SINGAPORE - Internet Governance - Public Session
Thursday, February 12, 2015 – 11:15 to 12:30
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

BILL DRAKE:	Maybe we should begin because there's probably remote participants.
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	All right. Good morning, everybody. It's nice to see this room is filling up. My name is Olivier Crepin-Leblond. Next to me on my right is Rafik Dammak. Two of the three co-chairs – where's Jordan? Oh, Jordan is over there. Oh, you're hiding. And Jordan Carter, the third co-chair of this cross-community working group on Internet governance. Today is the public session. It's good to see the room is filling up. I will hand the floor over to Bill Drake, who will be the session moderator.
BILL DRAKE:	Does Rafik want to say anything?
OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:	I don't know. Rafik, do you want to add a few words?
RAFIK DAMMAK:	Okay. Surprisingly, Olivier was too short [inaudible]. Just to thank everyone coming here to this session, which is I think the first experience to have it led by community working with the ICANN staff. So I guess we will see how it goes, and I think we can start.

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.

BILL DRAKE: All right, then. Good morning, everybody. I'm Bill Drake from the University of Zurich and the chair of the Non-Commercial Users Constituency. I'll be the moderator today. We're going to be talking about IANA transition and accountability for the next – no, we're not. We're not doing that.

We're going to be talking about Internet governance, the larger world of Internet governance beyond ICANN's remit and ICANN's interaction with that broader world of Internet governance. In so doing, this time, as Rafik briefly alluded to, we have changed a couple of things.

One is that these sessions tended to be, in the past, programmed entirely by staff and tended to feature panels of insiders giving serial presentations one after another with not a lot of time, sometimes for open discussion with the community. We decided we didn't want to go that route. We thought instead what would be better to try to do is to post some easily accessible information for people to have a look and get an update on developments on current Internet governance.

So there is a document prepared by the ICANN staff. Nigel Hickson and his team have a little document which is linked off of the website for this session, which you can look at which will give you a synoptic overview, some developments in key Internet governance areas, so we don't have to spend as much time updating you on those.

Then the second point is what we're going to do is we're going to have some people kick off the conversation by making brie comments, two to three minutes maximum, and have a little interaction. But then we're going to go to the floor and we're going to try and involve the community in a more interactive discussion from the get-go.

We also have changed the format of the room, as you see. We're going with a big open U-shaped room rather than the traditional panel sitting in front of a group of people and pontificating at them.

Our hope is that we will have a fairly dynamic and interactive session. We only have 75 minutes and there's quite a lot to cover. The topics that the cross-community working group members identified as being worth discussion together here include the NETmundial initiative, which has been the subject obviously of quite a bit of debate and controversy, even, in the ICANN community. And then a little bit on the WSIS+10 review that's coming up in the United Nations. There will be a big summit in December. The Internet Governance Forum and the renewal of its mandate. And UNESCO is having a conference, the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization in Paris is having a conference next month, the first week of March where it's releasing a big report on Internet issues and we'll talk a little bit about that as well.

So our time allocation will be roughly 40 minutes for the NETmundial material, 20 minutes for the WSIS+10 and IGF, and 10 minutes for UNESCO but we'll see exactly how it goes once we get into the flow of the discussion.

So that's the basic concept, and we have some very good people who are plugged into all of these things to help lead off the discussions.

Let me start then with the NETmundial initiative. There has obviously been a great deal of debate over the past year or so over the ways in which the NETmundial initiative was announced and booted up, and that has led obviously to a lot of expression of concern by different members of the community about process aspects of it.

EN

We don't necessarily need to dwell on that too much, although if people have things they want to say about that, that's fine. But I think a lot of that debate is fairly familiar to people now.

What we were sort of thinking it might useful to do is look a little bit forward and say, well, the NETmundial initiative has been launched. Now what could it be, what should it do, if anything? What potentially would be its role? Would people support that role? Would people like that role to be different and so on?

These are the kinds of questions I'm hoping that we can sort of get into the substantive questions of is there a purpose, is there a good rationale, for having some sort of a multi-stakeholder platform for community work together on Internet governance issues of the broader character that go beyond the remit of ICANN and names and numbers and which does not replicate the work being done in other bodies? We'll see whether people that that's a useful thing or not a useful thing.

To start this discussion, I turn first to Wolfgang Kleinwächter, who is a member of the ICANN board and has been appointed as sort of a spokesperson or ambassador for the NETmundial initiative and I will ask each of the speakers to keep their opening remarks to like three minutes. So, Wolfgang, please.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Thank you, Bill. Thank you very much, and I'm happy that the room is fully packed, because obviously we have to talk about this issue much more than we probably did in the past about this NETmundial initiative.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

For me, the NETmundial initiative is the next small stumbling step in this still unchartered territory. If we go back to the definition of Internet governance, which was produced by [WCIT], then you could ask ten years later how this has been implemented.

The definition has three elements. The first thing is that all stakeholders have to be included. I think this is more or less recognized today.

The second part is that Internet governance should be based on sharing – sharing principles, programs, and decision-making. And here comes the point. While the multi-stakeholder model is more or less recognizing now, we have different specific models for decision-making. ICANN is certainly a multi-stakeholder body, but the governments are only an advisory capacity. Decision-making is done by the board.

The [business process] is certainly a multi-stakeholder body, but the final decision-making capacity is in the hands of governments. So they consult with non-governmental stakeholders, but in New York, in the WSIS+10, the final decision is in the hands of governments only.

We have the Internet Governance Forum which is a multi-stakeholder body where everybody participates on equal footing, but no decisions are taken.

And here the NETmundial filled a certain gap because this was a multi-stakeholder process where all stakeholder participates on equal footing and they were able to produce outcomes. This was really an innovation.

The challenge after the April meeting – it's less than a year that the Sao Paulo meeting took place – was can we stabilize this? Can we move forward? Can we add an additional element to the [inaudible] of

different multi-stakeholder processes in this Internet governance ecosystem?

So far, this is still an empty page. It was a great experience in Sao Paulo that not only governments but also the private sector, civil society and technical community, could agree on a rough consensus around a set of principles.

For years, the question of principles has been discussed, so a lot of individual declarations and communiques which define principles, but it was the support of this document where only one stakeholder group or it was regional [admitted].

