponsored by ISOC. I was not...

ALAN GREENBERG: The line has gone quite for me. Has it for everyone else too?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yeah, we don't hear him.

GRIGORI SAGHYAN: [Inaudible]...

ALAN GREENBERG: He seems to be cutting in and out. Terri, have we tried calling him? Did we try a call out for him?

TERRI AGNEW: We have not yet, but I am asking him right now for a phone number.

ALAN GREENBERG: Okay. While we are waiting, does anyone have any questions either for Yrjö or for anyone else at this point?

I see no hands.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Alan, it's Olivier. There is a hand up from Anne-Rachel, I believe.

ALAN GREENBERG: Ah, and also Alberto. Anne-Rachel, go ahead.

ANNE-RACHEL INNE: Thank you very much Alan. I just wanted to actually, so Alan, just to what Yrjö and also Judith was typing at one point about civil society. This was one meeting where, again, innovation, quote/unquote, was that the secretary general had a meeting with civil society. You know, things that were dear to all of us might opening up of study groups, and council working groups, and all of that, and isn't this...

We can have the feeling in the end that we didn't achieve anything, that was really a lot. A set number of people, they talked, the incoming [inaudible]...

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Anne-Rachel, we cannot hear because of the background noise. Can everybody mute their phone?

ANNE-RACHEL INNE: Okay, thanks. So, one of the things that also civil society can do is that we have, for example, organizations that are in academia, others that are you know, regular NGOs working in the process, that can also become members of the ITU by being, and not paying. So they have quite a few organizations from civil society that can do that, and I think it would be encouraging to see some, probably do that also. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Anne-Rachel. Do we have Grigori back?

GRIGORI SAGHYAN: Yes, yes. Can I continue?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, please do. Alberto, we'll get to you in a moment.

GRIGORI SAGHYAN: Okay.

ALAN GREENBERG: Go ahead Grigori.

GRIGORI SAGHYAN:

Okay. Thank you. I told that my position was sponsored by ISOC. [Inaudible]... Because it's really hard to say something new after these presentations. I want to say briefly you can see on the presentation, [inaudible] but on the report which I have prepared. I want to say that I agree with Yrjö that, it is necessary to separate the position of ITU secretariat, ITU staff.

That position of some [inaudible]. And I want to say that, you see on the screen the [inaudible], they have specific position, to do some changes in previous resolution. [Inaudible] and I say they don't want to do any changes. I also highlighted this following difference, there are some [inaudible], first of all, [inaudible] of things, it's now very important, to facilitate the transition in [inaudible] to support [inaudible].

It was, in order, the resolution was necessary to support multistakeholder governance, multilingualism, [inaudible] cloud services. And I want to say that, first time in the ITU there was a notification that there is another model of [issues] statement between operators, and they note that there is a [inaudible], which is not used in [telephones], it's Internet specific mutual statement between operators.

[Inaudible], of course it's very important. There was not about land locked countries, and some notifications about Internet related organizations. There were more on their lines if we compare with Guadalajara resolution. I also say that this quality of service, which is very important in ITU, is again to [inaudible]...

Here we see that they don't want data to remove this requirement for quality of service. I think it's very important that when we speak about network neutrality, that there is not any special quality of service for any center itself. This was removed from Guadalajara resolution, about one or two. About public consultations with all stakeholders. This document was very hard from the [inaudible], it was mentioned that necessary perhaps to have consultation with multistakeholders.

We can read this carefully more than I find there. So, they have created council working group, it was a council working group, but currently this council working group will have more power. And this council working group will make all decisions related to the Internet. It is proposed to send the report to the UN general, about ITU activities. [Inaudible] country, [inaudible]...

Council working group, it's very important, it's a serious role now, as I understand it. And about how it could work. It's important that they have reached this, on the conference with a conclusion that there will be face to face meetings with [inaudible], and with [inaudible]. So all stakeholders will be able to participate in these council working group conferences.

