

## ICC BASIS and business interventions

---

### IGF Open Consultations, Geneva, 21 May 2013

*"The following is the output of the real-time captioning taken during the Open Consultations of the IGF, in Geneva. Although it is largely accurate, in some cases it may be incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors." (<http://www.intgovforum.org/cms/>)*

#### MORNING SESSION

ZAHID JAMIL: First of all, I'd like to say it's a pleasure to have served on the MAG. And I'd like to welcome all the new MAG members. And you're right to see it open up and have more members rotate through is wonderful and look forward to helping them out. I had just two or three points on what I heard so far.

On the issue of human rights that was discussed and had a lot of support. And, maybe we could come back to it later. I think that it would be a challenge to say that human rights is covered under all the existing previous themes. So I think that we do need to sort of give a little more focus on it, as we've already tried. We have actual workshop proposals on that theme.

Second is on CIR. I completely agree with Anriette. I think that's a very good middle way to have enhanced multistakeholder cooperation. Because, if you're going to see CIR again on the schedule, many people from developing countries and other places say, okay, we're going to thrash the other issue again for three hours on that one general topic. And, in fact, if we have much more detail, as we have seen, proposal for workshops and themes such as enhanced cooperation, multistakeholder principles, things of that nature, what we're doing is going into detail which goes forward. And, in fact, the CIR issue under that theme, et cetera, is taking those issues forward. So I would call that progress. And that is exactly what would be helpful in that situation.

Thirdly, and importantly, I know maybe I should have mentioned this earlier in the day when we had these issues. But I come from a developing country and coming to Geneva are challenges. There's cost, and we just heard about translations. We heard about the fact that money will have to be spent, resources are limited. So it raises the question in my mind at least that when are we going to talk about the resources and funding and financing of the IGF in general? And I don't see it on the agenda. I thought maybe that's an important point to discuss. I know it was mentioned last time and there was some support about discussing it. And, in my mind, would it be possible to maybe keep a certain period of time either today or tomorrow available to discuss that so we can actually make this sustainable? Because I think



it's an important topic, and to discuss it openly would be helpful. Giving people maybe time overnight to think about it or maybe sometime later today. Thank you.

AYESHA HASSAN: Thank you very much. I join other colleagues in thanking the outgoing MAG members, and I look forward to working with the new members. I'm speaking here as ICC basis and apologize for taking the floor as a MAG member.

I just wanted to build on Anriette and Zahid's point. I support Anriette's idea of the angle this year of critical Internet resources and the way in which you formulated a particular angle that would be taken up in main sessions. We've had several general CIR sessions, and we see that there are several workshop proposals that are really drilling down on a range of CIR issues, which, as we're talking about tracks, it might be useful to highlight that there is a CIR track in the workshop proposals which would encourage people to go to those session and go into more depth on other CIR issues in order to build on those discussions this year. So just a thought, if we can highlight it in a particular color or make it very clear that CIR is being discussed, but it's just being discussed in the workshops more generally. And then the angle that Anriette has put forward would be a good angle to describe what we're doing this year.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Markus. My name is Marilyn Cade. I am an individual member of the business community, and I want to thank you for your attempt to coach -- to coax, coax those of us who are not MAG members to take the floor and to coach the MAG members to provide space for the non-MAG members to contribute. There are not many non-MAG members here in the room. But I think it's really important to understand, in the time that I've been coming to these consultations, I've observed a growing tendency for the consultation day to actually end up to be a consultation with inputs from the MAG members on the consultation day, not just on day 2 and day 3, which is the meeting of the MAG.

So I think that, really, the consultation day is about all of us in our individual roles, not as MAG members even if some of us have that role on day 2 and day 3. So I would just say -- so I'm not discouraging the comments from the MAG. But we've got to figure out a better way to get more input on the consultation day.

I welcomed the suggestion from the U.S. that the MAG list be opened up for transparency reasons. We no longer, due to resources, have the summaries provided. In Paris, at the consultation, the decision was taken to establish working groups on certain topics. And non-MAG members raised their hand to ask to be added to those working groups. There was then no outreach to the community to follow up on that.

So, while we're here, I hope we can ensure that there is complete openness and acceptance from not just MAG members who are interested but non-MAG members as well who may be able to contribute to the working groups. And I heard that as the intent, but I just asks to consider how we make sure that happens.