The Sao Paulo declaration put this one step forward into a document basis now where we have an agreement across all stakeholders and across all continents. And we have to move forward, and this is the challenge now to fill these empty pages. Thank you.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you, Wolfgang. Filling empty pages sounds like a good place to start. Let's turn to Carlos Afonso. He is a member of the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee, which is one of the founding three entities involved in launching the NETmundial initiative. Carlos, do you have any opening thoughts for us?

CARLOS AFONSO: Okay. Thank you, Bill. I would like to a summary of the perspectives regarding the NETmundial initiative from the point of view of the organization I am a collaborator of, which is cgi.br which is participating

ICANN | 52
Singapore

in the initiative from the beginning and is still there providing infrastructure and secretarial support.

I would like to start by trying very simply to identify what the NMI is not. It's not controlled, managed, or overseen by the famous WEF. The WEF has now its own Internet initiative, which has recently been announced, the details of which will be published soon according to them.

It's not a forum. It was never intended to replace or compete with the IGF or any other forum. What the NMI is is a platform in construction and this construction fully depends on the Coordination Council which has been recently constituted. And by the way, they can explain this much better than I do, and we have representatives of them here – to provide mechanisms of support to concrete initiatives, projects, research, which we will [inaudible] the NETmundial principles and roadmap. It's an initiative facilitated by ICANN and cgi.br. We are providing [inaudible] support and funding the secretariat.

The motivation. Building upon the principles and roadmaps established by NETmundial. Several organizations of stakeholders are involved in the initiatives. Two recent examples are the WEF initiative, which I just mentioned, and the Just Net Coalition of some civil society organizations called the Internet Social Forum, which promises to follow the principles set by the World Social Forum.

I would like to read the opening remarks of the proposal which were presented the group, the Just Net Coalition, at the World Social Forum in Tunisia [inaudible].

They say the JNC proposal – according to the JNC, the Internet Social Forum will [inaudible] offer an alternative to the recently launched World Economic Forum NETmundial initiative on global Internet governance. While the WEF and the NETmundial initiative convene global [elites], the Internet Social Forum will be a participatory in [bottom-up] space for all those who believe that the global Internet must evolve in the public interest.

A direct parallel to the launch of the World Social Forum in 2001 and the counter-initiative to the WEF is curious because the initiative of the WEF is still to be announced. But anyway . . .

Again, it's not a forum. The NETmundial initiative is not a forum. It's a platform. And it's not controlled or managed or whatever by the WEF. Okay, I have more here.

NETmundial initiative is run by the recently constituted Coordination Council, which most of you know what the process was. It was not an easy process to select the people to participate, 20 people from five regions in all sectors to participate in this coordinating council.

I, from the beginning, was suggesting that it should be called facilitating council to stress the importance of a council which will coordinate the process of a platform. But the name Coordination Council is stuck. It's there.

The Coordination Council is currently doing a public consultation to obtain contributions towards its terms of reference, which should be presented in a first face-to-face meeting of the Coordinating Council in Costa Rica at the end of March.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

The CC is in charge of negotiating support – sponsorships, funders, to support the relevant proposals gathered by the platform. This is a job of the Coordination Council, not a job of cgi.br or ICANN.

The terms of reference will be essential to define the procedures and criteria for the platform to gather and process relevant proposals. The only limitations is that the mission of the NETmundial initiative and the mandate and goals of the Coordination Council are not changed in a way to distort the original idea. This certainly a [pre-condition] for at least cgi.br to continue to provide support for it.

Then there is finally a good idea, which I think and some other people also think could spark the process of supporting initiatives [inaudible] would be to come [to] the many workshops of the Istanbul IGF to catch possible ideas for proposals which could perhaps become demonstration projects in this [inaudible] phase.

Certainly [inaudible] IGF will be a good source of ideas as well, as this could be thought of a permanent interactive mechanism between the platform and the IGF. This is of course an idea to be submitted to the Coordination Council who are sovereign in decision-making regarding this.

So this is basically – I am trying here to reproduce the vision of cgi.br o the process and of the platform. Thank you.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you, Carlos. And you flagged several things that I probably have flagged. There are a number of people here, including on the panel, who are members of the initial Coordination Council. I'm one of them and

ICANN | 52
Singapore

we're about to hear from another one, and there's others in the room as well who I'll look to later who can try to provide more information about what is actually envisioned if people are interested.

There is, as Carlos said, currently a consultation process going on where a questionnaire has been designed and put on the web and we're seeking input from people pro or con what they think the initiative should or should not do. We could maybe even show just for a second that questionnaire to give you an idea of the types of things we're looking for.

That was very helpful, and there will be a first meeting of the Coordination Council in Costa Rica on the 31st of March.

Okay, let me turn then to one other person and then we'll open it up to the floor. Marilia Maciel is from the Center for Technology and Society of the Getulio Vargas Foundation and she participates in the NETmundial Initiative Coordination Council and is a member of NCUC. Marilia?

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you very much, Bill. Good morning to all. I remember that when we were in the IGF Bali and the NETmundial meeting was being discussed, the OneNet Coalition was launched and I thought to myself, "Oh, my God, I'm going to join another mailing list." And this was before IANA transition and so on, so imagine how I feel today about mailing lists.

But we went to this meeting about the launch of OneNet. I remember that I was convinced about the utility of having a platform that could be

ICANN | 52
Singapore

[a cross] stakeholder group where we could communicate and coordinate and maybe work together, and many of us joined this platform.

I think that for different reasons, the OneNet Coalition did not move forward as expected, maybe because the launch was rushed. But I still see the validity of having a space, a platform, where different stakeholders can coordinate, can come together, can communicate.

What is the role of such platform? I think that it's up to us to discuss and decide together. I'm not going to repeat what Wolfgang has said, but I agree very much with the scenario that he depicted in terms of an opportunity and the gap that we have that we could as well fill in.

I think that the main difference back then in Bali and now is that we can [inaudible] this platform in a much more solid ground because now we have NETmundial as a meeting that takes place very successfully, not only in terms of process – we proved that we can work together and have and achieve a concrete outcome in the end, but we have also a very good document. A document that serves as a compass for us to view this initiative on solid ground. So I think that we are in a much better position now to try to work together in a multi-stakeholder way.

In terms of the NETmundial initiative, the point that we are right now is that the Coordinating Council has been selected in December. We have started to work together, and quite frankly, try to assert ourselves as well as the multi-stakeholder facilitator of the initiative.