It's very important [inaudible] of the ICU. There was contradictions because here we see that they have used some article seven from ITR, they had underlined in this resolution, on article seven, which was not one of the main problematic points in Dubai, because if [inaudible] are not supported this point, this article seven, which is providing [inaudible]...

So I think it's, yes, and I don't know all of this commissioned, but ITU has decided to participate with [UNISCO] in special broadband commission, which is also very interesting that ITU is ready to share its role with [UNISCO]. So I think, [inaudible] ITU remit resolutions. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. We have a number of hands up. Alberto, you had your hand up a little while ago, if you would like to speak now. That would be on the Spanish channel.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto for the record. I hope my line doesn't drop. I have a doubt regarding what was mentioned as a new multistakeholder model. My question is the following, in what way is that model different from the one we are currently using within ICANN's ecosystem? Are the stakeholders different in that model? Does this new model have a different role or a different function?

And are end users represented in this new multistakeholder model, and if so, in what way? Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you very much. Who would like to take that?

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you very much. Nigel here. I think we tried to touch on this before, but so, I mean, I think there are two scenarios here. First of all,

the ITU in its general, from the ways that the plenipotentiary organized. I mean, people have talked about it as a multistakeholder process. So in general, and it's multistakeholder in that the actual delegations themselves are made up of different stakeholders. The US had a very large delegation made up of business, civil society, and the technical communities, for example, and other countries did that as well.

But when the actual governments are the only people that vote in the ITU, and the only people that have a substantial say at the meetings. Observer delegations like ISOC, I was on the ISOC delegation, and like the RIRs, sit at the back and can only really contribute if we're asked to or we specifically ask. So we don't, I think, we don't really regard that as true multistakeholder approach compared with what ICANN has. I mean, everyone has different approaches, but the ICANN model is slightly different.

But as was mentioned, the ITU has, in various examples, tried to reach out to different, to different stakeholders in the organization of the [wickets] review meeting that Tarek talked about at the beginning of the call, that wasn't truly multistakeholder preparatory process [inaudible] involved. So I think the ITU is moving in a certain direction, but certainly, it's not the same as the model we have used.

TAREK KAMEL:

If I may add also, that there is no confusion. I know we have already asked this question [inaudible]... There is no new multistakeholder model from our point of view as ICANN, that is coming out of Busan, so that we don't have any misunderstanding. It is meant that the

approach of the ITU to the existing multistakeholder model is improving, they are starting opening up to this, they try to be more inclusive within the global existing multistakeholder model.

But the outcome of the conference does not imply an overall new multistakeholder model, so avoid any confusion. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Tarek. Anne-Rachel, I see you have your hand up, did you want to answer some previous question? We're starting to run out of time, just a little bit. No, no more hand...

ANNE-RACHEL INNE: Sorry Alan, yes. I just...

ALAN GREENBERG: Thank you Anne-Rachel. Judith, you're up next.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Yes, this is Judith Hellerstein for the record. I wanted... My question was, I guess, whether I think the other people, did Nigel, Anne-Rachel, very interested in hearing about the results of the passage of the resolution to open up documents and also on more transparency? So I know people would be very interested in that, so that's one of the questions I had.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you Judith. Anyone want to take that?

NIGEL HICKSON:

Well, I'll say a couple of words. Anne-Rachel might want to add as well. There was a discussion on the decision of council working group. The US had a proposal to open up all council working groups to all members. And to also make sure that council working groups, reflected diversity and gender equality. And that was a very interesting proposal, of course, and got a lot of discussion, but it wasn't agreed as such.

There was an agreement that the ITU, of course, should be diverse in its makeup, or the makeup of working groups should be diverse and reflect gender equality. But the actual detail of any changes would have to be worked out by council. So that was on the makeup of working groups. On the transparency document, I don't recall the proposal agreement at the end, but again, I think, there wasn't a final absolute agreement to open up all documents to the public.

