
ICANN85 Mumbai | CF – WSIS+20 Lessons Learned & Next Steps
Monday, March 9, 2026 – 13:15 to 14:30 IST

REBECCA MCGILLEY

Hello and welcome to the WSIS+20 Lessons Learned and Next Steps. My name is Becky McGilley and I am a Participation Manager for this session. Please note that this session is being recorded and is governed by the ICANN Community Participant Code of Conduct, ICANN Expected Standards of Behavior, and the ICANN Community Anti-Harassment Policy.

Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. We will also post them in the chat for your reference. Interpretation for this session will include English, French, Spanish, Chinese, Arabic, Russian, and Hindi. Please observe the following guidelines to participate in this session. Sorry. There are three ways to ask questions.

If you are here in person, please go to one of the standing microphones and queue for your turn. If you're participating remotely, please submit your question through the Zoom Q&A pod. I will either read your question aloud or you can raise your hand to speak directly.

Simply click the raise hand icon at the bottom of your screen to join the queue and we will unmute you when it's your turn. Whether you are in person or remote, when it is time to speak, please state your name for the record, the language you will speak if speaking a

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.

language other than English, and please speak clearly and at a moderate pace. I will now hand the floor over to our moderator, Head of ICANN Government and IGO Engagement, Janis Karklins.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you, Becky. Good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the session on Lessons Learned from the WSIS+20 Review Process and Next Steps. As you know, in December, after about two years of preparations, the United Nations adopted the final document at the WSIS+20 review conference. This was a lengthy process where we, ICANN, participated in a very orderly and constructive manner.

The idea of this 75-minute session is to reflect how the process went, what we did, how we did, whether what we did worked well, and how these lessons from a previous process could be used going forward to the next important event, or events, starting with the ITU Plenipotentiary Conference, which will take place in November this year.

The session is planned to be as a community dialogue, and we hope that we will gather interesting views that your experiences that we can really analyze and take into account going forward. But in order to kickstart this conversation, we have invited a number of panelists here on the stage.

We will hear from Kurtis Lindqvist, the President and CEO of ICANN. We will hear from Sally Wentworth, the President and CEO of ISOC, two organizations that cooperated very closely in preparation of

the World Summit Review Conference. We will hear also from two community members, the community award winner, Amrita Choudhury, and congratulations once again, and Chris Disspain, whom probably I need not to introduce.

Then we hear also from Ian Sheldon, the Australian GAC representative who was also involved in the UN process. And finally, we will hear also from Chengetai Masango, who is the head of IGF Secretariat.

After introductory remarks of panelists, I will open the floor for comments for anyone in the room and online. And at the end of the session, I will ask all panelists maybe to make concluding remarks of about one minute long. So with this, I would like now to invite Kurtis Lindqvist to share his views.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Thank you, Janis, and welcome everyone to the reflection on the WSIS+20. I think it's good for us to reflect on this and think about the process, both to WSIS+20 reviews, by the way, but I think also the last 20 years, of course, that the review was meant to look at.

And intergovernmental processes require patience and clarity because international environment today is not simple. And I think we have to be aware of that and we have to understand our role and our work in the context of that. But I think the WSIS+20 review reminded us something that was quite fundamental, and that is

really the importance that the Internet really works because it's coordinated through collaboration.

And Janis mentioned the work with ISOC and others throughout this, and I think we had a very good working relationship and work together with ISOC, but also with many of our colleagues who were very engaged in this, and we shared information and worked with them as well.

And I think this collaboration has been really a key in how we got the outcomes we wanted. That is sort of what we had, that we had hoped for. And I think ICANN Org and the Board, we treated this as a priority, and we defined very clear channels for the community.

We had a discussion group among the SO/AC members that met regularly and exchanged views on this. We created outreach network of community members who shared common interests and also helped align contributions, and the community contributed to this as much as we did. And it was really a good source of information in that way.

And I think it also, what we heard back was it ended up helping many of the engaged stakeholders who maybe didn't have the resources to follow all the developments, but through this engagement and sharing, we could really build on each other's knowledge and insights that we gained.

And as ICANN, we also organized something together with ISOC webinars that would really help to generate more feedback and

work around this. Again, together with ISOC, we also developed the footprints of the 20 years of the Internet Governance Forum that helped to summarize these papers, and we had the other paper, the IGF we want.

And this collaboration really, I think, reflected our experiences and really reinforced that this wasn't just one of us having an opinion, but it was all of us together as a community who came together and shared these views.

And we also had a lot of direct engagement with actors in the process. We invited the co-facilitators to ICANN84 in Dublin, who really, one, I should also say that they expressed the gratitude for being able to come, because I think they really felt that they got an engagement they wouldn't have had otherwise.

I don't want to speak on their behalf, but I think that they mentioned that in New York. And I think also it really created a substantive exchange for them with the community, and the community thereby had a real good opportunity to give feedback and input to this. And this wasn't just about ICANN, by the way. I think this also helped the broader technical community, and I'd like to really thank the co-facilitators for really engaging with the community and really making this an inclusive effort.

I think that was very, very, very positive from our point of view. And I think these relationships that came out of this process really tremendously helped shape the outcome. And I think this environment and this collaboration and discussion is something

we shouldn't take for granted. It should be nurtured. We should really keep this going, even if WSIS+20 has ended for this time.

As Janis said, there was the new cycle started, and I started working on this in the prep camp phase and led to Tunis, so this phase will always keep going. It's not going to end, no matter what we think. So, I think keeping that going. And I do think we let this become a bit of a lull in the years leading after WSIS+10, and I think we do need to be careful about that.

I think we also had these intergovernmental sessions and discussions that many of us organized, and I think that's really, really helpful. I'm going to finish soon, but just a few things that I think are lessons that we took away from the process and leading up was that having clear objectives really made a difference.

It helped us understand what we focused on, and the discussions around this were much more informed when we explained how the DNS or how the internet worked. And I think the technical community came together and really did that, but it also underlines how important it is that a technical community can help by providing information, have a seat at the table to provide those insights, to provide that data into the discussions so that governments and other policymakers understand what's at stake and how these decisions will shape the outcomes.

Looking forward, we have another -- as I said, this doesn't end. We have the IT plenipot coming up in November, and I think we need to continue this. We need to continue having this discipline and

work on this, and I think we need to have it beyond November, by the way, as well. And I think ICANN, as ICANN, will continue to engage with governments. We keep holding a lot of bilaterals.

We'll have them early and proactively and really clarify technical implications of various decisions made. And I think we're happy. I think the governments do appreciate it. I mean, last week, I was at Mobile World Congress, and we had 19 bilaterals in one and a half days.