I think that we work together with the initial transition council that is composed by CGI and the WEF and ICANN, but still on the other hand,

ICANN | 52
Singapore

we are trying to assert ourselves as the coordinating body that is going to draft a terms of reference.

But one thing that is very important is that we came to the conclusion that these terms of reference should not come from our heads or our ideas or what we think about this platform.

Pretty much following what the NETmundial – the way that NETmundial was organized, and I was part of the executive committee of NETmundial and I had the opportunity to work on the draft document, we are opening a consultation process. So it's extremely important that people participate in this consultation and that they give us enough ides, enough good material, for us to work and to draft a TOR. And then the TOR will be made public again, and I think that people will be able to voice their views about the work that we have done in terms of trying to synthesize and summarize and reflect your ideas about the platform.

This is to say that I think that we have a good group, multi-stakeholder group, of people that really want to make this platform function and be useful for the community. And it's up to the community to tell us what this platform could be, how it could serve you, how it could be useful to you.

And I think that we have kind of overcome a difficult start. Now if we want, we can work together and make something useful with the NETmundial initiative and I think there are a lot of things to do, especially concerning the context that we have with the WSIS+10 coming. I think it's another opportunity for us to prove one more time that the multi-stakeholder collaboration works and it's the best way for us to put forth Internet governance in different scenarios.

The NETmundial initiative is another opportunity for us to strengthen multi-stakeholderism in the [inaudible] that is key for us with the WSIS review and with the tensions that are going to take place and we all know between the two models. We can show that the two models may coexist and both are important for Internet governance, but our collaboration should take place in a multi-stakeholder way to find solutions to the problems that we have. Thank you.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you, Marilia. You mentioned the questionnaire and [inaudible] has put it up on the board. Just to give you some idea of the kinds of things we're looking for in the way of feedback is identification of the issues that people think should be worked on from the NETmundial initiative. Any other views? Could you scroll down just a little bit further? Further, yes.

We asked a series of questions about functions the initiative could perform such as serving as a platform for people to join together and engage in projects serving as an informational clearinghouse, serving as a mechanism for tracking progress in the implementation of the NETmundial initiative.

But these are all just open suggestions building out of a lot of the dialogs of the past year, and what we're really looking for is to see if the community wants any of these things done or would like something else done instead. So we are very much open to trying to get a dialog going on that.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

With that said, let me try then to turn to the floor, having heard these three initial presentations, and see if we can get some input from colleagues here. We've got about 20 minutes that we can spend talking about this, and we'd very much like to hear your views on whether you think this is useful, not useful, should focus on X, should focus on Y, should replicate the experience of the OneNet, should avoid the experience of the OneNet, whatever it may be. We are totally open and we want to have a dialog. There's a microphone there, so if anybody would like to start, either people at the table or seated in the back.

Yes? [Akinori]. And please identify yourself when you . . .

AKINORI MAEMURA: Yes. [Akinori Maemura], JPNIC and involved in APNIC and a member of the Coordination Council of [the NMI]. I cannot agree more what Marilia said. All points presented is really, really right and I totally agree on it.

As Carlos make the initial explanation of the NMI, I was involved in the Coordination Council afterwards. I'd say not really necessarily [kind], but I don't think we necessarily follow everything which the conveners – ICANN, cgi.br, and the WEF – said because NMI is for the community to craft and the Coordination Council is to facilitate the discussion. That means that it is unchartered, but fully flexible for the community to define what is that.

We are now in the process of the [inaudible] to the terms of reference, then we really are looking forward to having a really active input for the Coordination Council to consider.

Another point is that I am really happy to see the Coordination Council members really active and the Coordination Council has by itself a very wide perspective of the opinion. It is [inaudible] multi-stakeholder [inaudible]. Sometimes the opinion from the member is a bit different from the others. So that's a really [healthy] thing.

Then I admire the spirit of the Coordination Council to get NMI right with the coordination with the community. That's what I want to say. Thank you very much.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you. The gentleman in the audience there?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: The gentleman in the audience, Carlos Afonso, and Janis Karklins.

[DANIEL DARDAILLER]:   Hello, [Daniel Dardailler] from W3C. I'd like to know the status of the role of IGF and ISTAR in NMI. There is a seat reserved for them, but in effect, ISTAR has no way to elect someone. I don't think IGF has a way to elect someone. There's no process internally to both ISTAR, which is [ill-defined] and IGF to select a person. So I'm wondering what is the status of their participation. Thanks.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you very much. I think that we have somebody here who can certainly speak to the IGF dimension, and that's Janis Karklins who is the chair of the MAG.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

JANIS KARKLINS: Thank you very much. On this particular question, we had a conversation in December and the MAG couldn't agree whether we should appoint the liaison to the NMI initiative, and the decision which was made was to ask a Brazilian IGF host to follow and to inform MAG about developments in NMI initiative.

Let me maybe use this opportunity to say one thing. NETmundial conference was very supportive to IGF multi-stakeholder as an Internet model and we need to make sure that the initiative follow the decisions of NETmundial conference to the letter.

Everything should be seen through the angle how the activity in the framework of initiative contribute to multi-stakeholder Internet governance model, how that supports Internet governance forum. I think this is a very important element in order to get this initiative support or be supported by others. So thank you.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you for that, Janis. With regard to ISTAR organizations, I'm not in a position to speak to that. There is [the] Coordination Council representative of the World Wide Web Consortium, but is there somebody else who would like to speak to the role of the ISTAR community? No? I don't know what their internal process or dialog is at this stage, to be honest, on this point, but if there's anybody else who would like to – Marilyn would like to? Marilyn Cade, please.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Bill. I'm certainly not speaking for the ISTARs. I admire them greatly, but I stand in awe in their ability to speak for themselves. Instead, my comment is a more general comment about the views that have been expressed by some in the broader business community.

I'm a part of a group that has raised a number of questions and I just want to comment as an individual business leader about the questions and concerns that have been raised, and they reflect I think on Ambassador Karklin's comments.

The NETmundial itself was quite a surprise to many in the business community as well as others, and was, as business embraced engagement and did in fact place people on the steering group and in the management group, we learned a lot more. We contributed. We were very concerned that the outcome documents be non-binding, but we also strongly supported the language that is in the outcome documents – and in particular, the outcome documents call for continued strengthening and support of the IGF.

I am a MAG member and it's very near and dear to my heart that what we do, whatever happens in NMI as it takes consultation that what happens as an outcome is in fact tested against the question of how are those activities or whatever happens as an output, how is it strengthening multi-stakeholder, Internet governance; and in particular, strengthening and enhancing and bringing the Internet Governance Forum closer to more and more participants from all stakeholder groups?

