
DUBLIN – Internet Principles: Openness
Wednesday, October 21, 2015 – 12:15 to 13:45 IST
ICANN54 | Dublin, Ireland

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] in English. For those of you who are sitting behind, you may join us so that we can all talk together.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Translation, we have simultaneous translation. Spanish, English, or French. I don't speak French, but maybe others do. So the idea is that we use our own language. We have several panelists that have Spanish as a native speaking language, so maybe we can switch in between Spanish and English. I already talked with our nice translators here that they will understand the switching of the languages.

I wanted to tell you that you're going to use a language you choose, you prefer, because we have simultaneous translation in English, French, and Spanish, so we have several panelists who speak Spanish. We are going to make the most of it, and those who want to speak any languages are welcome. We also have remote participation, for those of you who are not here. I cannot see the screen from where I am sitting. I don't know, but if there

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.

is anybody. I also know there is an audio and video stream going out.

So welcome, all of you. Thank you very much for being here with us, and I would like to thank Rodrigo and Jean-Jacques for helping us to get to this room. I know at this meeting, there are so many rooms and so many formal meetings, and what ICANN calls popup meetings –meetings that are convened on the spot to discuss issues or draft documents, and ICANN has done quite a lot here.

This initiative was born from the General Authority of Technology and Information in Argentina to talk about elements that made Internet more open and more inclusive. So I'd like to thank AFTIC, the Argentine association for this initiative. I was asked to coordinate it and I thank all of my colleagues and friends not only from my beloved homeland, but to all of our colleagues who are here with us this morning.

I would like to talk about some elements that help us to have an Internet which is really inclusive. This is especially important for countries in Latin America where access is still an element where – am I talking too fast? An area we'll still have to keep on working so that we get a fair participation of all our citizens, our businesses, and our stakeholders.

Thus, we thought, but this is not limited to what we have defined, we have thought of some elements, which really are important to improve access. One of them is traffic exchange point and other elements, which our experts would like to mention. We also thought of talking about contents. There are some projects related to the delivery of content through some networks, which are considered limiting factors because they don't provide access to everybody, and they are also limited type of content that can be sent through those networks. For example, the case of sending content through mobile network, free content, you name it.

So I'd like to suggest these two issues and the discussion is not limited to those issues. And maybe during the discussions, other issues come up, and I'd also like to invite the colleagues sitting around the table. Some of them are friends from old times and some of you are new friends, so I invite you to make suggestions and comments. Who would like to go first?

Esteban. Thank you, Esteban. And I think Esteban is ready. He has a PowerPoint, so I feel really happy about that.

ESTEBAN LESCANO: I am Esteban Lescano. I represent CABASE. And at this meeting, I am an ICANN Fellow, so I'd like to thank ICANN for having given

us the chance of understanding what ICANN's ecosystem is like and to get to know many people and meet friends.

When we were thinking about how to organize this panel, I thought it was important to talk about the openness principle in Internet, which is quite wide-ranging, and enterprised to many areas, as I mentioned related to Internet as a phenomenon.

So I thought it was important to begin with this chart, which comes from an ISOC report. You can see the source at the very bottom of the slide. So it comes from a 2013 report, which describes the full areas where this principle of openness applies. The first one is related to technology, where we talk about open standards. Then we have a second area related to economy, where we talk about open markets, access to those markets.

We have a third area, which is related to the social component of Internet, and here we have this issue of access, Internet access, openness in access; and a fourth area, which is related to governance, Internet governance. And here the principle is based on open institutions and being a lawyer working in the area of public policies, I wanted to tackle this issue first, open institutions, and give the floor to other colleagues who will deal with more technical issues related to openness from the point of view of economics.

When we talk about governance as an open institution, what we think of is a multi-stakeholder model. We all know about it, we experience it at ICANN meetings where we have civil society and the technical society and governments and the private sector participating on equal footing. So this open participation is related to transparency in the governance processes, and in the fair and equal rights participation of all actors. Out of those in the openness, we have the bottom-up processes for policy development and those policies have to foster innovation.

You know that one of the important values to be protected in the development of Internet is the capacity to have innovation and how all the actors work together to create new services, new applications, and new uses for Internet-related technologies. And finally, cooperation and collaboration among all the actors in the ecosystem.

But if we think how this applies, how this is applied in all the countries who are here, we have a first element, NETmundial, the San Paulo, statement, the multi-stakeholder declaration of 2014 where we see a list of principles related to Internet governance, and one of those principles is open, participative, and consensus-driven governance – that is, openness in consensus-based policies and in development of Internet-related policies. And this is important and we will see how this is

taken into account in Argentina or in the region where I came from.