It tells you that there is a bit of interest on governments, as well, in hearing this, whether we can keep up with the interests, maybe. But I think it is a very important thing. And I think governments should hear from a technical community, from businesses, and from civil society.

All of us have a role to play in this and really help shape these outcomes, because it's so crucial, so important for our daily lives, for economic growth, economic development, that we can really, really drive this. And I think I'd like to add that it's also the critical infrastructure. We know this is becoming a very important topic.

So that growth from the domain and registers to root server operators should also be part of shaping that discussion and having voices heard in this. And I think this review process really confirmed this learning that this is really important and valuable pieces of this. We really need to push for the technical governance structures that keeps the internet stable and secure and interoperable to be heard to explain how this is done, what are the

implications when we do this. But I think I'm out of time there. So, thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you, Kurtis, for your reflections. And now I will invite Sally Wentworth, President and CEO of ISOC. Please, Sally.

SALLY WENTWORTH

Thank you very much, Janis. And thank you to ICANN for organizing this session. I agree that it's a good moment to pause and reflect on what lessons we can learn and how we forward apply those as we go into future discussions about Internet Governance and defend the principles that we think are so important.

The Internet Society, of course, has been in these discussions about Internet Governance and in the World Summit on the Information Society since its earliest days. And we've seen these discussions sort of ebb and flow in the community over the years.

And one of the things that I reflect on in this process was the extent to which the internet technical community, and I think many people in this room, were really energized over a sustained period of time to engage with their governments, to engage in their regions, to reach out in New York and to actually have impact. And that's not easy to do.

We all have a lot of other topics that we are responsible for, other issues that we care about. But it's really important that we not take this multi-stakeholder consensus for granted. It has to be

constantly defended. And if there's anything that we learned in this process, it's that that consensus is fragile and it requires constant attention.

And the talking points, the messages that we deliver have to be fit for purpose for the moment that we're in. So, the talking points and the messaging that were successful 10 years ago, 20 years ago, are not necessarily the same messages that are going to land in this moment. It's not that the principles have changed. They haven't. We all fundamentally believe that an open, secure, trustworthy internet for everyone requires the participation of stakeholders.

And it's not just participation, it's engagement, it's the voices in the room that will make the decisions that we collectively make stronger, more resilient, more robust, and in the better interest of the users around the world. So, it's not just who gets in the room, it's that the quality of the decisions is better when we engage in this model. But that is not fully understood globally and it's not always fully accepted. And I think it's important that we reflect on the fact that that was a fight that we had to have and a case we had to make.

I think it's also important, I think, from where we sit at the Internet Society, we have a broad mandate with respect to the internet. The Internet Society's strategic goals are focused on secure, trustworthy, robust internet connectivity around the world, but also affordable and reliable connectivity, that development component of what we do.

And we have to meet governments where they are and be able to demonstrate that this model actually solves the challenges that they're facing. And yes, we in the technical community rely on the multi-stakeholder model for our decisions, but we also believe that connectivity is going to reach the hardest to reach communities when stakeholders come together to solve those hard problems.

The internet experience is going to be safer and more secure if stakeholders put their heads together, the technical community, the policy community, civil society, and others to actually craft robust solutions that are sustainable and resilient over the long run.

One of the things that impressed me in the run-up to this meeting was the real collaborative nature, the collaborative spirit that I actually felt across the internet community with governments, with colleagues across the different stakeholder groups, that this was worth engaging in, this was worth working together, there was enough to do that we needed lots of different groups involved.

I can say from the Internet Society, and I see Drew here, the IETF and the Internet Architecture Board engaged because they knew what was at stake for the work that they did. The TCCM emerged, another group that saw that this was a process, that something was at stake that they wanted to participate.

The Sounding Board, all these different groups, the groups that ICANN set up created spaces for people to learn about what was involved, take those messages back into their home countries, and

try to deliver those messages in a way that was meaningful in their local environment.

The challenge, of course, is that taking that local message into New York was really hard, and we learned that, I think, in this process, that we have small delegations in New York, the processes aren't always as open as we would like, it's harder to get in, and so the collaboration across these groups was ever more important as different parts of the ecosystem had different ways of getting in and getting messages heard. So, I think relying on each other was incredibly important.

I also do want to call out the UN Secretariat and the co-facilitators. They really did work hard, I think, to engage stakeholders. The UN system isn't always set up that way, and it's not always as inclusive as I think we are used to and that we would like, but I really think it's important to recognize that the co-facilitators, in particular, spent a lot of time with all of us and the stakeholders to try to get those voices heard in the process, and I think that really did drive a stronger outcome in the end. But I do want to come back to the thing I said, that this consensus is fragile.

The final days leading up to the agreement were very hard, and there was not a guarantee that we would reach consensus, and I think that we can't then just walk away from that and say, okay, it's done, see you in 10 years moving on, because that consensus has to be defended, I think, relentlessly over the coming years.

And so, the groups that were set up, the collaboration that we all engaged in is something that I know a lot of conversations are happening this week about how do we sustain that, how do we ensure that we don't lose sight of what's at stake here. So, some initial reflections, and I hope in further conversations on this session we can look forward to the remainder of the year and how do we keep this momentum going.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you, Sally, for your reflections. And after now hearing from two heads of organizations, let me turn now to community members. Amrita, please.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Thank you so much, Janis. Yes, I will reflect from an end-user civil society perspective. For us, when we look at the WSIS+20 Process, it was better than many other UN processes, especially the GDC, which happened because it was open.

Community members could submit their inputs, they could see them listed, they could also see who has listed what, they got an idea of what is coming next, the recordings were there, so it was a fairly transparent and more accountable system.

Of course, there is provisions to improve it further, especially towards the end, but overall, it was a transparent and more inclusive process where the rotated time zones, people really heard you out, especially for people from APAC, where the times are never

friendly for us. Our people did get a chance to speak, even connecting the co-facilitators were very accommodating, joining online for APR IGF and hearing out our community members.

I also had the privilege of serving on the Informal Multi-Stakeholder Sounding Board, there are quite a few IMSB members here, and this was a unique pilot and perhaps the first of its kind in the UN process, a multi-stakeholder process. We got a chance to hear from various community members as another option where the community members can speak to us.

What we heard, we presented the diverse views, we didn't form our own views and send it over to the co-facilitators for decision making. During the final lapse, though we were not allowed in the room, we had a few community members there as delegates, which could be improved in future. Some of our members were in New York trying to explain why certain stakeholders are having this perspective, and we have got feedback that that was helpful.

So, perhaps in future processes, the UN and the Plenipot coming up, which is more closed, these could be considerations which they could look at and our reflections, I think, should be up on the website of UNDESA soon.