So I'm certainly looking forward to reading the consultation contributions. And I guess my final comment would be by offering the

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

platform for consultation on the terms of reference, I hope all of us will take advantage to provide our comments to that.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you very much, Marilyn. Yes? Was there somebody else? Sally, you wanted to get in on this. Sally Wentworth, please, from ISOC.

SALLY WENTWORTH: Thanks. And just to try to maybe give an additional partial response to the question, I can't speak on behalf of all of the ISTARs, either I'm here for the Internet Society. We've expressed some views about the initial process of setting up the initiative and have had some ongoing dialog with the organizers, and I think we're encouraged to see the consultation that's out. I think that that's very positive because it will give all of us a bit more understanding of what this initiative is and what it's intended to do, and how it fits into the broader Internet governance landscape.

I think that kind of survey will be helpful for us to understand what kind of role we might play in this or not. So I think we're still trying to understand it like many others, and I think welcome the consultation as a step forward to getting greater clarity on what the initiative will do.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you, Sally. We're all trying to understand it, including those of who are involved. Carlos, with your permission, I'm trying to bring more people.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: Yes. Sivasubramanian from ISOC India Chennai. I'm speaking on my own personal capacity. This is a comment on the general overall design of NETmundial.

I believe that NETmundial has a purpose, has a different purpose. IGF has so far been happening as a formal forum. IGF has been a formal forum where discussions were more on the nature of formal discussions. NETmundial can be designed in such a way that greater importance is given to informal discussions so that it emerges as a forum where understanding happens, where agreement happens. It could be designed that way.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you. My understanding, but we'll see what the community wants, is that we do not seek to be a forum, per se, because we have an IGF forum for people to talk to each other – rather that we seek to be more of a platform that enables people to work on projects and do things that the in general itself doesn't do right now. But I understand what you're thinking there.

Are there other voices from the community that we could get into the conversation. The people who are involved can all certainly offer lots of thoughts, but we'd like to hear from you if anybody else has a concern, a question, and anything. Sure, come back.

[DANIEL DARDAILLER]: Sally didn't mention it, but I think ISOC is also running a survey right now.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

BILL DRAKE: Yes, I understand that they are. Wolfgang, would you like to add something?

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: When I entered my first [intervention], I said it's an empty page. So it's up to us to fill this empty page with good ideas. In my eyes, the NMI the initiative has the opportunity to bring additional knowledge, expertise, resources, and authority to the existing institutions, because sometimes the existing institutions have reached a limit.

Take just one example. The US [CSGD] has discussed [since years] the idea of this mapping to bring problems to solutions. So they have now, based on the work of the correspondence group, produced a mapping proposal which will go to the WSIS+10.

But after the conversation with the [CSGD], they told they will never have the resources to promote this into a project which could be called a clearinghouse for Internet governance. Though that means we have an idea on the table. Everybody agrees that this is a good idea, but it doesn't move forward. So that means here the Council can help to mobilize funds, institutions or whatever to bring this idea which was a result of a discussion in the IGF into a concrete project.

I think this linkage to translate the ideas and proposals identified by the IGF into concrete actions, I think this is what the NETmundial initiative can do and it's really – we should stop this to discuss NMI and IGF as alternative for competitors. My concrete proposal is not yet decided, will be that the next meeting of the Coordination Council is together

with the IGF in Brazil to make very clear these two elements which belong together but could have a different task, and the NMI can make additional contributions with better resources, higher authority, and external [inaudible] expertise. Thank you.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you, Wolfgang. And this idea of a clearinghouse, a knowledge-sharing mechanism that would help developing country governments, for example, who are trying to tackle a problem like spam or security or whatever connect with resources and people and expertise that would help them solve their problems is something that was in the [inaudible] Report, the high-level commission. It was in the NETmundial initiative paper. And [inaudible] in only one sentence, I wrote a long paper about it building on the roadmap. It's something that been out there and it's something that the IGF itself does not do formally in that sense. So these are very compatible.

Yes, please? We have five more minutes on this one.

SCOTT SMITH: Scott Smith from the Department of State. I'm curious about what format you would envision containing the diversity views that a platform is likely to produce. It would seem that the idea of narrative text or a consensus document implies that there will be consensus, but in a diverse range of views, would you see allowing all of that to kind of coexist?

I'm just curious in terms of the technology and the tools. Thank you.

BILL DRAKE: Who would like to answer that? Would you like to?

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: I would not recommend that the Coordination Council becomes a negotiation body, which creates a language. The best thing the Council can do is to organize enough support for a concrete project and to agree on projects. And probably [inaudible] priorities of the project. Probably we should have a call for ideas, and then the Council can select what the best ideas are. But they should not enter into negotiates to find compromised language and issues where probably members in the Council agree only to disagree.

BILL DRAKE: Someone came to me the other night in the bar and had a proposal for something to strengthen the IGF by helping improve its informational base, and she said, "Do you think that this could be something that you could bring onto the platform?" And I said as far as I understand, that would be the kind of thing you'd want – an open platform where somebody proposes a project and sees if there are partners who would want to work with them to make take it forward. And that would be constructive [things]. The CC would not be making decisions whether it's a good thing or a bad thing. We create the space and people in the community come together on their own steam and decide what they want to do or don't do. So it's not negotiations in any way as far as I can tell.

EN

Carlos, you wanted to add something. Then we'll move onto another topic if there's nothing else from the audience. Go ahead.

CARLOS AFONSO: Quickly. Just to emphasize that the public consultation is very important, can touch any issue, can propose anything of course, and the Coordinating Council is still the structure which is sovereign in compiling all this and establishing a sort of consensus document, which we [coin] the terms of reference. There is no intention, at least on the part of cgi.br, to interfere in this.

Another thing is following what Wolfgang said, and this is my personal vision. The focus is on a platform, and we could view it as a sort of initiative to support startups. Startups which could, for instance, propose a new way of monitoring or helping the IGF. Startups which could propose a new way to monitor or develop some items in the principles from NETmundial. I can imagine many, many ideas that could be proposed, and this platform would sort out, try to decide on a very balanced and transparent and of course [inaudible] view the ways to support it.

Let's not go beyond that. We'll never be [inaudible] in my view. OneNet was a forum to discuss a political positions, I would say, regarding contributions for NETmundial, for instance. That's not the objective of this platform, not at all.

