

RAW COPY

NRIS LAUNCH OF PROCESS TO RESPOND TO HLPDC RECOMMENDATION 5 A/B  
CONSULTATIONS

MAY 5TH, 2020  
14:00 TO 18:10 PM UTC

Services provided by:  
Caption First, Inc.  
P.O. Box 3066  
Monument, CO 80132  
1-877-825-5234  
+001-719-481-9835  
www.captionfirst.com

\*\*\*

This text document, or file, is based on live transcription. Communication Access Realtime Translation (CART), captioning, and/or live transcription are provided in order to facilitate communication accessibility and may not be a totally verbatim record of the proceedings or used in any way that may violate copyright law.

\*\*\*

Thank you! Can you see if this would reflect your introduction:

[Marilyn Cade]: Good morning, good afternoon and good evening to everyone. My name is Marilyn Cade. I am here for the IGF-USA together with several of my colleagues. Thank you very much for gathering in such a large number. I see there are over 180 of us on this call. This call is organized by several national, regional, subregional and youth IGFs. I would like to thank the IGF Secretariat for allowing

us to see their Zoom account and helping us to schedule our calls, so as this webinar. I also thank the IGFSAs that have financially supported this webinar by covering the costs of real-time transcription.

We have come a long way since Tunis and the WSIS process that gave birth to the IGF. The WSIS-follow up and the CSTD recommendations to the IGF were reminding us that we need to develop the Internet governance ecosystem everywhere, especially in developing countries that have particular challenges related to access and connectivity. Through more than 125 NRIs, we have managed to bring the IGF processes to the local level. The HLPDC process is important. It could orient the future ways of digital cooperation and the IGF, as well as the NRIs, as an already established mechanism, is described in the HLPDC Report and proposed as one of the possible mechanisms. The NRIs felt they need to respond to this, as they have a long-standing expertise and experience in digital policy processes.

I would like to turn to my colleague Sandra from EuroDIG that was one of the NRIs involved in this process of the NRIs responding to the HLPDC. Sandra, over to you.

[Sandra Hoferichter] >> Thank you very much, Marilyn. As the NRIs is an expert on all the IGF matters, and I'm pretty sure you're all very much aware -- how to read that report, what are the results, what is the relevant for the continuation of the IGF in this perspective. I think everyone in this call from the NRI community

are in favor of the IGF plus model. You are aware there are two other models that are introduced by this manual and Jovan will explain a little bit more in detail then. In detail but our community is very much enthusiastic about the IGF class model and how we can fill it what it could look like in reality, and this was opined when the IGF in Berlin or these championship groups were around there were round tables formed and different stakeholder took place or these round tables and formed championships and co-championships and for the recommendation 5A and 5B mid-January in Geneva. I think it was the time when it was already published and there are a set of questions to be shared on first on this mailing list on, basically, what the information the co-champions the German and government are interested in, and then during this open consultation, mid-January, a couple of NRI representatives agreed to organize a consolidated of input to this process. Later on the task force the was formed, and I think it's important to note that this task force is relatively -- not entirely but relatively balanced. We have members from Africa, from North America, from Latin America, Europe we're running a little short of Asia-Pacific people, but I think this is changing or -- or this is going to change soon, so now we have put these questions that are on the table already into a survey that Katie will present later on but what I would like to do now is to hand over to Jovan to walk us again through these three models because I think it's important that we have models on the tree model but our survey will only concentrate on the IGF class model on recommendation 5 A/B,

but the follow-up process is also consider the other models. We should be aware of this, and this is also why it is so important that we have a great and a huge number of respondents on this survey, not only NRI coordinators but also the individuals from the community, to businesses, to governments, to international organizations -- they should all reply to this survey because only this survey will be -- will deliver the arguments that we need in order to fill the IGF class model with live because there are a lot of questions around, and we should help giving them the answers.

So with this, I think I can hand on directly to Jovan unless Marilyn would like to add something more.

No, she's -- then let's go to Jovan directly.