Having said that, the agreement which the governments came across of the review was good, I would say, overall. It still has people-centric messages in it. The multi-stakeholder model is reinforced, strengthening the idea of the national regional initiatives, youth initiatives. There's a lot of capacity building, et

cetera. However, the devil lies in the details and implementation is something which we all hopefully would be concerned about how it pans out. Things look good in the document.

And how would the rest of the community, the technical community, civil society, business, academia, actually engage in the implementation? That's more critical, especially when, due to geopolitics, we are seeing the Multi-Stakeholder Model under, not a threat, but it's shrinking because there are, you know, countries walking out of various UN processes, et cetera. We really don't know how it will pan.

And I think if we want a nuanced internet and, you know, we really want the WSIS, whatever has been agreed, followed, we need to see how the rest of the community can support this, what their role would be. And for the most of the community members, the civil society, end users, et cetera, what is important is getting the information, which perhaps ICANN Internet Society gets it first, that passing down what worked in the WSIS+20 review process of having the information percolating down or demystifying what something means so that people can react, that would be really helpful in the buildup, even for Plenipot or in future.

And perhaps the UN might consider having an IMSB kind of a model for other processes, even implementations, as in that's our wish list. Let's see how it goes. I'll stop here, Janis. I hope I've stuck to my three minutes.

JANIS KARKLINS

Yeah, thank you, Amrita, for your reflection. And now I'm turning to Chris Disspain. Please, Chris.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Thank you, Janis. Good afternoon, everybody. I'm going to reflect on this from a perspective of the ICANN community. There are better people qualified on this panel to talk about the results of the actual WSIS process. The truth is, I think we don't know if the result was better because of what we did. We just know that the result was pretty good. And we feel, I think, that we put in a fairly huge effort to get it to that point.

I think the discussion group that we formed, sort of informal discussion group that we formed, was incredibly useful. I think that the TCCM was immensely helpful. And I want to call out especially the ccTLD managers that put that together. But I don't think it should have been necessary. And that is kind of what I'm going to build on from my reflections.

I also think at the start, we made a bunch of assumptions, or rather, a bunch of assumptions were made. Not the least of them being, well, this is now a New York-based process, a UN New York-based process, not Geneva. So, we need to remember to handle it in a different way. And therefore, we're really talking about government to government. And it was this community that pushed back on that and said, well, hold on, even if that's true, we

shouldn't just accept it. We should be pushing back and saying that's not the way it should be.

And in fact, it turned out that either the assumption was incorrect, or the fact that we pushed back meant that it did become, in many respects, a multi-stakeholder process, which I think we should all be immensely grateful.

The key point, and both Sally and Kurtis have said this, is it's not over. We now have a permanent IGF, which is marvelous. But we will have continuing work in WSIS, will doubtless be a WSIS Plus, whatever, 25, 30, et cetera. And I think that ICANN needs to have a clear strategy on what to do now after the results.

Sometimes it feels as if we get through a piece, we've got through this piece now, and then we kind of let it go until we need to get through it again. And I don't want to see that happen. I want us to have a clear strategy on how we're going to interact with an ongoing and now permanent IGF. This is not bad. Is ICANN just going to turn up and do its usual welcome to ICANN session for the new people and so on? Or is it going to have a different strategy that deals with helping the rest of the community to put on sessions and so on and so forth?

I lived through the Board's decision-making process to become an ITU sector member. In fact, I think that decision-making process took almost all of the nine years that I was on the Board for. And at the end of the day, we decided that we would become an ITU sector member, D, I think. And that's great. But I don't know what's

happened since, and I don't know what ICANN has been doing in the ITU. And I'm not saying I necessarily want to read reams of documentation about it, but it would be good, I think, for the community and an org to talk about how ICANN interrelates with the ITU and so on.

My final point would simply be, I think that bilaterals are great and obviously incredibly important. And my question for us to consider would be, how do we approach those? Are we listening to input from individual governments? Or are we communicating? And if so, what is our messaging? And what's the strategy for delivering those messages on an ongoing basis?

So I think all of that, it wrapped up in a sort of sentence at the end is just an acknowledgement that this is an ongoing thing. And we really do need to have a very clear strategy that gets looked at on an ongoing basis and adjusted as and when necessary, rather than merely reacting to events. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS

So, thank you very much, Chris, also for your suggestions going forward. Now, let me turn to Ian Sheldon and gather some government perspective from the process and what lessons can we draw from that. Thank you. Ian, please.

IAN SHELDON

Thank you, Janis. It's my pleasure to be here and thank you for inviting me to be part of this fantastic panel. My name is Ian

Sheldon. I'm the Australian GAC representative, but I'm really appearing here in my capacity as the Director of Internet Governance within the Australian government.

My team led Australia's negotiations with the WSIS process. And I had the pleasure of being locked in a room in New York in the basement of the UN building in December, hashing out the final stages of this WSIS negotiation. I'll comment predominantly on process. I think you've heard from a number of speakers today, including during the opening plenary, on some of the substantive outcomes from the process. But for me, I think the last 18 months are worth taking a closer look at and how this community and other multi-stakeholder communities engaged with it.

As others have said, I think we were very lucky in having Co-Facs who were genuinely open and interested to learn more about this Multi-Stakeholder Internet Governance Model. Their genuine interest and curiosity really helped open some of those doors and provide opportunities for this community to come and better educate them on the governance of the internet. You may recall they attended the Dublin meeting last year, and I think that was pivotal in helping show the Co-Facs what multi-stakeholder systems in process look like.

And so, I think this community's engagement with the Co-Facs at that meeting was vitally important in helping shape the future outcome of this negotiation.

Similarly, I think initiatives like the Informal Multi-Stakeholder Sounding Board were also critical in providing the Co-Facs with that de-risking mechanism of space for them to come, bring their questions, talk to them about what you think the community might think about certain things, how they might want to navigate certain touchy issues, and who they might want to get further advice from.

And building off of that, the Australian delegation was incredibly lucky to have Jen Chung on our delegation in New York in December to really act as a bridge between the rest of the IMSB, other parts of the technical community, with us in the room. Because as Amrita mentioned, the doors were closed, and many of those final stage negotiations weren't broadcast and weren't open to the rest of the community.

I did want to take a little bit of time reflecting on Australia's process as well. As an Australian government, we learned a lot of things about how to better prepare for these UN negotiations. We took a bit of a risk and put down a lot of ideas in a non-paper. We knew that historically a lot of the long-held negotiations on the internet have been largely defensive.

We'd been using a lot of the same tried and true defensive points for a long time, and we'd been getting clear signals that we needed to go a little bit further, bring a narrative to the negotiation, put something new on the table. Not all of those ideas stuck, but they really helped shape the landscape. The process that sat behind the drafting of that paper was multi-stakeholder in nature.