If you recall, we would have said this. I apologize, but the beginning of this plenipotentiary, the council met on the first Saturday and made the unprecedented decision, that the document, the input document, all the input documents for the plenipotentiary would be made public, mainly because they had already been linked on the wiki link, and they were made public.

And then there was a discussion of whether all documents, all plenipotentiary in the future, should be made public. I think the detail of that was subject to council approval.

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Can I actually comment on that? I was hoping someone would. It's Judith Hellerstein for the record. The resolution that the US put forward was to open up few of the documents, and what I think was the, if I recall correctly, the resolution on that was that it was an agreement that in the future, documents would be opened up, that all input and output documents would be opened up, and that a discussion would be held to create a new policy on how to open up other documents.

And that was what, I think, was agreed, but I have to get more confirmation on that. But I think that was what was agreed, and so I would be interested in finding out more information about what work was done on that, but I guess maybe people were not really clear on that.

ANNE-RACHEL INNE: If I may chime in Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, certainly.

ANNE-RACHEL INNE: I can go ahead? Okay. This is Anne. In fact, there was a decision that was taking into plenipotentiary on free online access to ITU publications. And in the output document that we have today, and if you go look into those kind of acts of plenipotentiary 14, you will see that it says, to provide public access to all input and output documents

of all conferences and [inaudible] of the union, from the beginning of year 2015, unless where disclosure will cause potential harm to a legitimate private and public interest that our way is the benefit of accessibility.

So it truly says, basically, it would be up to council to decide that some of the things that were instructed already to ITU secretary general, is to make sure that transparency and openness are in all financial documents. So in human resource hiring, as Nigel said, in terms of candidates, but also gender diversity, and things like that. And basically to continue the review and the access policy to ITU documents. So this is all on council's plate, and we will see probably, we will start seeing something by the next council working group.

And they're normally to instruct, I mean the council was instructed to submit a policy for 2018, for final decision on opening completely or not all of these processes.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Anne-Rachel. We have one last hand from Olivier. I ask you to be very brief, we have three minutes left in the webinar, and I would like to try to end as close to the formal ending time as possible. Olivier?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Alan. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond speaking for the transcript. And I actually have two questions, but thankfully one of them got responded to before I even asked it, and it was to do with the

opening up of the documents. The second question I had is with regards to the ITRs, the International Telecommunications Regulations that were voted on during the [wicket] time.

And for a moment after [wicket], and in fact, quite a while after [wicket], there was always an apprehension that the PP 14 would be the time when things would move forward on these, either there would be some changes to the way the IT works so as to make this a blanket, just majority vote or something where everyone would have to follow those regulations.

Or there would be something happening. Have there been any... Or was there any move whatsoever to transform these ITRs into something that would have to be approved by all countries at PP 14? Was there anything done about this basically? Or, are we still, as far as the international telecommunication regulations, with some countries running on a set that is from 2012, and some countries running on a previous set, which I believe was 1988 or something?

TAREK KAMEL: Alan, can I respond quickly?

ALAN GREENBERG: Yes, certainly.

TAREK KAMEL: Thank you. The plenipotentiary 14 did not change anything concerning the [wicket] resolution, Olivier. I also need to mention that the

resolutions that are coming of the plenipotentiary are non-binding resolutions, by the way, as such. So its nature is different than the [wicket]. So to answer your question, no. There has been no change of what happened in Dubai in December 2012, no change coming out of Busan in 2014 concerning the [wicket]. Thank you.

ALAN GREENBERG:

Thank you very much Tarek. I would like to thank all of the speakers, and all of the participants in this call. It's been interesting, and I'll echo what several people have already said before, it's quite amazing how... At least, I think I've come away with a fair understanding of what happened, without actually spending three weeks in Korea. So I thank you all for doing that for us, and for being here today and try to fill us in on what's been going on.

I think this has been a really good webinar from my perspective, and I'm delighted that this is the first one I'm hosting. I hope they will continue at this high level. Thank you very everyone, and I'll see you sometime on the Internet.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]