And I would in particular welcome Sally, a contribution from ISOC to this consultation.

BILL DRAKE:	I share your vision. Okay, let us move on then to our next topic. Obviously, there's much more that could be said about this, but again, the idea is still emergent. As I noted at the outset, the first meeting of the Coordination Council will be on the 31st of March. They will try to [inaudible] and finalize the terms of reference based on a community contribution. We need as much input as possible on this questionnaire, so I hope people will go to the website and provide their feedback – pro, con, whatever. It's fine. Anything else.

Turning to the next topic, the WSIS+10 review will be an inter-governmental summit held under the auspices of the United Nations General Assembly in December 2015 that will review progress on the WSIS and will look into a whole range of different issues, including I presume the IGF. It's supposed to provide some mechanism for input by stakeholders into that inter-governmental process, but the modalities of that as yet rather unclear.

So a number of people are quite concerned, and we talked about this at the last Internet governance meeting in LA exactly how we will participate and try to influence that process. We want to hear from colleagues who are closely involved in the process to let us know what's going on.

I thought maybe we could start with Sally. I know, Sally, you've been tracking this very closely for the Internet Society. What's your sense of where we are in the preparations and so on?

SALLY WENTWORTH: Sure. Thanks for that, Bill. It's going to be a busy year again on the UN calendar with respect to Internet governance. And I do think that's important for all of us who are working in the various technical organizations – ICANN, IETF, elsewhere – is to have an understanding of that broader policy context that we're all operating in.

The WSIS, as Bill said, review will take place at the end of 2015 in New York. It's an opportunity for the UN, for the UN community and we'll see how broadly that gets defined and how inclusive it can be in terms of other stakeholders. But it's the chance for the UN to review what progress they think has been made on the action items that were outlined in the WSIS back in 2005 – 2003 and 2005.

Have we met the targets? Have we delivered on the vision of the Information Society that was adopted then?

This will happen in New York alongside a review of the sustainable development agenda, the sustainable development goals. So I think that we should fully anticipate that there will be a strong development angle or aspect to the WSIS review, and that's not surprising for those of who were involved in the WSIS the first time.

That's going to be a very important opportunity for countries and for stakeholders to reflect on the extent to which we've achieved the promise of the Information Society. To what extent are people online? Are they part of the Internet? Do they see themselves as benefitting from the Information Society or is there more to be done? Of course there's more to be done and this will be a chance to see what that looks like.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

I also think that the security aspects, of course we need to be mindful of the broader security discussions. There will be a big conference in [inaudible] in April, and I think that's – obviously issues related to cybersecurity are high on the agenda of governments of industry, of all of us really, and I think we should anticipate that that will be another substantive angle in the WSIS negotiates.

Then, of course, as Bill pointed out, this larger question – maybe not larger, but a key question of the future of the IGF, the mandate of the Internet Governance Forum, and really I think organizationally how is the UN going to organize itself? What is the role of the UN of the various agencies in this multi-stakeholder ecosystem?

I think we're all hopeful, but have to pay attention to what extent does this UN process come out once again with a real acceptance of the multi-stakeholder model, of the open, global inclusive Internet or is there a desire by countries to walk that back in some fashion? Do we revert back a little bit to traditional governance?

I think these are some of the issues that will be on the table in the WSIS process this year.

BILL DRAKE: Just to follow up on that real briefly. Russia, China, and some other partners recently rebirthed their proposal for a Code of Conduct for the Internet, which was, in the view of many of us, not exactly the most speech-enabling, freedom-enabling document. And this is also going forward in the General Assembly.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

We have seen over the years many proposals to create new UN inter-governmental bodies that would oversee this or that or be an omnibus place to solve all problems and so on.

Would you be expecting those kinds of issues to come up once again in the WSIS summit?

SALLY WENTWORTH: I really think so. I think it's an interesting discussion. The WSIS originally took place in Geneva where the ITU and much more engagement of the more technical agencies. This is going to be a different environment of the General Assembly.

All of those issues – the online privacy resolution that the UN has been working on will be part of the discussion. I think, as you said, proposals from Russia and China on the information order, rules of the road, codes of conduct.

Again, this is really going to go back to do countries believe that enough progress has been made, that they buy into this model or are they going to look to again more traditional mechanisms like codes of conduct or regulations or something of that nature? I think we should definitely be prepared for that.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you. Before I come to Janis, I actually want to turn to Nigel who represents ICANN and [inaudible] inter-governmental processes and follows these things closely. I'm wondering if the IANA transition does not quite go as one hopes and we have to have an extension of six

ICANN | 52
Singapore

months, say, how would you see this playing out in the context of the WSIS summit? How would this affect the politics? And any other thoughts you would have on what we might be looking at.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thanks very much, indeed. I'll try and be brief. I think Sally has set some of the framework for the WSIS review. The review of WSIS is supposed to be on the so-called WSIS outcomes. It's supposed to look, essentially, at what's happened since 2003 and 2005. Have we more accessibility? Have we more multi-lingualism? Have we more e-skills? Have we more e-government? Have we more e-education? It's supposed to look at those issues.

But we know that when the UN countries get together in this inter-governmental setting in New York in December, there will be a wider discussion that takes place, as Bill and Sally have alluded to, and it will be to an extent, have governments got the correct role in Internet governance? Are governments doing enough? Are governments given sufficient opportunities? That will be one of the issues that's discussed.

Should the RIRs still have a responsibility to give out IP numbers? Should ICANN still have a responsibility for the DNS? These will be some of the questions that are asked.

So the linkage to the IANA transition is absolutely key. It's absolutely fundamental. Here we will have 192 governments around the table. I don't suppose we'll get 192, but theoretically you can have 192 governments around the table in New York asking the question, "What is this multi-stakeholder approach? Has this multi-stakeholder approach

ICANN | 52
Singapore

delivered, as codified in the [Tunis] agenda? Do we want it to continue for the next 15 years? Should we have an alternative approach?

And people will say, "Well, we've heard about this IANA transition discussion. These guys have been in rooms for the last six months, nine months, and what have they produced?" And here is the linkage, because if the answer to that question is, yes, it's been complex, it's been difficult, it's been difficult in those trenches to produce something – accountability, IANA transition, CWG, these are words that will just float into the ether.