When we came to these meetings, we tried to suck in as many ideas from ICANN and ISOC, other parts of the community, and put everything on the table. And so, I think if there's ever an opportunity for this community to put out similar thought pieces, to be proactive, to clearly articulate some of those ideas and how that might be embedded into the process, I'd very much encourage you to do so, and then give those ideas to other government delegations who'd be happy to take them into negotiations and help lead that positive narrative as well.

There was a lot of value in the Australian government taking some time to explain what UN processes were like as well. It was very apparent to me that there was quite a gap between the perception of what a UN negotiation looks like and the reality on the ground. And so, we took quite a lot of time explaining to our local community, as well as those communities across the region, what some of the nuances look like, what's the culture of the UN, how do these negotiations flow and play out, and they really helped prepare our community to give us advice that was timely and useful.

And so, that was, again, a little bit of a risk. Government doesn't usually take a lot of time to lift the hood and show how these processes work behind the scenes. And so, we tried to do that as much as we could to really show those who are less familiar with the UN, what those trades look like and what the culture of these negotiations looked like.

And I think finally, the last point I do want to make is that there still seemed to be quite a disconnect between the negotiators in New York and the parts of governments who are in touch with this community. I think we worked very hard to make sure all information flowed from this community through the GAC, back to capitals and through to other foreign offices. But there's more to be done. And I think that touch points could be broadened out. And I think the ICANN community is an international one.

You all have your own local governments and touch points. And as others have mentioned, the pressures that we faced last year aren't going away. We'll have the plenary on later this year. We'll have the GDC review. Those relationships that we started to form in the early stages of the WSIS negotiations need to be strengthened, need to be revisited and broadened out.

And I genuinely do think that this community has a big role to play in helping shape those future negotiations in that regard. I might pause there. There's certainly a lot that I'm looking forward to discussing with this panel. But looking forward to hearing what others have to say as well. Thanks, Janis.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you, Ian, for your reflections. And now I would like to invite Chengetai Masango, who is the Head of IGF Secretariat, to share his experience, because part of the conversation was about his own project. Please, Masango.

CHENGETAI MASANGO

Thank you very much, Janis. And also, I'd like to thank you and ICANN for organizing this. So from my point of view, I think that the resulting resolution was actually very positive and beyond expectations. If you look back at what happened in the CSTD, for example, how those negotiations went, the resolution and how those negotiations went was actually much better.

Yes, there were some problems and there were some sticky points there. But on the whole, it went very, very well. And it's also a testament to the organization of the multi-stakeholder model, the technical community, the private sector, and civil society and governments, not just within those stakeholder groups as well, but the collaboration, the collaboration that the technical community had with the government, collaboration that the civil society had with them as well.

So, it really did show that it was a very good demonstration of the value of the multi-stakeholder model. I don't want to repeat everything that has been said, but I do agree with all of it. But yes, the Sounding Board as well was a very, very good thing that did happen and brought in the multi-stakeholder voice because I was expecting that from basically July or August, it would be totally closed to governments. And also, the willingness for governments to put in people who may not necessarily be their own citizens on their delegations was also a very good demonstration of that.

In the CSTD, there was a vote. And I think in most of the other resolutions, a vote was always called for. For the WSIS+20 resolution, there was no vote. It was adopted by consensus. So, that was a very, very big plus. And a lot of people did comment on that. And the Co-Facs have to be commended because if we did not have such open-minded, ready to embrace different viewpoints and ready to listen to other people, we wouldn't have had the WSIS+20 Process as it was. So, they really do have to be commended for that.

Now, we've been talking about how the process went. I'd also like to talk about what's going on for this year. As Chris said, it's not over yet. It's an ongoing process. Yes, we did have a good outcome and we did surmount a very big hurdle. The IGF is now permanent. And with that permanency, we have to look at how can we best reorganize, rethink ourselves for the future.

The first thing, which was also a very big thing, was for the request for the IGF to have some regular budget funding. So, that's one of the things that we're working on right now, going through the ABCAQ committee to see what they can give the IGF.

We have asked for six permanent posts because at the moment, we did not have permanent posts in the regular budget. So, that will also help us in planning and forwarding our planning horizon. The other thing that we did ask for is for an amount for our annual meetings because it's difficult for especially countries from the Global South to host an IGF annual meeting.

So, if they give us an amount for the annual meeting, which we did cost out based by Geneva expenses, then it will be much cheaper for Global South people. They just have to pay the extra if there is an extra. I mean, I think there will be an extra, but they just have to pay that extra to host an IGF meeting. We also asked for translation services so that all our outputs are translated into the six UN languages and so more easily disseminated and understood by a greater number of people.

The other thing that we are doing is that I personally have been asked to see what the community also thinks. There is paragraph 97, which welcomes the establishment of the leadership panel, but it welcomes the establishment of the leadership panel, but that does not mean that the leadership panel will continue. The IGF is a bottom-up, multi-stakeholder process. So, if you do want the leadership panel to continue, then please do say so.

The other thing that we also have to look at is paragraph 101, which has the government dialogue. What is the government dialogue? ICANN has the GAC, do we want the same, some sort of similar thing in the IGF, or do we want something different? I have had points of view from people saying that they do not want a very involved process in the IGF because it might change the nature of the IGF, but these are all discussions that we should have, and we need the community input into that.

Talking about that, the first set is we are going to have an EGM, an Expert Group Meeting, or an IGF retreat, which is going to be in April

14th and 15th of April next month, but it is a very small retreat, only about 20 people, and then from that is the launching pad to have more community discussion.

I think I am over my three minutes, but yes, and the other thing is how do we fit with the GDC, how do we fit with the WSIS action lines? Is there room for collaboration, and how do we do that going forth? And also, with ANGUS as well, and we have to see that internally and also externally with the stakeholders as well. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you, Chengetai. Since you used one abbreviation that is not very familiar in the circles, ACABQ, that stands for Advisory Committee on Administrative and Budgetary Questions, and these are a committee of 21 individuals who prepare budget proposal for the fifth committee, which then makes a decision.

So with this, I would like now to open the floor for any comments or questions that community members would like to make on the topic under consideration, and please, there are two microphones here. If I may remind, please tell your name before you make your comment or ask question.

REBECCA MCGILLEY

Excuse me, Janis, sorry. We do have some hands raised earlier from the Zoom, if you would like to go to them first.

JANIS KARKLINS

I will take one from the room and one from the Zoom.

REBECCA MCGILLEY

Great.

JANIS KARKLINS

In that way. Please.