We also have, besides this NETmundial statement or declaration, there are examples of open institutions, which are good examples with specifics, but good examples of open Internet governance systems such as the policy development process within ICANN in generic support of organization, or the WSIS process – a process which started in the Information Society Summit (the WSIS) and you know this process of this taking place within the [inaudible] Nations and we also have the IGF (Internet Governance Forum), which as you know, also uses a multi-stakeholder approach.

NETmundial, and this is interesting, there are other things – other initiatives – for Internet open governance. In our region, we may think of [residence CGI] as an example of multi-stakeholder approach.

In the case of openness in Argentina, there is a lot to be done, but some things have been done, and we are quite proud of it. In the case of CABASE, CABASE is the Argentine Internet Association, and association with gathers Internet service providers, content providers, data centers.

Right now, we have over 220 members. Well, 300 members. We are really happy about our growth. In 2013, we passed some

commandments. We call them CABASE's commandments. And the goal of these commandments is to get the sector to self-regulate itself – that is, the representatives of the companies agreed on certain principles, ethical principles, that apply to the development of Internet in Argentina.

One of those principles, I will read it in Spanish. It says, “Governance and democratic and collaborative regulation. Governance and regulation of several elements of Internet shall be carried out in a transparent , multi-[inaudible] democratic way with an involvement of several sectors of society protecting and encouraging its nature of collective creation.”

And this is important because we are talking about public positions where the administration asks for comments. We also use this to [relate] to the media, etc. So when they ask us about this, we send people to have look at our commandments. So it is used as a way of expressing our position to relate ourselves with public actors, private actors, the media, and also as a way of collaborating in the discussion of public policies in Internet or Internet-related public policies.

Besides, we don't only have these principles, but we try to move forward through several initiatives. For example, one of them is follow-on, we have asked the Argentinian administration to participate in an amendment of the regulations, a new federal

authority administration was created to manage communications services. It's a [inaudible] concept for IT initiative services. A council was created and somehow it's a multi-stakeholder council, and CABASE asked to be involved as a member of that council, representing ISPs and broadband providers.

Besides, we have organized roundtables on issues which are of interest to the industry. For example, the development of the Argentine Digital Act, network neutrality, and we have organized roundtables involving representatives of the administration, the private sector, the academia, and civil society. We have also asked the authorities, whenever possible, that when new standards that were related to the Internet sector, we asked the administration to follow this open procedures for the definition of policies.

Anyway, what we see – and I'm coming to the end of my presentation –there is still a long way to go, and that's why I say that this principle of openness in Internet governance is a goal to be achieved. It is something we all have to build step by step, and although we have these global initiatives in place, such as NETmundial and regional initiatives such as Brazil CGI.

And somehow, the federal authority for technology and communications services in Argentina still has a long way to go.

In Argentina, it's a federal authority. There are seven members, but only one of them is appointed through a multi-stakeholder approach. And this person appointed comes from a federal council, the information and energy services and [digitalization] services.

It's a council made up of 34 members, but a majority come from the public sector, so what we realize is that, well, we are – that we trust that step-by-step progress can be made. And this is a colloquial way, so we used to take things in Argentina, step by step, we will be able to achieve our goals to get to open Internet governance. Thank you very much.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Esteban. I'd like to hear what you have to say, Esteban, because you started participating in ICANN many years ago. Some of us have been here for more time. I'd like to know what you think about the way these issues are dealt with in this environment, especially because you get in touch with new people, newcomers to the group who are more open-minded, a fresher look who are not so used to the way we work within ICANN. I'd like to know what you think about this.

ESTEBAN LESCANO: Thank you. The truth is that it's very interesting because... I'm going to speak personally. This is my sixth ICANN meeting, but it's my second fellowship program, the first one where I am a coach. And it's very interesting because you are a newcomer to an ecosystem, which is already operating. Some people have been working here for many years, and what is interesting is that you may find a place in [inaudible]. Even if you are a newcomer, you see this principle of openness, this possibility of starting to participate in the various stakeholder groups, different discussion groups. So though I consider ICANN as an organization, although it's very hard to read and learn about all the acronyms and find your place, and this is hard task, but it can be done. So we feel that there is this openness to deal with new issues.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much, Esteban. I have said this many times, so I apologize if I say this once again. ICANN has made great progress in many areas. One of them is a fellowship program, which was started in 2007, which is a great way of bringing in people from countries where it's difficult to travel. The [inaudible] simultaneous translation is a wonderful team that has been working for us until the small hours of the morning.