But if there is a roadmap, if there is a plan, if there is a concrete transition, not in effect, not happened of course by December, but if there's a plan towards it, but we as the governments and we as the multi-stakeholder community will be able to point to that reality.

But if there's nothing at all, if all we can point to is discussions, discussions and arguments, then those countries – well, some of those countries will say – yeah, right, well, ICANN you've had a few years, 15 years or so. Let's try something else.

BILL DRAKE: Well, that's an encouraging thought. Could I just ask, as an add-on, in that context, would the NETmundial initiative, having been stood up and gotten some momentum potentially be of any strategic value in those interactions?

ICANN | 52
Singapore

EN

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Yeah. The NETmundial initiative, those of us that were fortunate enough to be in Sao Paulo I think got a real sense of energy. We got a real sense that the multi-stakeholder community can come together and can actually produce something.

Now, okay there were some governments that said this wasn't exactly what they wanted, but an awful lot of those 92 governments in Sao Paulo were very keen about what happened at Sao Paulo, were very keen on the principles that were agreed, on the roadmap that was agreed. They cued up those microphones. They took part in that multi-stakeholder debate and produced something.

Yes, perhaps some parts of the community wanted to go further on net neutrality or further on surveillance or whatever, but that model proved it could produce some substantive output, and I think the NETmundial initiative has got that potential as was described before.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you. Well, in this context thing, Yanis, the IGF certainly would seem maybe to come into play with all these other games playing out in the UN General Assembly, the renewal and endorsement of the IGF could get drawn into this larger environment as a bargaining [chip] or anything else. How do you see the World Summit negotiations playing out and what might it mean for the IGF?

YANIS KARKLINS: Certainly. IGF will be on the agenda of negotiates, and that became abundantly clear after the decision of the second committee last year

not to take decision on renewal of mandate of IGF upon request of delegation of Mexico.

Let me maybe come back a little bit what [Siva] said and go to initial intent of WSIS review. When we negotiated follow-up and review of WSIS in 2005, the underlying idea was to make sure that experiences of implementation of decisions of the summit would contribute to conversation and review of achievement of [millennium] development goals.

In that respect, we thought that a review in 2015 would be appropriate. Actually, we made the mistake because now we see that [millennium] development summit review process is well underway and the summit itself will take place in September 2015, and the WSIS review will take place in December 2015. In other words, the train will be gone by then.

As a result, there will be question whether WSIS framework should be maintained or that should be completely abandoned. Because if that's what [inaudible] [millennium] development goal review, it would be already decided. But it will not be. So therefore, that will be one question.

Second question is renewal of all mandates that were given by WSIS and then here comes IGF. Whether we should be sure that IGF will be extended, I think that there was overwhelming support to continuation of IGF. The mere fact of existence of a few dozen – maybe even three dozen – initiatives of national and regional level suggest that a multi-stakeholder dialogue on Internet governance related issues is necessary. But we need to see what will be approached during the negotiates and

whether that will be just discussion of extension of mandate, or that will be also a discussion about the change of the mandate of IGF.

In this respect, the implementation of the recommendations produced by the [CSDG] Working Group on Improvement of IGF will be looked very closely. And now planning the Brazil IGF we are trying to sort of follow these recommendations very closely, and we have introduced a number of innovations – actually, those were introduced already in the preparation for Istanbul meeting, but now even more.

What are these new elements? These create bigger visibility of IGF. This is to engage in production of more tangible outputs through best practice forums, and this is attempt to create or engineer the intercessional activity stream which may bring some kind of policy messages to Brazil IGF for endorsement.

Whether we will succeed, time will show. Actually, if I may say, the call for proposals has been launched at the beginning of this week after Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group retained the title of the Brazil IGF and the title is Evolution of Internet Governance: Empowering Sustainable Development.

And IGF retained eight sub-teams: cybersecurity and trust, Internet economy, inclusiveness and diversity, openness, enhancing multi-stakeholder coordination, Internet and human rights, critical Internet resources, and emerging issues.

I'm using this opportunity to encourage all those who are thinking about putting forward proposals for workshops during Brazil IGF, please do it. The deadline is [30] of March. Then MAG will be looking at those

ICANN | 52
Singapore

proposals and will shape the structure of the meeting during the next meeting which is set for [2022] May in Geneva.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you, Janis. So let's go to the floor. Any thoughts or concerns about the WSIS+10 Summit process, the kinds of approaches governments might take in the UN General Assembly, how stakeholders might weigh in and ensure that their voices are heard in this process? Anything along those lines we're hoping for your inputs, please. [inaudible]. Sally Wentworth while we're waiting.

SALLY WENTWORTH: I'll jump back in. I do think these UN processes, particularly when we get into WSIS and all the various acronyms – [CSTD, and ECOSOC] and all the various things. It can sound very distant. And it is very procedural. It's traditional UN processes.

I do think it's important to look at this, though, and say what is it really about? You're going to have a lot of individuals – they're going to be from their governments, yes, maybe from other stakeholders – in a room looking at this vision that was set out in 2005 for the Information Society and they're going to look at it from the vantage point of from where they sit, of whether they're a government, a developing country, a developed country, an industry player, a civil society entity, end user possibly and say, "Do I see myself in this vision? What do I think about security? What needs to be done to create more access? Do I believe the digital divide is getting smaller or is it expanding? Is the model participatory? Do I feel like I'm heard?"

It can be – we read these reports and we all do them, all of the acronyms and all of the meetings and all that. But I think it's important for us as a community to remember what this is really about, and this is about making the Internet open, accessible, a tool of innovation and that is really what, hopefully, this summit will be about.

On the other hand, it could also be about if people don't think that the Internet is meeting those expectations or we don't make the case that it is participatory that the reactions will be what Bill and others and Nigel outlined of something far less inclusive and far less open.

So I think it's important to get this back down to real. This is real stuff.

BILL DRAKE: Marilyn. Can I go to the floor? So [Matt] and then Bertrand, and then we'll come back around. Yes?

[MATT]:   Okay. So let's take a reality check on the WSIS, okay? Effectively what's happening is we're stepping back in time. The WSIS review is going to be an inter-governmental process, limited opportunity for civil society to participate. Effectively, the final decisions on the WSIS will be taken behind closed doors. I might be exaggerating slightly, but I doubt it.