PETER JIA WEI CUI

Am I audible? Yes, thank you. And hi, I'm Peter Jia Wei Cui from Taiwan, and I'm a sponsor fellow from TWNIC, one of the ccTLD managers in Taiwan. And my question will be, because I really agree with the speakers you stated about that we need clear messages to conveying to the organizations, conveying to the UN bodies and make them understand about that. But I mean, I can, although I'm a newcomer here, but I do some research and I feel that it's kind of like a community with a lot of diversities.

So, how to make sure that when the idea is collected, when the opinion is collected, their diversity is ensured, but also not with fragmented messages to convey, it's really important. So, I want to hear more about how to ensure that I strike a balance between maintaining the diversity, but also make sure that the messages can be clear, unified, and straight to convey to the government.

JANIS KARKLINS Yeah, thank you very much. There will not be an immediate answer. I would like to ask panelists to think and incorporate answers to different questions in their final remarks. Now, please, the one from remote, one remote participant.

REBECCA MCGILLEY Yes, Jorge, if you could please unmute yourself and take the floor.

JORGE CANCIO Hello, everyone. Do you hear me okay?

JANIS KARKLINS We do hear you. Please go ahead.

JORGE CANCIO Okay, wonderful. So, hello. I'm sorry not to be in Mumbai myself. I'm Jorge Cancio from the Swiss government. So, just wanted to make some comments that really go very much in line with what Kurtis, Sally, Ian, and others have said.

So, first of all, it was very important to have a proactive agenda. I think we, as Switzerland, we tried to make a contribution by the non-paper we published quite early in the process, which helped, I think, to frame the conversation. And equally important was to frame the process. And this went through very early engagement, both with UNDESA, with the department running the secretariat,

and with the co-facilitators from Albania and Kenya as soon as they were appointed.

And fortunately, they had open ears to opening up the process. And they agreed to establish this Informal Multi-Stakeholder Sounding Board, which was an idea we had floated a long time ago, and the European Union also supported. And also, it was important that they allowed us to embed civil society or technical community people into our delegations during the process, which we did various times.

I think the results were positive. But as Sally said, they are fragile. The consensus is fragile. And I would add it's conditional. It's conditional in the sense that WSIS has to deliver. And WSIS is an architecture. It's a framework of different UN entities working on Internet Governance and digital policy matters.

And the IGF, which in ICANN is very well known, is part of a family of different organizations, of different processes. And this family has to work as a virtual policy cycle. This is the next step, really to make it work in implementation, like a virtual policy cycle, so that it delivers on connectivity, on data, on AI, on finance, on other things that are in the resolution. And the IGF is part of that solution, but it's not the only place to have the discussions.

The ITU is a place. UNESCO is another place. The WSIS Forum is an instrument. The CSTD is an instrument, et cetera. And we have to make them work together in a virtuous manner. And I think ICANN, and I commend you, Kurtis, and your people on the role you have

had during the process. You have to continue to be very proactive in the implementation, helping the UN system, the WSIS architecture, to deliver. And ICANN has some means to make it happen, both in your policy work and your implementation work. And also, if I look at the fund of proceeds, we have from the last round, that's a very meaningful and useful instrument to feed in, to put some money on our words, to make things work in a positive fashion. Because it's conditional.

The deal with many of our G77 colleagues was, you accept the consensus, you accept a system where the multistakeholder approach is not only in the IGF, it's in many other places, under the condition that this framework really delivers on your needs, on the needs of the global majority, of the global South.

So, I think we have to walk the talk of what is in WSIS+20 in the final document, not wait another 10 years to have another fight on the text. Because if we don't deliver during these 10 years, we will have a very difficult stance then. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you, Jorge, for your observations. Please, next speaker in the room.

REBECCA MCGILLEY

Excuse me, sorry, if you could please state your name and who you are representing. Thank you.

BIBEK SILWAL

Hello and namaste, everyone. I'm Bibek Silwal from Nepal. I work with the youth IG initiatives in Nepal. I think it's a very great discussion during an ICANN meeting about implementation and institutionalization of the WSIS+20 outcomes.

And my question is regarding WSIS outcomes and the opportunities for youth. And how can this discussion, especially the WSIS+20 outcomes, can be translated into a real-world opportunity for youth, especially developing economies, the digital economies, especially in terms of capacity building and how can they come and take forward the roles in the next decision making. We have a couple of more people in the room from global south and LDC countries. So, that's for the betterment of the internet. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you for your question. A remote participant. Next one, please.

REBECCA MCGILLEY

Yes, please. Christine, can you please unmute yourself and take the floor?

CHRISTINE ARIDA

Thank you very much. Can you hear me well?

JANIS KARKLINS

Yes, we can hear you. Please go ahead, Christine.

CHRISTINE ARIDA

My name is Christine Arida. I'm with the Egyptian government. And I thank you for this panel and for the opportunity to reflect on lessons we've learned from the WSIS+20 process and how they can inspire us moving forward.

So, I'd like to, in my intervention, talk about four points. First, about the increasing fragmentation of the policy sphere. I think we've established during the past three years, and especially with the lead up to the WSIS+20, that multiple processes risk accelerating diversions and that they are particularly challenging for less resourced groups such as developing countries.

And I believe what we've learned from WSIS is that we can leverage existing architectures, even if this is complex. But this provides more room for innovation and then building competing processes. And now that we have the IGF mandate permanent, I think there is a responsibility for the multi-stakeholder community, including, of course, ICANN, to leverage that platform to enhance work modalities, outputs, footprint, to improve effective and inclusive participation, but also in terms of substance. And I was glad to hear on concrete steps to that end.

The second point is about the early interactive engagement that is politically aware, and colleagues have reflected on how

coordinated messaging was instrumental to build trust and to build understanding at the different levels. But I believe partnerships, novel modalities, such as the IMSB, were quite effective in breaking silos and in converging points of view.

A lesson for the future is that maybe as a technical community, as a multi-stakeholder community, we should not be merely amplifying the narratives or protecting them as an abstract principle. Maybe we've done that too long. We should rather make sure that public policy interests that are by governments are duly considered and tackled. And that engagement is mindful of existing power asymmetries and gaps.

The third point is about WSIS+20 outcome document pinpointing that development at the equity are structural tests of legitimacy. What does this mean for ICANN going forward? We should ask ourselves questions like, are economic and policy architectures reproducing structural inequities or mitigating them? Are new policies development sensitive? Are global South communities meaningful in power? And to that end, continue to support effective engagement of missing voices and underrepresented regions and groups.

And the last point is about the erosion, maybe if I can call it, of the technical policy boundary. In the context of ICANN, this means that the narrow technical mandate approach may not be sufficient enough. DNS policy decisions are generating real geopolitical consequences, increasingly intersecting with topics that are very

important for governments, like cybersecurity, disinformation, trade policies, et cetera. So, I think to that end, the multi-stakeholder governance model needs to be strengthened, needs to be agile enough to evolve in order to remain legitimate, equitable, and aligned and to deliver in an increasingly geopolitical digital environment. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you, Christine, for your reflection. And now I'm going to the next, the microphone in the room. Please introduce yourself.