[Jovan Kurbalija] There were some sort of dilemmas because I'd been explaining this model for so many times, and I'm sure you have attended at least 2 or three sessions, but on the other side, there is some sort of lapse of time and there are new circumstances, and there's is a dynamics, which is as old -- well, almost 15 years if not older dynamics, of the different working groups and gradual sort of nurturing and discussions and, basically, you are architects who built many bricks into this IGF building, but obviously we live in a rather unique time with the COVID-19 crisis where all policy developments have been accelerated.

And I will start with just one observation. The fact that we are meeting today on Zoom is more or less normal for our IGF community. We're using WebEx, Adobe Connect, nowadays Zoom but other

communities made the huge shift from offline to online world. And in a very IGF has been in this world for at least 12, 14, 15 years.

Why is this important? Sometimes in IGF -- brother IGF community we are either shy or we take things as just the normal things. We don't make a big fuss about it, but we should continue doing good things like remote participation but also we should start talking more about it. Are getting the new -- sort of live and new relevance with the COVID-19 crisis. As you know, the pandemic crisis, basically, put the field on huge stress. Many people shifted working online remotely, remotely online meetings are now more or less the main way of delivering meetings, and we are going to, basically, see completely digital space. With positive and negative developments and positive side, new ideas, new developments, new tools.

On the rather negative side new types of cyberattacks, for example, on health institutions and new type of the misinformation in fake news, but also some new developments, who would have ever thought that online groceries would be become part of the digital critical infrastructure? This is the sort of the context -- or let's say converse on which we should discuss what Sandra just introduced.

Another point is -- and it's very important point that my wife is knocking on the door, and I asked my daughter to open the door. Is that the -- we have to essentially --

Just a moment.

Zoey, Zoey, no, I have to open the door. I'm sorry. I'm

coming.

>> SANDRA HOFERICHTER: That's the beauty of virtual meetings.

>> JOVAN KURBALIJA: I'm sorry my daughter was sleeping, and she woke up, and that's a very, very real atmosphere. It's not as dramatic when kids -- when his kids enter the space. You remember the BBC media?

What Sandra talked about is corporate legitimacy, and I think IGF community has a legitimacy to talk about these changes, and it's not -- let's say traditional legitimacy by being voted by apartments but legitimacy of the of treatments of legitimacy putting a lot of ideas and scrambling on IGF instruction.

I have to be a bit critical, and I hope you will take it in positive and constructive way, IGF has not been as proactive in this discussion as in my view it should. It should out of its responsibility for the put it on digital cooperation, but also out of the need to -- to, basically, good things about good developments. We have to talk more about really remarkable developments in IGF, while being critical in the same way. Therefore, there's a bit of legitimacy but also responsibility, but I think it's excellent timing for this discussion today. And for what Sandra and others are trying to do in order to energize discussion. This is the broader converse.

Let me now move to, basically, -- I'll try to share with you my PowerPoint.

As you know I have always -- I have advanced -- okay, and that's fine, and here you can see my PowerPoint. Okay. Good.

It is always good to get back to -- to the core of the discussion and the issue that is -- that we're discussing. This is the UN high-level report. I want to mention I'm not anymore the director of secretariat. The parliament worked last year, and now follow-up process is coordinated by the assistant secretary-general and his office. And accommodation 5A we have Germany, Emirates and the UN, basically, working on that.

What is exact words of this? Recommendation -- I'm sorry, for background noise. It's a bit busy at my place.

We recommend as a matter of urgency the U.N. secretary-general facilitated an agile and open cooperation process to provide updated -- and I'm highlighted updated for global digital cooperation. That was always the spirit, to update existing Mims, not to start to create something new.

With the option discussing Chapter 4 as a starting point, this is Chapter 4 which describes three models as a starting point and as you can imagine that was bright a negotiation with the panel of the people who's not interested in government mechanisms.

And then there's a timing element. We discussed an initial goal of making the UN 75th anniversary, 2020 this year with the global commitment for global cooperation to share principles and understanding objectives for improved global digital cooperation architecture, and that is now in the process of being discussed in New York. I don't have that many details.

(Coughing.)