So, my question to you is what's our agenda? Do we want a WSIS post 2015? And if we have a WSIS post 2015, what would we like it to be? We seem to be kind of assuming that our agenda is being dictated or letting our agenda be dictated by other parties. This is a review process. Then perhaps we need to review the WSIS. Let's not step back and let us

ICANN | 52
Singapore

be carried along here. Perhaps we should be saying what we would like to see post 2015. Thank you.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: I'm fully in line with what [Matthew] has just said. I think it is [sad irony] that ten years after the WSIS Tunis meeting, the format for its review is less multi-stakeholder than the Tunis meeting.

And as many of you in this room participated in the whole WSIS process, we fought for the right of getting more multi-stakeholder, we got even documents as the general outcome saying the goal is to make participation [inaudible] the principle for handling Internet-related issues.

The fact that the WSIS+10 review is in that format is a shame. Not to mention that any progress that has happened in terms of access or any of the topics that have been listed in this list has nothing to do with the WSIS follow-up process. It was the initiatives of private actors, was the initiatives of some governments who have done decisions at the national level.

Having participated in the drafting of a certain number of resolutions in the UN system since the WSIS, none of them has produced one single paragraph that was different from the wordings that were adopted in 2005, except for some initiatives like Brazil and Germany on the privacy and all the things.

So as a review, the WSIS process has produced one thing which is the IGF. And I want to be very clear: if for whatever reason the decisions that are being made do not take as a [granted] issue that the IGF will

ICANN | 52
Singapore

continue, I hope that Mexico or any other country will have the guts of raising its hand and saying, "We don't mind. We will organize it, period."

BILL DRAKE: One can hold conferences without the blessing of the United National General Assembly. It is possible.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: All the regional IGFs are organized without any mandate from inter-governmental body.

BILL DRAKE: Yeah. Any last thoughts on this? If not – okay, one more, and then we will go . . .

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Janis also wanted to say a quick word.

BILL DRAKE: I'm sorry. All right, quickly then. We're beginning to collapse on time. I'll extend the session 5-10 minutes into your lunch break if that doesn't annoy you too much in order for people to be able to speak. Please, quickly.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I'll be brief. My name is [inaudible]. I come from the European [External Actions] Service. I just want to say having been part of the whole negotiations process of the [inaudible] solution and so on in New York

that, obviously coming from the European Union but also I think other governments as you all know are very much fighting for keeping all stakeholders involved in this process [of the review].

We all don't know clearly how the whole process will look like with the WSIS review, what's running up to the [actual] high-level event in December, what is important, that there is still some language which includes having consultations with all stakeholders. And this is language that we fought hard to keep in there, so it will be important that we try together everyone from all stakeholders to be as much involved as one can be throughout this [fall]. So starting July and [onward], keep your eyes open and let's all together try and feed into the process. Thank you.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you very much. We do need to keep our eyes open. Marilyn Cade and Janis Karklins.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I'm going to be a little more optimistic. I think in fact this is a window of opportunity. It is important to take stock on a regular basis. And we did achieve a lot in Tunis, and I will say as someone from business who spent many of the days of the first preparatory process in the halls and not in the room, yet at the outcome, we were all in the room working toward language that was agreed in the Tunis agenda and has carried us forward as a very good platform.

It does behoove us I think to also remember that there are other activities that have taken place that are feeding into the review, one of

those being the coordinated work of the four agencies that was called the multi-stakeholder platform culminating in the high-level documents now called the green book which assessed the action lines and includes a vision statement that is going forward.

We also have the [CSTD] review which has been mentioned, which is an excellent document. We have, as we speak now, about another topic, another event – the UNESCO consultation.

I want to urge us to think about this very positively and to think about how we become very informed and go work at a national level with the governments to help them engage with their contacts in New York and to provide feedback that is relevant and informed to helped the negotiators in New York.

It's a very different world in New York and it's different at the General Assembly and it's different for a reason. They have very different obligations. So perhaps this is our opportunity as a very broad community to create awareness and to figure out how we help.

BILL DRAKE: Thanks. It's certainly true that when they had that enhanced cooperation session a couple of years ago, we watched it on remote because most of us couldn't be there, the representatives from government that were there talking, [inaudible] thinking, "Wow, did they just discover Internet governance?" [They had] the solutions.

Janis?

JANIS KARKLINS: Last thought. The resolution and modalities of high level meetings suggest that that would be president of General Assembly who would be in charge of organizing the consultations with other stakeholders. That is not part of inter-governmental machinery.

I think that it would be very useful to use IGF Brazil meeting for such type of consultations. Why one would say it may be too late, but in reality, in November, there will be very stable draft of the WSIS+10 high level meeting, and all stakeholders would be able to provide comments and input to that stable draft already. Whether we will succeed on that or not, time will show. I am in contact with the UN New York office, and also I hope that the MAG will help me in accepting that type of opportunity, if [the] president of General Assembly will accept. So thank you.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you, Janis. In the few moments that remain, we'd like to do a small informational item on one other session coming up that's important and interesting which I mentioned at the outset. This is the conference happening in early March at UNESCO in Paris.

To introduce a little bit about that, we have here to start us of Walid Al-Saqaf from NCUC. Walid, where are you? Sorry, Walid, go.

WALID AL-SAQAF: Yes. The Internet study, the UNESCO Internet study, was mandated first by the 52nd resolution of the 37th General Assembly or General Conference of UNESCO in 2013. It basically requested that there will be

ICANN | 52
Singapore

a comprehensive study on Internet-related issues produced through an inclusive multi-stakeholder consultation process.

So the study covers Internet issues within the mandate of UNESCO, and that would be access to information and knowledge, freedom of expression, privacy, and ethical dimensions of the Information Society. However, it also has a very fundamental part, which is options for future actions.

The study itself was built on the concept of a paper that had been developed throughout 2014 with the theme of Internet universality. There are four pillars that this concept is built upon.

The first is that Internet is basically human rights based, and that's very close to our hearts at NCUC; and for me as an Internet activist myself.

The other part is that it is built on open technology and opportunities. So that openness of Internet is very fundamental.

Then there needs to be the thing that concerns many people from the developing world, such as Yemen where I come from, which is accessible to all. That's extremely important.

And finally – and this is what we've been talking about throughout the early part of this session – it's multi-stakeholder engagement.

So these are the four pillars, and I remember many occasions when [inaudible] who is spearheading the process here saying, "I call this [Rome]." And it may be something easier to remember. If you remember these four concepts, it resembles [ROME] abbreviation.