MILLENIUM ANTHONY

Thank you very much. My name is Millenium Anthony. I am an ICANN85 fellow, but also part of the youth IGF coordination team, but also very much involved in the initiatives under the Internet Society.

First of all, I'd like to really thank all of you for sharing your reflections. And I also would like to acknowledge the efforts that were done to make sure that young youth voices are included throughout the WSIS+20 consultation and all that, like we saw even in the African region, we saw young people being involved in different ways where we made sure that our voices are being included in the WSIS+20 outcomes.

My question is not very much far from Vivek's question, and I wanted to reflect and to hear your thoughts because in the outcome of the WSIS+20 document, we saw how youth

engagement was highly recognized and how it's important in the future of the information society.

And now as we move to the implementation phase of the WSIS+20 outcomes, I wanted to know what would be your take from the engagement that has been done throughout the WSIS+20 review process. What were the lessons learned with the engagement of youth, but also in the next phase, how can we ensure that youth voices were not just involved during the consultation phase, but also in the implementation where in it and our voices are actually heard? Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS

So, thank you very much. Do we have anyone else on? Do we have anyone else? No, not for the moment, please.

JORDAN CARTER

Thanks, Janis. Good afternoon, everyone. My name is Jordan Carter. I work for the .au domain administration. A few sorts of reflections and observations.

The first of all is that any success we had in this process, the license to do it came because we were talking about the people-centered information society that WSIS stands for. If we had all gone and said we only care about Internet Governance, make our Internet Governance work, we would not have had the successes that we did. So, I think it is important, other speakers have already said, to draw in that bigger context.

This Internet Governance or digital policy model needs to deal with a complex array of things. That doesn't mean we need to do them all that I can, obviously. Our narrow mandate here sustains, but we can't just go into these global negotiations only worried about Internet Governance or just the DNS.

The second point is a bit of a flow. A lot of us had challenges with the GDC's process and I'm pretty confident that it was partly our critique of that process that helped leverage a better process in the WSIS negotiations, both of which are different sorts of intergovernmental processes, but we got some wins and got a more open framework.

So, we need to keep doing that pressure. It might not seem obvious that the ITU will change its processes, but you don't have to change your formal processes to open things up to more substantive input from stakeholders. So, even if we don't win it the first go in terms of improving these things, I think we need to keep that pressure up.

That just tells us that in whatever our stakeholder role is of interest here, we do have to devote a bit of time and energy to sustaining this governance system. We can't just work on the topics of interest, nor should we just work on the system. We have to be working within the system to advance the set of issues that we all care about.

Coalitions were really important in this and a lot of people use the metaphor of a choir or a chorus. We didn't all have to have exactly the same talking points, but we all were pushing in the same

direction and I think there were lots of strengths to that. Coalitions also let you do less work yourself because you're working together. So, that was part of the founding idea behind the Technical Community Coalition for Multi-stakeholderism. Lots of small registries, none of us could by ourselves do the analysis or the advocacy that was needed to help hold a voice in this process, but that working together really amplified any investments that we could make. So, shout out for coalitions.

ICANN and ISOC, as this goes on, are probably the best funded, best resourced public interest agencies that aren't simply businesses. So, I think there's a special responsibility on ISOC and ICANN to facilitate and support that process. I think that got better as this two tango process of GDC and WSIS happened. I hope it keeps getting better as we move into the plenipotentiary and beyond. I'm hopeful there are positive signs of that from both of you, so thank you.

Making the IGF a success since we got the permanent mandate is super important. I don't have fully formed thoughts about the future of the leadership panel or the government track, but just particularly on the government track, part of the joy and terror of this process is that as a senior decision maker you might come into contact with a community participant who is not the sort of person you would ever meet, and we have to foster that cross-sector dialogue as well as creating spaces that are welcoming enough to people like government officials to get them in the door.

I don't know exactly what that looks like. Definitely the parliamentary track at IGF has massively improved as it's moved to an open-door process, but if we're going to build a government track let's be really careful not to simply create a new silo. Thanks.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you, Jordan, for your comments and suggestions. Yes, please, go ahead.

CHENGETAI MASANGO

We don't talk about a government track. Parliament track and that's it. It's government discourse, government dialogue, et cetera.

JANIS KARKLINS

Okay, thank you. Since we have 12 minutes remaining in the session, I will sort of close the line after now five speakers in line. Please try to be as brief as possible.

REBECCA MCGILLEY

If you could please speak into the microphone. They're having a little trouble hearing remotely. Thank you.

ASHIRWAD TRIPATHY

All right. Hello, everyone. Namaste. I'm Ashirwad Tripathy from Nepal. I'm also vice chair of APriGF. This year we had this working group within APRIGF, WSIS+20 Working Group, where we took

input from the community and did submit our submissions to the co-facilitators. Their excellencies, co-facilitators were really very good in terms of taking our input and making sure that our voices were heard.

So, IGF being permanent is a win for us, but our concern is on implementations. How do we take this outcome to the action lines into the community, into the grassroots? That would be one of the challenges I think APAC faces most because we are one of the most diverse regions in the world.

As Sally said, taking local voices to New York was very hard, but taking the voices, the outcomes of New York to local level is even difficult because most are not even aware about these processes. So, how do we tackle that and how do we take outcome to regional, not just regional, but national and sub-national as well as local level? With local, I mean municipal level. I think we need to think about that.

And to Chengetai, I think UN agencies within that country would be a very good way for that country to kind of implement those actions lines with the community. So, how is IGF thinking in that line?

And finally, regional IGF and national IGF needs to be supported. And funds are one of the issues that we face in organizing regional IGFs. So, would there be any mechanism or way how we can source a sustainable fund for regional IGFs as well as IGF is permanent? We

would want regional IGFs also to be permanent, independent and sustainable. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS

So, thank you for your questions. Please.

DANA CRAMER

Dana Cramer, Toronto Metropolitan University and also coordinator of the Canada Youth Internet Governance Forum.

It's not a question but a comment. One of the happy outputs from WSIS+20 included recognizing youth as a distinct stakeholder group. This was advocated for youth across regions with coordinated efforts by Net Mission in the Asia-Pacific and WSIS Youth Caucus, which was cross-regional. However, in the context of today's session, it's rather disappointing to see that this panel did not bring in any youth to its fold to speak about this widening of bottom-up stakeholder development and meta-participation. And I hope in the future on topics like these that all stakeholder groups are considered in panel development. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you for comment. I would say pretty accepted, even though all of us, we feel young in our souls. Please.