The -- I also really was interested in the comments that Subi offered. Because I do think it's natural that experienced players who are very concerned and committed in the success of the IGF may want to contribute and perhaps may be offering workshops and comments and not



pausing long enough to let new speakers and new players reach the floor, so to speak. Stepping back and limiting our own enthusiasm about the number of workshops we propose or the number of speaking roles we accept may be the very thing that we need to do. Those of us who have been around a while -- I put myself in that category -- not just MAG members to enable these new voices and these new participants to feel comfortable.

So I think one observation I have is I went through the workshop proposals, and I counted. I counted not only the number of proposals that different entities proposed but also the number of times that some of us appear as proposed speakers. And I guess I'm going to ask us to really think hard about stepping back and spending our time -- and I don't want to use the word "mentor." I want to use the word "coach" -- step back and think about taking a different role. It is going to be a harder work to find new voices and coach and coax them. But it is what we need to do to make the IGF a success and to broaden and deepen and diversify the participation. Thank you.

MARILYN CADE: My name is Marilyn Cade. I'd like to strongly agree with you, Milton, and to ask us to think a little differently. I'm frankly very disappointed to hear that the MAG would propose to reduce the number of workshops to 70 or 80. And I'll go back to saying, I read the proposals and I counted. And 70 or 80 workshops will mean that workshops proposed by MAG members and well-established and historically-strong contributors get space and new people don't.

I was at -- I was able to attend parts of the WSIS action line forum last week and there were workshops in which there were panels of four or five people and an audience of four or five people. I don't think that works, but I don't think that's what we had at the IGF. And I also think at the IGF we're trying to not only have informational sessions where you can have 100 people in a room and a panel of presenters and a little bit of exchange with the participants, I think we're evolving to needing different kinds of interactions and a room that's got 25 people in it in a round table environment that are exchanging in-depth discussions and moving past stating opinions and getting to true dialogue may be a phenomenal contribution to the IGF.

I haven't heard very many workshop presenters complaining about not having a workshop. I think the main sessions last year did receive a fair amount of criticism in that they were -- and I think what I heard in February in our discussion is we wanted to really seriously consider redesign and changes in the main sessions. I would urge us to return to the philosophy that if there are rooms, we make them available and we focus on helping workshop proposers to strengthen their proposals, if that's what's needed to pass the checklist of the MAG. Thank you.

ICC: Thank you. Ayesha Hassan speaking for ICC BASIS. I'd like to support and build on what Milton and some of Marilyn's points have been about. I think that there are some proposals that may not fit in the track that are actually very well thought out but they are very much related and relevant to the Internet Governance Forum's mandate, so we need to look at this, I think in a qualitative way to look at proposals that really will add value to this year's event. We also -- I think it's fair to go back out to proposers who have a significant number of proposals there and ask them to choose. There might be ways in which they would now, having seen the proposals that are out there from other people, they may consider not just



merging but also just consider what do they want to prioritize for their entity or organization this year and give up some slots that way.

Another way we could look at this is look at some of the very well thought-out proposals that are really on point for main sessions and offer for the proposers to actually be integrated as the main session, perhaps drawing upon the speakers they have identified and recognizing them as partners and organizing it so that they would get the profile or recognition that they have actually contributed to this year's program. Thank you.

MARILYN CADE: I support the comments that have been made. I want to go back and focus on a comment that Milton made and talk about my experience in Baku in the main sessions.

I observed two interesting things. The really interesting discussions were going on in the workshops, I think. But, in addition to that, the structure of the room was such that a lot of people ended up sitting in the back of the room and having other conversations. And I could see that that was really annoying some of the people who planned the main sessions. And I would also just point out that these are main sessions. They are not plenaries. And I want to really reinforce that. There's an opening session and a closing session. But these are main sessions. Plenaries are something different. And I hope we're not migrating into thinking the main sessions are plenaries, which means everybody has to be summoned together to hear the same thing. The diversity and interest that people bring to the IGF, I think, is really its strongest value. And if no one -- if someone comes to an IGF and has the kind of learning experience and builds relationships and networks and gets the kinds of satisfaction that they need out of participating only in workshops, we still ought to think that's a success. I'm a big believer in the main sessions, but I think we've got to refine our thinking. And one way to do that might be to make them a 2-hour session followed by a -- can I just finish -- a 2-hour segment followed by a 45-minute to an hour effort to understand what key points have been brought out during that session by the use of more formal rapporteur approaches.