>> JOVAN KURBALIJA: But that is getting in UN dynamics. I know there will be -- offered in the general assembly and member states in the next step after the panel's work, and you have the last part as part of this process we understand that U.N. secretary-general may appoint -- and the second five days endorsing the internet governance for a multistakeholder approach.

What happened -- let me see. I'm probably doing something wrong. As I always do.

Okay. What we did in the work of the panel we tried to follow relatively, and I would say logical steps to identify gaps, what is missing in current mechanisms to see what are the functions that can address these gaps and what are the models that can accommodate these functions?

Let's see not sufficient inclusion, which is one of the gap -- ongoing gap in any governance process, and then there's a function the only inclusion involvement processes in all aspects from multilingualism and capacity-building, and then there's a model -- one of the three models that could accommodate these functions.

In this way, by dividing in gaps, functions and models, we didn't choose the rigid approach to have it only, let's say, IGF model as the only model, but we left discussion a bit open to see what are the models that can accommodate in the best possible way certain functionally, like leadership, inclusivity, evidenced-based policymaking. At one point there were 20 functions, and then we

reduced to 10, and you can find the report.

What we found, and it was for me -- I've been in IG for 20-plus years, it was for me quite supervising to see there are really many existing mechanisms and there are some things rather -- well, naive or myopic view that we lack mechanism on digital policy and internet policy. I'm using the wider term. We identify more than mechanism. You can find them on digital watch website where we keep the ongoing mechanisms, and it is a bit conservative because recently I discussed with the 5G people, and they told me there are more or less something like 40 is to 50 processes standardization bodies, which are discussing different aspects of the 5G. It is not necessarily a problem of the lack of the governance mechanisms, and that was the -- that was the major insight. The main problem we found in discussion and consultation is that people do not know whom to call. In the proverbial Henry Kissinger whom to call if he wants to call Europe, whom to call if we want to solve digital problems. Now we're seeing this challenge today with, for example, discussion on the tracing apps. Countries that are developing different approaches, Apple and Google are doing their own way. They're discussing incorporating, but there is no place in space where different actors can come and discuss, basically, what can be done in coordinated way. It will come sometime, but there is quite a bit of confusion, and I'm mentioning something, which is so visible this is the discussion about tracing apps as a way to deal with the COVID-19 pandemic and returning Sarasota to normal function. Therefore, you can find

many, many examples but what is missing is a place where different threads could be put together request governance mechanisms but a place where different lines can be connected and in particular small developing countries marginalized countries, anyone who doesn't have institution and human capacity to engage in global digital debates can see what's going on, can participate, can see information being updated.

I've been receiving these calls from my students, for example, for a small island states and, basically, Africa, hey, what's going on in Europe with this tracing up? We don't know what to do. You're invited to join, and we're trying to field some of those gaps, but they should be done by organization like -- with the IGF body. Another point, which is extremely important for you is lack of virtual coordination. The previous one was more horizontal which was going on from regional, national and global levels. There are no El -- elevators do not work. Elevators are blocked. There is lack of understanding, and this is one of the major challenges for -- I would say overall the digital corporation architecture and IGF+ system.

If we identify gaps we identify functions, and we then came to discussion what could be the model for these functions? This is what -- some sort of graphical summary -- there were three models, IGF+, core gap, core governance architecture and common architecture and the most easiest to identify was the IGF+ because there were working groups, there are written articles, thinking by you must have

you in this community and, basically, we said where we can land these functions? And these functions could be landed in the advisory group, which is more or less MAG, core cooperation acceleration and an incubator of norms and policies held for inclusion and helping actors to participate.

Now, you know, what is the -- probably one of the suggestion is to beef up the MAG and to have a more prominent role of the UN leadership and the secretary-general opened up the last IGF which was an improvement and to have these three new bodies either developed within the advisory group which was I think suggested by U.K., within the MAG, which is a perfectly legitimate function or to have them as a subgroup of the advisory group or something like this but what should be the function of cooperation accelerated? Cooperation accelerated -- it should accelerate cooperation but in what practical ways? By making this more functional which you are in a way doing with the NRI initiative but also by connecting with the green lines to processes outside the IGF and in my opinion it will be the main challenge of IGF. People are not waiting for us to come on with ideas. They are moving on. You have web forum, you have so many initiatives where thousands and thousands of people attempt with SXSW, which is less and less technical, which are more and more policy forwards. If IGF wants to remain relevant, it has to make really serious outrage to those initiatives. This cooperation accelerator will be a networking space where at least we will know what's going on in SXSW, in web forum and converge with the -- with

the IGF. There is a need for that.