And besides remote participation, I think these three areas have evolved and when we talk about openness to the community, it is worthwhile mentioning. And I know I have said this several times, but it's worthwhile repeating. The translation system is wonderful and it has more languages than the United Nations – one more, Portuguese in this case – plus a fellowship program and remote participation. I cannot open Adobe Connect so I don't know if there are any questions for remote participants, but I can see there are several remote participants, so hello to everybody.

Could you open the Adobe Connect, Fatima, to tell me if there are any questions?

Thank you Rodrigo. I cannot open Adobe Connect in my computer. Who would like to take the floor next?

Javier [inaudible], he is a close friend. He is Chairman of the Argentine Internet Association, CABASE, and he has been a director, and he has been the owner of several companies, and I believe those companies have always been pioneers in Internet and connectivity issues in Argentina

Ariel, thank you very much for being here with us.

[ARIEL BRUNO]:

This is Ariel. I will follow up on Esteban's presentation. A comment to be made. A few years ago in the Argentine Chamber of the Internet, we started three years ago an engagement model. We are no longer a participation chamber. We have a federations of [comparatives], we have nonprofit associations, we have provincial governments, a large number of universities in our association.

So we have tried – and this is something you can see reflected in the management board, which we had to expand to accommodate a large number of participants from various sources and origins.

And this was based on a clear understanding of what participation and openness means. Having made this clarification, as I was saying to Esteban, we have 300 members but some of them are federations of members, such as the Federation of Telephone Cooperatives, which are 300 cooperatives. We have the Association of Cable TV Providers, Internet Cable TV Providers, over 1,200.

So we have a large number of members directly or indirectly, and also we have national coverage throughout Argentina. So we tried to be present in all geographical areas because that is one of the principles. Internet should reach everybody. So we're working on that.

A few years ago, our association held its meetings only in Buenos Aires, the capital of the country. Now we have meetings in 16 different cities, so we have been able to create this opening and participation throughout the country.

So now, I'd like to refer to the [infrastructure]. We are responsible for the operation of Internet traffic exchange points. We have 16 of these Internet exchange points, traffic points, in operation. There are others for information.

Since 2009 to date, we have increased our internal traffic by 60%. And this is because we have changed the concept we used to have because until 2009, we only allowed the Internet providers, the carriers, be part of the Internet traffic exchange points, and we've been able to invite other sectors to exchange traffic.

Actually, we're working on the definition of a traffic exchange point is and we've changed what we call them the NAPs (the network access points), now they are traffic exchange points, Internet traffic exchange points in the understanding that the participating members, the only condition, the only requirement, is to have an autonomous network number and IP address.

It doesn't matter from which sector they come, but that they should only meet this requirement of having an autonomous

network number and an IP address to be recognized as such and comply with [EBGB protocol]

From then on, we've changed the Argentine status quo for Internet development. So now universities, government organizations, and content providers are able to participate on an equal footing and not only have a voice, but also pour their content and traffic because, though it seems to be obvious in the light of the work carried out since 2009, it is highly relevant.

Because in 2009, we had one gigabit per second of exchange in Argentina comprising all actors, and now we are higher than over 80 gigabits per second. This is domestic traffic within the country's boundaries.

So it is proof that it was necessary to include in the connectivity outcome outline, institutions such as the Tax Authority of Argentina, which is one of the main content providers. Taxes are settled online in Argentina, so having access to that structure of information was important for all Argentine citizens, and they were not connected to anything where the process of connection to a traffic exchange point... Well, that changed the situation.

Then the process of the elections process, both the parliament and executive elections. We've worked with the Ministry of

Justice so that its network is available for all citizens in all regions on equal footing.

So our actions have been fruitful and we are, by the way, helping. I'm wearing another hat, which is I'm the President of the Latin American and Caribbean Association of Operators of the Internet Traffic Exchange Points, [LAC EX], and here I am representing LAC EX, which is an association born in 2003 with the mission of developing good practices and allowing Internet traffic exchange points operators in the Latin America and Caribbean region adopt the best technologies practices so that the management can perform the development.

And what we are doing in our CABASE organization and in [LAC EX] is precisely that. To promote the existence of traffic exchange points and abide by best practices, obviously, with the inclusion of the local flavor because we believe that each country, each region, should consider local conditions.

Not all countries, not everywhere, we can apply exactly the same recommendations in exactly the same manner, and it is also relevant to understand that governments, as regulators in each location, in each country, has a different vision.

So by contributing to the development of traffic exchange points in [LAC EX] we are working so that, in our region, the internal traffic is increasingly larger, that whether greater connectivity

among countries, that the traffic that should not leave our region does not leave our region. Meaning the Internet traffic between Argentina and Brazil should not go through a third country because that was not the case in the past.