ZAHID JAMIL: Thank you. I just want to say I think the issue with the -- having the reporting in from the workshops into the main sessions was we wanted some sort of a connection between the main sessions, the workshops also. Not that this is a plenary, I completely understand and accept that. Maybe one of the solutions could be -- and this is just an idea I'm throwing out there -- is to have the panelists who will be in the main sessions at least attend one or two of the workshops on the other days. When they participate in those workshops, maybe from the floor or otherwise, there may be some sort of an understanding that people would have in those workshops that maybe our view may come out on the main session and give them some incentive to come to it. Otherwise what we have is a main session where a discussion is completely disconnected sometimes from what's been going on in the workshops. That's just a thought.

AYESHA HASSAN: Thank you. Ayesha Hassan speaking on behalf of half of ICC basis. I'm only taking the floor because in the past ICC has called on a streamlining of the number of parallel events that go on. And so I wanted to clarify at this point -- and I would just support things that Matthew and Izumi and others have said about -- and Paul about quality versus just a strict quantity issue. I think if we just look at, as Izumi is pointing out, where are we with the



assessments from the MAG members? We might see that we've already reduced significantly, if we're looking at the quality of workshops -- I know, as Izumi pointed out, I don't know how many I gave lower than 4. But it was -- there is, you know, a significant number that probably will fall in that category. I also would like to support Subi's idea of looking at where some things may actually lend themselves to being a pre-event. And that may be another way to look at it. We can talk about this tomorrow. But I would just -- let's look at where we are and then look at how the schedule can be creatively planned before we arbitrarily axe people's workshops. I think there are some really quality proposals that should be integrated into the program.

Lastly, I would just say it might be interesting to experiment this year with one main session where we have a reduced number of workshops in parallel. Picking, as we've said before, topics that are maybe having open forums or Dynamic Coalition meetings and leaving one main session with a little bit more priority and just see how that works. Thank you.

### AFTERNOON SESSION

THERESA SWINEHART: Sorry. Thank you, Markus. Yes. So the third group is the ad hoc group on principles of multistakeholder cooperation and enhanced cooperation -- or multistakeholder principles and enhanced cooperation. So I think as we heard this morning and also last week, it's quite timely. Just to flag as some background, the concept of forming this group was really as a result of the discussions having occurred in the IGF over the past years and also in their multiple forums. We decided to separate out the multistakeholder principles from the Internet Governance principles as Anriette had highlighted because they're primarily procedural. What are the terms for engagement, how do we identify what those threshold processes are, and obviously those are complimentary but distinct from the enhanced cooperation dialogue. So that's where we've kept that. It's also to be noted with the work of this group in particular in relation to the enhanced cooperation is these discussions are also occurring in other forums. And in this discussion and preparatory work to incorporate and also recognize that dialogues are occurring in other forums and it should also be complimentary and seen as input or output into those dialogues.

So where we are right now in the process is subsequent to the February Open Consultations meeting and the summary report following Expressions of Interest from MAG members and others we've put together a mailing list. We've begun a process of trying to compile relevant materials that should be the basis and premise of the work. This group includes both MAG and non-MAG members and it's likewise growing. So anybody interested should obviously let us know. We've had several e-mail exchanges, one conference call, and tomorrow morning we will again be meeting face-to-face at 8:30 in case anybody would like to join.

In the discussions what we've looked at is the materials that are relevant for the work and began discussing a possible timeline and outputs. The timeline that we're looking at is trying to have two draft pieces, one on multistakeholder principles, one around the enhanced cooperation, that can be used as a basis for discussion and input in the preparations of the IGF overall and to try to have that close to ready in draft form by middle of July, if possible. These drafts would be living documents for continued input and together with these would be annexes of relevant consolidated materials that were used as the basis. So we see this as a work in





progress. What I do want to highlight is with the proposal received -- seen from Brazil last week, that obviously would form another important premise for the work and for reflection of the work of this group as well.

MARILYN CADE: I think I'm going to express my concern and my question. Years ago the MAG met in closed session and the community traveled to the consultation and then was not allowed to even be in the room when the MAG met. We made, I thought, a huge amount of progress and the MAG developed a different standard of interaction which enables the community to be in the room for the MAG to work together on the second two days but to not exclude the community from the room. I certainly am sympathetic to the idea that there are new MAG members who are getting to know their colleagues and I really applaud that, but I just wonder, is it really necessary to exclude the community from even being in the room?

MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Markus. My name is Marilyn Cade. My comments, I think, are probably framed now in indirect support of comments that were made by Theresa, I think, and - - sorry.