IHITA GANGAVARAPU

Thank you so much. I'm Ihita Gangavarapu. I'm the coordinator of Youth IGF India, but I'm also a former NextGen and NextGen

ambassador. And I'm currently working in the space of cybersecurity.

So, my question is on the lines of the broader discussion during WSIS and Internet Governance. And throughout the entire consultation process, we saw a lot of focus on the issues of online abuse, infrastructure security, and building trust in the ICTs overall. And even within the youth network, especially through Youth IGF India, we've been seeing this being a pressing and consistent area of discussion since the beginning. Yet many of these initiatives still operate in silos across different institutions and communities.

So, given ICANN's coordinating role in the DNS ecosystem, how can it help bring these efforts together and better connect them with the broader WSIS implementation discussions? Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you for your question. And the last speaker.

VIRENDRA GANDHI

Thank you very much. Namaste to all the madams and sirs with folded hands. Thank you very much. This is Virendra Gandhi [ph] from Hyderabad. And thank you very much, sir. It's been a pleasure to be in the midst of you and also at the very outside. I congratulate ICANN. And I wish all the madams across on their days and also across these all. International World Women's Day to all of you.

And my question to this one. We are discussing about the one we have learned, the much-much technology. And what next? That is

a question to put forward everyone to be discussed with this one. Only a few lines I will give you, sir. One is the one we have to discuss about AI governance and data governance. Digital data, all the one that contains human rights.

And also, the one AI in ethics, digital cooperation. And also, the one across the globe, we are using the one, the technology, the latest tools, like robotics and AI, forgetting about the one divine spiritual intelligence, natural intelligence, human intelligence.

And we are being that much we are using then autistic like this one, AI artificial intelligence everywhere. But even then, sir, my only the one submission to the request to this one, how they in this kind of a situation across the globe, the competitive world, AI can be the one effectively will give the answers. Or we need to be discussed in an effective manner where cannot have the one errors.

I want error-free in spite of all these using the one, the digital technology tools. And also, the one technology tools, I'm going to say like an Artificial Intelligence and robotics. Thank you very much.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you for your questions. So, now we have remaining six minutes, exactly six panelists here. And I will turn to in the same way as we started. So, Kurtis, with you, if you would like to make kind of concluding remarks, remind reminders on the questions that was about how to maintain coherence of messaging of the

community. How we could increase youth participation and youth prospects in light of decisions, how we can support regional IGFs. So, these are questions I noted in my notes, please, Kurtis.

KURTIS LINDQVIST

Thank you, Janis. I actually think, by the way, I want to second Janis, I think the criticism taken about the lack of youth representation, I do think it's fantastic at a lot of these events, both IGF and here, how much youth representation there actually is.

And I should say how much interest in this there is, because this panel has been around for 20 years, if not longer. And I'm actually quite happy that we will see that there are others coming behind us who are interested in picking this up. We are part of the solution.

I don't think we're the only solution to bringing youth and the regional IGF supported. I mean, we as ICANN do give support to regional and national IGFs, as I believe ICANN does as well. We can't fund all of it, but we do support it. And I do think that how do we broaden the participation, or I should say, how do we continue to have the broad participation is a crucial topic that we should have together with the community to discuss, you know, how do we bring this?

I mean, IGF is much broader than just ICANN and ISOC, by the way, and I think we need to have that diversity of voices. And I think that goes back to the first question we had about how do we ensure both diversified voices and coordinated voices? And I think it goes

to what we heard is that many voices aiming towards the same direction, or at least having the support and the same outcomes, it's actually going to be as powerful as just one.

And I think in this case, we really had that. I mean, Chris talked about how can we make some of this more coordinated and more transparent, and I think we should do that. And I think, you know, the process evolved over time as well. I don't think where we started this process three, four years ago is not where we ended in December.

And I think where we are today, me and Sally coordinate very, very closely on a lot of the work that we do, and we share a lot of opinions on how we do this, and we exchange ideas.

Our mandate as ICANN is much more-narrow, as someone mentioned, as Jordan mentioned, our mandate is much narrower, ICANN is broader. But I still want to come back to the other point that was raised about these topics and Internet Governance is becoming interweaved, not just with trade policies and industrial policy and other topics, but also about security resilience, but also geopolitics.

And I think we have to understand that, we have to deal with that, and we have to navigate all that together. And I think that's a lot of the work we have to do. And we do cooperate. I think we do need to work more on that and continue to work. And I think that's what this was so successful at the end is that we did have that

coordination, we could work on that strengthening. So, I hope we can continue that and maybe we can build on that.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you. Sally?

SALLY WENTWORTH

Thank you. I wanted to align with Jorge's message earlier that the WSIS has to deliver. The best way to preserve or defend and grow the consensus around the multi-stakeholder model is to deliver, to show that this model can deliver on the problems, the challenges, the opportunities that were highlighted by stakeholders in the WSIS.

And I think for the technical community, we need to demonstrate that we not only care about Internet Governance and the Multi-Stakeholder Model in order to protect the processes that we manage or participate in and care about, but we also need to show that that model will deliver on a range of issues that stakeholders have told us they care about.

We heard here about cybersecurity, digital development, digital inclusion, and many, many more topics. And I think, yes, we care about the Internet Governance Frameworks, but we also need to show that these frameworks deliver for an internet that is inclusive and safe and secure for everyone.

There was an important question as well about how do we ensure that diverse voices are heard. This is critical. And what we spoke

about over the last several moments is the ways in which diverse voices were included in the WSIS negotiations over the last 12 to 18 months and the lessons that we learned from GDC where that wasn't possible.

With respect to the IGF, the Internet Society has been a longstanding participant in the IGF and donor to the global IGF as well as the national and regional IGFs. Last year, I think the estimate was that we gave about a half a million dollars in 2025 to this IGF ecosystem because we believe that those local voices need to be included in the process, voices of youth, voices of marginalized communities, and we believe that the internet grows from the bottom up.

And so, that's where we've chosen to devote our resources because we believe that the model, both the national and regional IGFs as well as the global IGF, provide a space for us to demonstrate how the Internet Governance model and the multi-stakeholder ecosystem is delivering results for end users that matter.

The last thing I'd say as we look forward to the WSIS implementation and the frameworks that come forward as a result of the WSIS+20, it's important that we continue to build on the lessons that we just spoke about, the importance of inclusion, the importance of transparency.

I am worried, frankly, that the complexity that comes out of WSIS in terms of the different groups that are stood up and the processes that are stood up, there is a tendency to go back to a closed model.

And that closed model makes it difficult for everybody to participate. Even organizations like ours struggle to keep track of the various groups, the various rooms where decisions are being discussed.