The idea here is that the study had been conducted through 2014, and it included the 30 questions in a survey. I happen to fill it up. There's opportunity for everyone to contribute through the Internet, through the survey, as well as consultations that have been going on. And if you've been in several events, including the IGF and others, you may recall that there were workshops concerning this study.

As a follow-up to the study, an important part of concluding the study, there is going to be a conference. And this conference will be held in the third and fourth of March in Paris at the UNESCO headquarters, and ICANN happens to be one of the partners. In fact, among the speakers would be Fadi as well as [Catherine] of ISOC. In fact, several people perhaps in this room, including myself.

Then there will also be an opportunity for registration. It's open for all. There is a link that you can open through the net. If you would like to find the website, it's a bit obscure. If you search on Google, you can write in "UNESCO net conference 2015" in one word. It will include, as the page says, about 300 civil society representatives, advocacy groups, government representatives, private sector, technical community representatives, international organizations and regional organizations involved.

It's basically going to look into means of supplementing or discussing the findings and seeing how do they form better – there may be opportunities to form consensus and ideas that would build for future steps.

While the objective of all of this was to support and contribute to the WSIS+10 review process and post-2015 development agenda, I think it's

important to understand the value of this study, as well as the conference, so I give the floor to Marilyn to proceed from here.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you, Walid. Marilyn?

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I'm going to be very quick. I'm just going to point out that at ICANN where we often attract more of the technical entities to attend, we perhaps miss the fact that what we do at ICANN has significant implications for issues like access to knowledge, information, content development, etc. That falls into UNESCO's realm

For those of you who don't know this, Ambassador Karklins was at UNESCO for quite some time and made a terrific contribution to helping to broaden UNESCO's activities.

One of the things that will be addressed in this study and in the output – and there will be a negotiated document, there are workshops where we will actually be engaging and looking at draft language – is a discussion about UNESCO's role within the UN system regarding Internet governance.

I myself am a big fan of further enlisting UNESCO. I'd like to see us as an ICANN community actively participating, encouraging others to participate in that conference, and strengthening the engagement of the UNESCO engagement with governments [inaudible] UN system on the role that they can play in Internet governance.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

The ethical dimensions category, let's be honest with ourselves, that comes out of concerns that governments have about the surveillance issues and the access to stored and moving data and private information. So that is a particularly important I think, and relevant, research topic that we'll all be informed by as when we see the study that is released, and also we can think about the implications for the role that we play here at ICANN.

I hope to be there, and I think it is something that all of you should at least go online and look at the content and the questions that were asked. Thanks.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you very much, Marilyn. It was very concise. All right, I think we're moving to a close. We're five minutes late. Is there any quick comment anybody would like to make about this UNESCO business? Yes, sir?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] from the National [inaudible]. Thank you, Walid and Marilyn, for that. Can I ask you what would be the specific agenda for the UNESCO meeting with regard to the IANA transition? Will it be discussed at all? Apart from the role of the UNESCO in converting to evolving [IG] processes, will any of the proposals be discussed, any other concrete outcomes that we've had until now? Thank you.

EN

MARILYN CADE: I don't see it as being specifically addressed. This conference is based on a year-long consultation with contributions that have largely come in already. In fact, those contributions are online. That's not to say that in the room in the two days that someone might not raise the linkage of the IANA transition, but I would think that actually it would be unusual to focus on that topic in the UNESCO conference.

Discussions about accountability might be more likely to be raised and be more directly relevant, I would think.

BILL DRAKE: Sir?

AHMED EISA: Okay. I am Ahmed Eisa, ICANN fellow from Sudan. I am the chairman of Gedaref digital city organization in Sudan. We are one of the partners with ITU in promoting for the WSIS process and the WSIS [inaudible]. So an initiative [inaudible] WSIS because we are promoting for the WSIS. One of them is the Internet governance.

We are practitioners as [inaudible] members. We are practitioners in connecting people with disability, empowering women, and many other marginalized communities. So we prefer if what happened here in ICANN they have a fellowship for developing countries, for the same things I think it [inaudible] can promote for participation of developing countries, to have a fellowship for IGF summit. That will help.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

In addition to that, I visited your website yesterday, and up to now, it is not activated, the link for submission of the proposal or workshops in the IGF website. Thank you.

BILL DRAKE: Yes, I think that's coming up soon. Janis, would you like to finish off here?

JANIS KARKLINS: Yeah, just about UNESCO. Initial requests in 2013 General Conference was to launch the process of development of UNESCO recommendation. In terminology of that organization, that means legally binding instrument.

During the General Conference, there were very intense negotiates, and instead of launching work on recommendations, it was decided to do a study first.

This study will be presented in one month from now and discussed, then it will be sent to the General Conference in November 2015, where then subsequent decisions will be made on how to handle questions further.

BILL DRAKE: And finally, on the point of proposals, I just want to note that while we were sitting here, somebody in the room – [inaudible] – submitted a proposal to the NETmundial initiative for support for [The Friends of the IGF]. So there you go. Synergy between NETmundial initiative and the IGF already emerging.

Okay, Nigel would like to give us a closing [inaudible]. We are ten minutes late, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: We have to pay overtime if we go over. No. I just wanted to mention that a lot of people go away from these ICANN meetings and come back in four months' time or whatever and wonder what's happened.

So the [inaudible] is to go to the ICANN site. We will be posting updates on the WSIS process and on the UNESCO conference as well, which we're involved in. So please follow the process, especially on the WSIS, the [CSDD] meeting, the paper that's been referred to. It's all open consultation, so please have your say. Thank you.

BILL DRAKE: Have your say.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel, and thanks to all of our panelists. Thanks to Bill Drake, of course, and thanks to everyone here who has taken part. The working group work continues. As you can see, there's an enormous amount of work ahead of us.

There is a sign-up sheet for the mailing list which has been going around. If you haven't seen it, haven't put your details on it, please just drop your details on a piece of paper and pass it over to [Rinate] in the corner.

ICANN | 52
Singapore

Jordan Carter had to leave early, but Rafik, did you have anything to add?

RAFIK DAMMAK: I think you should not keep people from going to lunch.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: One last thing. Did you like the format of this session? If you did, please put your hand up. Okay. Do you think we need to change the format? Anybody who thinks we need to change the format, put your hand up. Okay, I note more people like the format. Because we're trying to work out new formats.

Okay. Thanks very much everyone. I hope you can still catch a little bit of lunch before this afternoon's public form. Thanks and bye-bye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]