At one point before COVID crisis we identified almost 10 processes which we are discussing the model of -- in the same way AI is with artificial intelligence. I'm sorry you can recall in cyber-recall any processes, and everybody is saying it's useful to know what's going on next door. I'm not sure people will accept to be coordinated, but this cooperation can accelerate, and we can discuss more details.

Then there is a policy incubator, which is a place where you come in with a policy gap and say, we need to develop a multistakeholder way new rules, new guidelines, new policies, whatever, policy incubator wouldn't be a place to make decisions, but it would be place where multistakeholder cooperation would make some of those decisions with private sector, parliaments governments organizations to adopt it and discuss it further.

Let's say tracing up. Tracing up is, basically, everyone is crying for some standardization and interpretability policy. It would be perfect landing space, much better than existing bodies, I know there's Facebook and Google and governments of Germany, Italy, people are discussing, but this is why the IQ was established 50 plus years ago not to discuss things bilaterally but to have a place where everybody would feel at home and in particular where small and developing countries would at least have an idea of policy process. This is more in process for policy incubator.

And it would have a function to have well, an observatory a

digital watch and processes and help desk, a place where actors can come and raise their issues and ask for assistance from capacity developing, drafting new law, whatever. Like a policy cooperation and policy from the community, those should not be the places to make the decision. By acting as an assistance of one-stop-shop for actors to come, and then to be guided to private sector actors to standardization bodies, international organizations, whoever can help that's the idea for the IGF, IGF+.

The second model is distributed core governance architecture, which is, basically, building on the experience of icon dynamics, IPF, and this creating peer coordinator network, which will address specific issue like a COVID, for example, by having support desk and to have network platform, which will -- which will, basically, support let's say the discussion on the COVID order tracing up application.

Having assembling with UN and having forum and having digital cooperation, *et cetera*.

It would be -- let's say dynamic coalition on steroids and that one can develop.

Let me just make a parallel here. Dynamic coalition would also be policy incubators and to some extent cooperation accelerator. What is very important we have not really reinventing the wheel. We are building on the really great experience that IGF have developed.

Therefore, for those of you coming from technical, I.T. community that would be more or less the spirit of this exercise,

more *ad hoc*, more agile way of creating this sort of network -- peer coordination network, with one organization taking the lead, or hosting it being a private sector company, and then engaging.

As you can see it's not necessarily these two models are incompatible. Elements from this model can reach the IGF and IGF+ model.

And then we had the model that was more driven by the need to do something on digital Congress --

(Inaudible.)

>> JOVAN KURBALIJA: And this model was tech. They are addressing the digital comments like data, through tech panel, architecture secretariat, UN annual meeting and being more anchored into the UN system. It is the least-developed model in the terms of a substance, but it is a model that addresses extremely important issues, which is the commons, common infrastructure, data is a commons. While some elements of this model can be taken or developed further the need for regulating the comments is important. It may be taken by IGF+ or core governance. This is more or less I would say not 10,000 -- 8,000-feet view. If you focus on any of these models you can see obviously the IGF+ has the most mileage. It has the infrastructure, it has the elevators, moving from national, regional to global. It has a mandate, which is very important.

Article 72, and we celebrated 15 years is one of the most brilliant drafted article which, basically, gives the U.N. secretary-general cart blanche in whatever he finds possible.

They should this should be -- they believe this should be renamed, but that's for a different discussion.

IGF is the most realistic, the most mature model that may serve as anchor where the elements from the other two models could be brought in and the whole digital cooperation field should be raised, and I would say on a much -- much higher level.

Well, I usually finish my presentation with my favorite -- favorite image. Just to inspire discussion, and that's it sorry for my interruption to open my door, but that's the reality of these meetings.