And you see, it feels some days that you learn about them on a daily basis, that there's a new group that's been stood up to address a portion of the WSIS framework. So I think something for us to really fight for as a community is openness and transparency and inclusion to drive the results that we all care about.

The last thing I'll say is that from the Internet Society's point of view, this is a priority for us. The strength of the internet ecosystem, we will continue to prioritize that as part of our strategy and our resourcing, the partnerships with ICANN, with other members of the internet community are incredibly important to how we do this work. And so, you should expect to see that continue and hopefully grow.

And we really do welcome feedback from the community on what more we can do. Where we have information that's useful to share, we want to do that. And I know our team thinks that's very important. So, we're here for it and we're here for the long run on these topics. I know alongside ICANN, as Kurtis said, we collaborate closely and that'll continue this year and beyond.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you, Sally. I would like to ask indulgence of our interpreters and scribes. We will overshoot a little bit, maybe five minutes, because I still want to go floor to other panelists for the brief concluding remarks. Amrita, please.

AMRITA CHOUDHURY

Thank you, Janis. I will not repeat what Sally or Kurtis mentioned, or even Jordan mentioned, or Jorge, plus one to that. I'd talk about the funding part, which came up. Ashirwad raised it, I think, somewhere. Bibek also spoke about how to engage. I think we are all looking at what are the ways in which we can engage in this process now, when it pans out.

Funding for the national regional IGFs is important, while IGF is figuring out how they will get the funds. But for many of the national IGFs, who aren't even, you know, closely linked, they don't even have a legitimate bank account, the IGF Support Association has been supporting it.

And we look forward to the technical community, ICANN, Internet Society, and others to support us, even the ccTLDs or others, because we give funds to these NRIs who don't even have a bank account, who IGF cannot fund, because of, you know, certain protocols which you have, legitimacy, et cetera.

So, if we really want those national regional youth initiatives, in especially developing countries, to work, and so that they can come up with their voices, give their submissions, it would be good

if such organizations are really funded, or other funding models are looked, obviously, having a preset funding organization may work. So, perhaps those are certain things which needs to be looked, if we really want to walk the talk and support the NRIs. Thank you.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you very much. Chris, please.

CHRIS DISSPAIN

Two things. On collecting information internally in ICANN, what we need really is to come up with a mechanism to do that. There used to be, and I'm fairly sure it doesn't exist anymore, but there used to be a sort of cross-community Working Group on Internet Governance issues, and we should probably consider putting that back into existence.

On the onslaught of youth, which I appreciate, ICANN spends, ICANN's mission obviously involves it going to IGFs and working in respect to the DNS and delivering all sorts of things. But the overarching one world, one internet implies something slightly wider than that, and I don't see a reason why ICANN, and ISOC for that matter, although I think ISOC is more inclined to do it as part of its natural bent, can't act as a facilitator or a convener to help youth organizations, as an example, get to things like the IGF, even if they're not necessarily focused on specific DNS matters. Thanks.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you. Ian, please.

IAN SHELTON

Thanks, Janis. A couple of things I'd like to say in closing. I think there continues to be a role for pure technical advice as the conversations grow more complex and the digital ecosystem becomes more intertwined.

The advice that you provide to governments on the operation of the internet shouldn't be an opinion. It's advice. It's straight bat. There should be no spin, and that's one of the most valuable things that you can provide as we navigate this conversation. It's not up for debate. It works in this fashion, and a lot of governments don't have an appreciation of all of that complexity.

So, I think to the first point, how do you balance various opinions, that there should be no opinion about the technical management of the internet. It works in a certain way, and that consistency in messaging needs to be amplified across this entire community.

As you move into other digital spaces, like AI and emerging tech, things get a little bit more complicated, but the strength of this community is the operation of the internet, and that narrative needs to be crystal clear. So, I think when you talk to your government agencies, bear that clarity of communication in mind.

I do think the community has and will continue to deliver on a lot of those promises. I do think there are challenges in awareness and selling those opportunities. I think there's a lot of things, like the

Coalition for Digital Africa is a fantastic initiative that I think a lot more government representatives would love to hear a lot more about, because it shows this model in action. It is delivering tangible connectivity to a continent.

So, I think, again, if there's opportunity to raise a little bit more awareness around what has been done and what more could be done in a similar vein, I think that'll help us get through the next couple of negotiations as well.

And finally, I'm hearing a recurring question about how do I get involved. Here at ICANN, talk to your GAC members. They're here. They've come a long way to talk about the --

I'll be quick, reach out to them. And if you don't know your local GAC, come talk to the leadership. We can help you get in touch. They're your best way to get involved with government decision making, and if they're here, you know, they're not going to run off, you've got a captive audience, the GAC don't really leave the GAC room, so you really know where to find them, and there's a lot of opportunities ahead with people in this meeting. Thanks.

JANIS KARKLINS

Thank you. It seems we are lost in the presentation. Thank you very much, interpreters, for the work. Chengetai, maybe very briefly, if you have otherwise, I will close the session.

CHENGETAI MASANGO

I'll be very, very brief. Just to answer the question about local UN agencies involving local UN agencies with the IGF. We have a very good relationship with the UN Residence Coordinator System. So, we do cooperate with them and also the regional commissions such as Esquire, we cooperate with them as well. So, if you are in a country and there's an RC, you can just contact us and we can set up that.

The other thing about youth capacity building and funding of youth, yes, we do cooperate quite strongly with ISOC, GIZ as well for youth. And one of the things that I think Amrita mentioned is that we cannot give money to youth programs or to NRIs who do not have a bank account who are not incorporated. We cannot give money to an individual's bank account because we've had instances where that individual disappears. So, we need that accountability.

And the last thing about the involvement of youth, yes, this is something that we've been thinking about for a very long time. And it's not just enough to say that you must have a youth member on the panel because then the panels will be 10 people on the panel. But youth who are involved in that topic that are being talked about. And one thing that you can do is that at the IGF website, we do have a resource person's page.

So, if you fill in that, youth can come in, fill in that, say, I'm a youth and I have these, I am knowledgeable in this topic and that issue. And then we can go there and pick somebody and that makes it

much, much easier for us. We have to work together. And if you have any other suggestions, we're quite willing to incorporate them as well, but not just putting a youth there just for the sake of having a youth on the panel.

JANIS KARKLINS

So, thank you very much. With this, since now I am standing between participants and the coffee break, so I will not draw any conclusions. I will only, I will say thank you very much to our panelists for their thoughts and contributions.

Those who participated in the conversation as well as those who listened, thank you very much interpreters and scribes for helping us understand each other better. And with these words, I would like to close this session and hope that we will thank panelists by round of applause.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]