[ Speaker is off microphone. ]

>>MARILYN CADE: Sorry. So I just -- what I had wanted to say is, the WTPF, the World Telecommunications Policy Forum, is a forum which is -- which was chartered by the ITU council for a specific purpose and it is closed. It has completed its work with six opinions and a Chair's report and the document that I believe we were talking about this morning, it now is actually a Brazilian document which is relevant to the conversations and discussions about the role of governments and participation in multistakeholder fora but it is actually no longer an opinion nor is it a draft opinion. I think it's very relevant to include it in our conversations and in our considerations, and it is a topic that definitely belongs here and will, as you said earlier, Markus, be discussed as a topic in other settings as well. And I welcome that, but I think we should just refer to it as a Brazilian document about the role of governments in multistakeholder so that there isn't confusion that somehow there's a leftover, unfinished opinion that would go back into the WTPF, which is in fact a completed initiative. Thank you.

MARILYN CADE: Marilyn Cade again. I just should have asked this question at the end. It's my assumption -- and that was why I referenced Theresa because of your comments you made earlier -- it's my assumption this will be one input document but there may be other documents that would come into the discussion about this topic and I'd just like to say that I would strongly support that openness as well as of course the inclusion of that other document.

ZAHID JAMIL: You know, just sort of tinkering with some of the words I heard in the last two interventions and I'm thinking I think it makes sense that this is not just talking about governments per se and it also makes sense that it's not excluding them. So maybe something in the nature of inclusion and participation, these are the words I heard, inclusion in a multistakeholder forums or in multistakeholder forums-role of governments. So we give -- you know, we balance it out. Just a thought.



THERESA SWINEHEART: I think that there's multiple views and positions and thoughts and outputs on whether from workshops or whether proposals that have been put into different forums. With the Brazilian proposals, if we want to call it the Brazilian proposals, a very thoughtful piece on one facet of the dialogue. And I think we would be remiss in not seizing the opportunity to incorporate that in the discussions around this topic. I think, just as with any of the other proposals that place an important role on operationalizing the role of governments as -- similarly with regards to the operationalization of the role in the private sector or civil society or technical community. So I think we should look at it in a holistic way and incorporate it as part of the dialogue and was struck by how timely it is that this document came in and using the opportunity to discuss it in the IGF forum which brings together a different group of stakeholders.

CHIP SHARP: Thank you. Chip Sharp, Cisco Systems. I do not oppose this discussion at IGF, just to make sure it's clear from my previous intervention. It was a question of, you know, the discussion.

The question here really is -- and maybe this will be discussed in the MAG or later on -- is how you would actually logistically do this in that the what we call the Brazilian proposals is currently a contribution to WTPF and how that would get translated over to IGF. Would we solicit the Brazilian government to resubmit this to IGF? So it's really a logistical question as to how that document would actually get input into an IGF discussion.

MARILYN CADE: It's Marilyn Cade. I think perhaps I started this. So let's see if I be a little clearer about what I was suggesting. I welcome having the discussion on the topic. My comments were clarifying that there is no draft opinion that continues. The work of the WTPF is closed. There is a Chair's report, and there are six opinions that are agreed. There, of course, is material that is associated with that report.

But I think that's really neither here nor there. What's here, I think, is I hear, generally, support for discussing the topic. I suggested that the content of the document which I was calling the Brazilian document on the -- I should get the title right -- operationalizing the role of governments in multistakeholder something -- I think it's bodies, belongs here. And I welcome that, and there may be other inputs. But I don't see why we can't just invite the Brazilians to provide us with an input document to the -- whatever the working forum ends up being, if it's a plenary session or it's a workshop or it's a roundtable. And then build on the comments of some others who have said -- and myself as well -- some other inputs might also be incoming from participants in such a session. Thank you.

PATRICK RYAN: Patrick Ryan. Thank you. I don't know that I have any suggestions or bright ideas that are going to resolve this. I think we can talk about anything we'd like at the IGF. The only thing that really troubles me to some extent that I'm unable to resolve is that we're talking about unrelated things. One is referral from ITU to IGF. Another is a Brazilian proposal. We're in an open forum right now where anybody can take the microphone, and all those parties are available as well to be here as well. And I'm surprised that the referral from



the ITU is not accompanied by having a representative here to talk about it and defend it and explain it. Thank you.