Over to whoever is chairing, Sandra or --

>> CONCETTINA CASSA: Thank you for your brilliant presentation. I will start to give some information about -- as Sandra mentioned before the subregional is focused on the IGF+ model actually there are two main parts. One is in explaining the context.

To follow up the process that has been started by the contentions of the bilateral -- of on the cooperation recommendation, and then why it's important to analyze part -- actually, NRIs are in 125 countries, and they are also so familiar with the IGF+ , so they can give added value to this process that can be considered by the challenge.

The first is to explains the context and explains a little bit about the three models that we just have explained, and then a set of questions that are more focused on IGF+ as I told you before.

Yeah, one important information you have to give a response

by the 21st of May. We fixed the deadline because we know that this follow-up process we lost at the beginning of June because we need to count influence from the NRIs. The first one which of the three models is best to pursue global digital cooperation, and maybe they think IGF+ is not the best model, so we start the first question just asking which of the three models best pursue global digital cooperation, and then from the second one and all the other questions what focus on IGF+ and the second is the advisory group. As you said group advisory group so here there are two questions the No. 2 is squaring about the structure. If NRIs and people who are participating do they think the advisory group should have the same structure as the current mark? And we are not asking only if -- yes or not on this question we also have more group but just is to understand it was the suggestion on how this platform should be improved, and we give an example, and this is just an example, what should be improved, the number of advisory group members should be more clear or maybe people think advisory groups should be who is the representatives from additional sectors. That's all, so we give the possibility to enter the Texas of 150 words just to select the input from NRIs.

If you go on, this is the -- question No. 3 is still on the advisory group, and we are -- we are asking about responsibility. If they think responsibility of advisory group a should be broader than those that are performed by MAG. If answer is, yes, answer.

Question No. 4 is about -- still about the additional sector

because parliamentarian -- I mean, last year there was an important vulnerable parliamentarian -- maybe these are one sector but there are also other sector like youth -- I remember in the final section there was some youth that were asking for more involvement in the IGF, and there's academic and so on.

So this question is to ask if they think that the that other additional sectors should be involved in the IGF activity?

So just going to Question No. 5 is about tangible outputs. This is the main issues in IGF. You know, these are all for discussion of how to reach these objective. So here there is a list of possible things that could improve reaching of our tangible -- like recommendations involving parliamentarian, involved of the awareness and the purpose and activities of IGF, but you can also put other suggestion as you prefer.

Then there are some questions about the IGF+ that was explained, so the Question No. 6 is about cooperation accelerator. If you think that accelerator -- this cooperation accelerator is a useful element, yes/no, and please explain why you think yes or no. It's important to understand the reason why you put yes or not on your reply.

So just going to Question No. 7, this is about -- about cooperation accelerator. As Jovan explained, it was to get more cooperation among several technical board so here there is a list of possible -- so we are asking what -- which kind of organization and how do you think we can improve this cooperation among

organizations working with the internet governance.

So just moving to Question No. 8 is: Do you have a suggestion on how accelerator could facilitate such cooperation? So the question is -- it's explaining and maybe we can just put Question No. 9 that it's asking the same for the policy Incubator -- I mean, if it's a useful element. If, yes, how it should look in terms of composition or responsibilities and if not, explain why. And just going to Question No. 10, the same question is on observatory and help desk, and so just give your suggestion or these elements on IGF+ architecture.

So just going to Question No. 11 is about funding because as you know, I mean, the actual founding of IGF is a kind of combination of voluntary contributions of governance, technical organizations, architecture, and so on, and we know that finding time in IGF because we need more funding, and so this Question No. 11 is asking: How we can improve this aspect of IGF. How we can get more funding and, and it's asking -- how this funding mechanism could be improved. If it's sustainable and how it could be improved.

So just going to the next question that is No. 12. No. 12 is about the strength of the IGF -- the IGF role because as you know, one of the main criticism to the IGF is also related to the fact that sometime there's overlapping initiative and IGF cannot express its voice as it should bad so maybe -- I think maybe -- the question is: Should the IGF achieve a better role in addressing in public policy and that will be --

So yeah, this is -- how to -- to reach these improvements and the reason.

So then we can go to Question No. 14, then it's about the IGF projects that was -- this is the recommendation that the IGF+ is linked to the office of the UN secretary-general, and so the question is if you support these recommendations.

So the last questions, 15, 16, 17 is to ask if there are also some aspects of the other two architectural considered for the potential inclusion -- that you should be included in the IGF model, and so we're asking if it should be included in the how -- in which way.

And then the 17 is just left for any further recommendation.

So, yeah, the last one is about demographic section, so it's asking for your name, your region, and so on, so the question actually is 17 questions, but it requests just 7 minutes of your time, so we hope that you can join -- you can complete this survey. We will not accept anonymous participation because we actually, as part of IGF, we think it should be open and transparent process, so we prefer you specify your contact name.

So I don't know if Sandra or Marilyn want to add something else. I mean, I finished so thanks for your time.

>> MARILYN CADE: Thank you, it's Marilyn speaking, Titi. I want to cover two more questions, and then we want to go to questions or statements and in order make sure people can speak, I will ask you to raise your hands online. If you possibly can. I've seen one or

two comments in the chat already but let me just re-enforce the importance of -- even though the time is short, the importance of doing these submissions and -- once we receive the responses, the task force will be reading all of them, synthesizing them, and then we'll publish a final output document. If you're signed up for our list, and you see on the PowerPoint the NRI forum at [nriscooperation@intgovforum.org](mailto:nriscooperation@intgovforum.org), and we will be publishing the final document and once it's published, it will be communicated to the co-champions for further communication to the broader group.

I really hope that you will also -- if you need help in explaining the questionnaire itself to your broader community then let us know on the task force. All of us, I'm sure, are going to be available and if I personally can help you in any way in doing a follow-up call with your community to motivate responses then just ask I'm sure Titi, Sandra and others on the task force will also be available as well.

Sandra, if you have comments but let me turn to you, and then I'd like to go to questions and statements from anyone else.

>> SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Marilyn, I would have no comments so please let's go to the questions from our community.

>> MARILYN CADE: Okay. The first question that I've seen, that I want to respond to is Nigel's comment about a 10-minute survey.

Nigel, I did a walk through -- Nigel, it's Marilyn speaking, I did a walk-through, and I'm extremely familiar with the report and with the IGF and with the NRI community, and I would book it at more

like at least 20 to 25 minutes, and if you are responding on behalf of an NRI, then you will -- like, for instance, Dustin, and I will be talking to our steering group about how we're going to develop our comments, so certainly, if you're going to respond in the text boxes, I think you're quite right. It will take more time, but very, very important to do.

And even if you can't respond to each of the text-box questions, please try to do as much as you can on that front.

There was another question about translation into the 6 UN languages, and this is not a task force opinion, Titi Sandra, but I just want to re-enforce what I said on the list. The task force doesn't have separate funding. The reason we're giving you the transcript something you can translate using Drupal, Google Translate or some other online service to be able to share with your community -- if the -- if the survey is to be translated, I personally believe it would have to be done by volunteer native speakers as we do not have financial support to undertake the translation into the 6 UN languages.

I will also make one more comment, translating into the 6 UN languages -- and I see our dear colleagues from Afghanistan on the phone so just one example translating into the 6 UN languages wouldn't really help as the languages that are spoken in Afghanistan are not in the 6 UN languages, so I think we're somewhat dependent on native speakers to -- to translate for their communities.

I don't know if anyone else wants to -- to comment.

Jovan has left us. Thank him again so much, and we will communicate with him in writing.

>> JOVIN KURBALIJA: Thank you, Marilyn. I was about to click leaving minute, and I have one meeting in one minute. Just one more encouragement that you put these efforts -- it is a critical moment because the process is now moving towards in a way closure with some roadmap and recommendation from secretary-general. With this good timing please dedicate some efforts if you need any additional information or answer from my side, please drop me an email either through Marilyn or other colleagues directly. Have a nice day/morning/evening or wherever you are based now. Bye-bye.