ZAHID JAMIL: I was thinking, Chair, maybe one way to resolve this is we're talking about different words -- the Brazilian proposal, governments, et cetera. Instead of being worried about what we call it, we leave it to you, the Chair, or maybe you can come back with something tomorrow. In principle, I haven't heard anybody say this issued shouldn't be discussed. I support this should be discussed here. If the ITU is talking about multistakeholderism and the role of government or anybody else there, we should be the ones taking the lead in it. We should definitely discuss it. So maybe we leave it to the Chair to come back with suggestions, et cetera, or leave it to your diplomatic skills. And then we can just agree in principle.

AYESHA HASSAN: Thank you. Ayesha Hassan for ICC Basis. In that vein, it would be helpful if we have a date by which people need to request pre-event space on the 21st. It's on the web site. Last time I checked it wasn't there. Thank you very much.

MARILYN CADE: Actually -- it's Marilyn Cade I have more questions that I thought I would just pile on so you could answer them all at the same time. I thought I recalled in the early days that open forums were for international organizations or international groups and that we also had the Dynamic Coalitions and then we also had, I think at one point, the idea that countries might have a session that was about a particular initiative they were doing within their country. So I'm just kind of recalling. I -- my question was more, in the past I've been very involved in the national and regional initiative round table and I'm aware that there is a pending discussion about how to address the national and regional IGF's and I'd just like to be sure that that discussion is open to any of the coordinators of the national and regional IGF's to have that discussion but to note that I hope we will, in our planning, keep in mind that some of the activities that we haven't yet fully developed may present a particular need for sensitivity in scheduling to make sure that they can take place at a time when those parties who are most affected can participate in them. Thank you.

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN: Thank you. Jeff Brueggeman with AT&T. Having spent the weekend working through the workshop proposals, I'm struck by how the process lends itself to feeling like you're operating in a funnel capacity, and I think this -- this discussion to me raises an opportunity of, if we're going to have open forum, for example, let's look at the people who have submitted workshop proposals and try and invite them into the discussions. I think, you know, as we've seen, there's a lot of overlap in the issues that people are raising and I know it's very difficult for us to go through a process of cutting workshops but maybe the opposite approach is to try and be as inclusive as possible for the things like the -- an open forum, a round table, or some of the workshops that maybe are being more highly rated. Let's go out of our way to try and bring more people into the process where there are others, and ultimately, if they want to have their own workshop, maybe that's fine as well. But I think that is a very positive development, having attended the human rights and a couple of other open forum discussions. I do think that's a good innovation and maybe we can encourage people who





have been submitting workshops thinking as the way to raise the issue is, you know, maybe they can take advantage of this new forum as an alternative.

ZAHID JAMIL: I was going to say in Indonesia, one of the most vibrant groups we have is the Indonesian Press Council. I'd love to hear what they have to say. They've been doing a lot of work in Internet governance. I think I came up with only one workshop where I couldn't come up with another workshop. Just wanted to make the point.

MARILYN CADE: Marilyn Cade. I'm just -- I'm not sure if Robert Guerra is on the phone as a remote participant, but I'd just like to mention an approach. And perhaps we can come back to it at another time. And that is, when we talk about creative approaches, I wanted to flag the concept of the cyber dialogue modality that was used at a meeting that several of us were at in Canada. And perhaps when we come -- Markus, it depends on when you're talking about the format of innovative approaches. Because I'm not a MAG member. So tomorrow and the next day, I'll be rather far down the line in talking about that. But I just want to mention that there are some experimental approaches that I've seen. And I think others have experienced. And, whenever it's talked about, maybe we could just make sure that that session is open to input.

MARILYN CADE: I see there are other people here, so I'll just kick off. It's Marilyn Cade speaking. Cyber dialogue is what I would think of as sort of a facilitated -- not just moderated but facilitated approach with a panel of expert speakers, a panel of identified experts who may rebut or add to, expand or challenge what has been said and an interaction that occurs within that group and then reaching in to a broader set of observers who are really there more to observe this broad interaction. So it's -- it's not exactly a roundtable, but it is a -- an effort to identify expert respondents who bring particular additional points of view and using a moderator that is actually very skilled and experienced and trained in that particular approach. Liesyl was there as a panelist. I saw Jeff Brueggeman. I thought there might be a couple other people who participated in it who might want to comment on it. I was quite taken with it as a way to not have 25 panelists, but to have a way to hear sort of a range of views and then get very quick succinct two and three minute responses or enhancements or challenges to particular points.

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN: I was going to say it might be particularly useful innovation for the main session. Because I think what it allows is to have a broader set of views represented as opposed to a very small panel. And it can be designed to fit a very large room. And, as we all saw in Baku, it was difficult to have an interactive session. And this preplans a little bit of that to start that going while still then opening it up to the broader audience as well.