>> MARILYN CADE: Thank you. Thank you to Lucy, also for the suggestion of crowdin.com as a -- an online translation service as well.

Let me -- do you see other questions that we have received in the chat that I may have missed before I go to the participants?

>> Nothing, I think, Marilyn you covered well. I hope I didn't miss anything, but I do see a raised hand in the participant list.

>> MARILYN CADE: Fantastic. Sandra.

>> SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Just to add to our participants while we can understand you might use any translation tool for translating it into your language, we would really appreciate if you do answer in English so translate it back to English because this NRI task force is a short time we don't have time to translate multiple languages.

So if you're uncomfortable doing it in English, please translate

it into English before sending it to us. That was just what I wanted to mention, thanks.

>> MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Sandra.

We do have some background noise so please mute unless you want to speak, and if you want to speak just go ahead and ask for the floor.

If you haven't raised your hand, you can still ask verbally for the floor.

>> ANJA GENGO: Sorry, Marilyn, this is Anja.

Before anyone takes the floor -- this is a good question from Desiree whether the survey is officially open and can the link be shared with the wider community.

>> MARILYN CADE: And the answer is yes, yes, it should be shared with the wider community and, Olga, thank you for joining us. I outreached to a number of groups where there are IGF stakeholders involved. That may not be actively involved in an NRI such as the cross-community working group on internet governance that can. There are several other contacts that I have, and I think it would be fantastic for all of us to think about that broad distribution to enhance awareness about the -- the survey and the importance of this response.

While we will be aggregating and responding for those who contact us by submitting the survey online, getting the message out that you can also respond as an organization or as an individual, I hope is an important part of broad anything -- broadening the awareness and participation and thought role of the NRIs in driving

the -- the input, so do share it and feel free to share it broadly.

Alexander has asked a question about the link, and I would ask Dustin or Poncelay just to verify I'm not able to flashback.

>> Dustin, sorry, I'm just going to jump in. The link that Alexander shared is the correct link.

>> MARILYN CADE: Thank you.

And just to re-enforce what Sandra said, ice really not possible for us to extend the deadline and do an effective analysis. Apologies for that, but, you know, we -- we really have to stick to that deadline in order to do the analysis. If we're lucky, we had 120 people at one point on this call, and if we get 100 responses, you all can understand that that means we're going to be working very hard to get the analysis done.

Other questions?

Sorry, my cat is right to eat my laptop.

(Laugh.)

>> MARILYN CADE: Virtual meetings.

Okay. Folks, I don't want us to miss any questions here.

(Laugh.)

>> MARILYN CADE: Okay. We've introduced the pet concept.

If we are missing any questions, I put my email in the chat. I believe Titi's there. We all know Anja's, you know Sandra's so just send us any -- any questions, and so we'll make sure -- and we'll make sure that we also share them with the full list, and we get all of you who gave us your email signed up for the ongoing communication

list.

Final comments from Titi or Sandra?

>> SANDRA HOFERICHTER: Maybe just to add that we will share this webinar with you as a video recording. We will also share the captions with you, so you can translate it into your languages as well, so for those in your community who could not follow this webinar today, they will even be able to catch up with the transcript and with the recording later on, so Anja will draft one more email that you can then also forward within your networks. And, again, it's important that everyone is invited to answer this survey, individual people as well as organizations or NRI communities that reply as a group of people. That's what I wanted to mention.

>> MARILYN CADE: So, Sandra, it's Marilyn, we do have one question responding to the survey as an individual or as an NRI: If you have done a consultation with your community of NRI -- your steering group or your community, then you should submit it as an NRI because it's stronger.

If you are responding as an organization -- so let me give an example. It could be that the ICANN, a cross-community working group on internet governance, or ISOC or AccessNow, *et cetera*, might decide now to submit a response as an organization. It could be that an individual would want to support as an individual, we will accept all of those and our analysis will show in what categories the submission was made.

Yes, Judith, I think we've -- we have that figured out, thank

you.

Okay. Folks, again, thanks to the -- everyone who participated. Really great turnout and particularly for all of us at this time sheltering in place. Look after yourselves and look after your families. We will come through this together. Goodbye.