AYESHA HASSAN: Thank you. Ayesha Hassan for ICC basis. For the main sessions I think that's appropriate approach. I think we can bear in mind, too, that when we're preparing the main sessions, it is critical that, when MAG members and others are trying to approach speakers, that we have confirmation that the people we're putting on the main sessions are actually going to be able to get to the IGF and that they're committed to coming. I think in some cases we ended up with last minute gaps on main sessions. And then we were quickly



running around to see who had expertise and who didn't have a conflicting session. And so it was much more complex than just MAG members taking over.

So, going into Bali, we can prepare the main sessions well in advance and have commitment and really have the group of people who are participating as moderators and speakers prepare together so these are substantive sessions. Hopefully we can avoid having these gaps where we're left to look to the expertise who might be in the MAG. Thank you.

TERO MUSTALA: Thank you. Tero Mustala. Nokia Siemens Networks. I would like to continue on this main session issue mainly. And trying to respond so what you were just asking, continue the discussion from February Paris where we were talking about innovative forms and so on. I would like that we remember that we very much are agreed to explore new ways of running the meeting. And I've been looking at these. We had, basically, two problems. We had workshops where our problem is we had too much stuff, and we have to do some selection. So it's a kind of positive problem. But then I would very much like that we really would focus on these main sessions. Because, looking back to Baku, I think the most critic and the right critics was for so many sessions. And for that reason I would suggest that we really rethink what we mean by the concept of main session, starting from how long it takes, what are the possible formats, how many we have, et cetera, so that we don't just stick to, let's say, the classical way of main session with huge panel and little audience.

ZAHID JAMIL: Thank you. I just wanted to say that the idea of three or four questions, as Bill put it, was excellent. And I believe that we have a workshop's requirements requirement for a background paper or discussion paper. That could be something that could be out there. I don't think it should be opinions necessarily because it could be divisive -- divisive, sorry, and have different views. And on the point of the three hours, it's possible to maybe take the three hours, split them up into three different sections across one large topic. So for instance, if there was a topic on cyber security, legal frameworks and it had sort of sections on spam, one hour on spam, one hour say on legislation, one hour on hacking or something of that nature. That way you have a broad team but you have different sections and they divide into three parts. That could be useful depending on what sort of things we come up with eventually. Thanks.

TERO MUSTALA: Just to continue a bit about the main sessions. First, if we think about -- or consider the different titles or so, I would encourage us to think for the main session title something which is relevant right now or this year. And I think one example of that is the Brazilian paper, whatever the right name is, it doesn't matter. But that is something we didn't discuss as such last year and I think naturally it would continue. But it came up this year, and for that reason I would encourage people to think in a way similar topics which are more or less hot right now and they would then in a way be the right titles for at least some of the main sessions. Not just repeating old titles or areas as has been the practice, at least for some time.

Then another point actually is that the relationships between the main sessions and the workshops, I think it could -- they could be used in two directions. Either by starting with a main session and then continuing dealing with the same issues in some numbers of workshops to larger detail from -- or from different point of view or so on, and also, the other way around,

PATRICK RYAN: Thank you, Patrick Ryan. One of the big challenges that we're discussing here is to what extent do we be prescriptive but also still allow for the opportunity for creative innovation in workshop style so that we can develop the IGF in a way that is experimental and let's things happen. At the same time, there are a couple of things that I think are very important. In the case of a 90-minute workshop, I do believe that we should set up some strong guidelines that -- try to limit, to the extent we can, the ability for panelists to continue talking. How many workshops have we been in where panelists get all the way to the end and just as a matter of pro forma so okay, we're going to leave the last five minutes for questions. Nobody has a chance to ask questions, and it's really a shame from the point of view of actual participation in the IGF. At the university we have this -- we have this problem as well. At that time university that I'm affiliated with, one of the ways that we get around that is to -- to sort of somewhat address Izumi's concern as well, is to, you know, make sure that the first few questions are asked by students and students are really given the student, exclusive opportunity during the first part to ask questions. Now, I don't know how that would work in -- you know, in an IGF format. It's not like we can call on participants in the same way that a professor can call on students. Yet at the same time, figuring out a way to encourage this participation and to enable the voices to be heard, particularly from the many people in the audience, it's not necessarily a cultural problem. It's just have a -- you know, don't have a type A personality like me and others do to really get them to take the microphone and speak up. Thank you.

.....