So this is part of our understanding in our view that provides fair and equal conditions toward Internet members. I'm going to close here and if there are questions, we could open up for questions.

OLGA CAVALLI:

I have two questions. I will switch to English. Distinguished panelists, Ms. Engineer Asha Hemrajani. She's a member of the Board of ICANN, and she is an engineer like me. We hosted a roundtable about the role of women in ICANN. It was quite interesting on Monday. So thank you, Asha, for being with us. We know you are very busy. But she was keen to come and exchange her experience. She lives in Singapore but she travels all over the world, and she's a radio engineer, somehow, like what I am.

So I will switch to Spanish again. Sorry for these changes. Ariel, I have a couple of questions. One is a technical question and the other not so technical. At a regional level, what do you think has been the impact in this that you have [inaudible] that there is less traffic that leaves the region and stays here.

That has been a goal to be attained, decidable objective to make it more convenient in financial terms. How much do you think this change in traffic exchange points has changed in the region? I don't know if I've made the question properly, but probably you understand. How much have we increased the local traffic versus the outgoing traffic?

And the other question is whether the [LAC EXP] is a physical interconnected exchange point between operators such as the London, Amsterdam, or Frankfurt points. That is a question. These are quite technical, but it's my provisional advice.

[ARIEL BRUNO]:

Let me start by the second question. [LAC EX] is like Africa EX or Europe EX. We are associations of operators, of traffic exchange points. CABASE is equivalent to M6 or links who are the operators. Those who operate the traffic exchange points.

And it should be noted that an operator and a traffic exchange point are different things. The TEP is a network facility. The operator is an organization that operates the TEP. These are two different instances. The traffic exchange point is a technical facility, the network feature, which is managed by switches.

On the other hand, the association or the operator are either associations or business organizations. There are different

models for and for non-profit. So the Latin American and Caribbean Association of Traffic Exchange Point Administrators, [LAC EX], is one of the five members of the EX Federation, which is the international federation, which has only five members, which are the Associations of the five regions, which are Asia-Pacific, Africa, Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean, and the recently one established for North America.

Now on your first question regarding the traffic exchange, in recent years, we've seen all over the world that contents – the ideas to contents closer to the end user. And this has created a change of traffic flow and also a change of money flow because, in the past in Argentina, we had to pay international links to look for contents abroad.

Now the large content providers pay to have contents closer to its users, to their users, so the equation has been reverted. So we have seen a change of flow. However, I do not consider that traffic as part of our [close]. It has nevertheless helped the traffic in our region to change because we no longer go outside to look for those contents. I hope you understand my explanation.

We could say that from 2010 to 2015, this flow, the direction of the flow has been reverted. Though still in Latin America and the Caribbean, 60% of the overall traffic is still outbound. But as I can say, as well, in the case of Argentina, which are the figures I

know in detail, at present, we have an average 400 to 600 gigabits per second of traffic that, in the past, we had to pay go outside Argentina, which are now residing locally.

And this has a financial impact on all of us that is quite significant. Just to mention, for you to understand this financial impact, in 1995, we paid for an international link in Argentina, a 64 kilobit per second kilobit, we paid \$40,000 per month.

In 2000, we paid \$1,800 per month for 1 megabit per second link, and now we are paying, on average, \$15 per month for a 1 megabit per second link. So if, in the past, we had to go for 600 megabits per second inside of Argentina, we had to pay \$1,800 US dollars per megabit per month. We have saved a lot of money and the equation has been successful.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Ariel, for your answer, and the figures speak for themselves. And I understand, as well, that CABASE has a regional leadership role through [LAC EX] in promoting traffic exchange points.

[ARIEL BRUNO]:

But this is something for us [inaudible] because that is the Oxford, the expert.

OLGA CAVALLI: That is my excuse to introduce Oscar Messano, president of LACNIC [inaudible] what is your position in CABASE. He's the secretary of CABASE and the President of [ccTLD] and he's a pioneer, as well as Ariel and Tony, because he had to leave because he's working again in the GNSO Council. He apologized he was not able to stay.

They have been pioneers in the development of Internet, first in Argentina and then in Latin America. So thank you, Oscar, for being here with us. So why not follow on Ariel's comment.

OSCAR MESSANO: Thank you, Olga, for your comments. Following up on Ariel's words, I'd like to describe the situation in the region rather than Argentina and the CABASE project. In the Internet ecosystem, structure is the Holy Grail. Without this structure, whatever it is on top of it does not exist.

So the first problem we have to address if we want to see Internet develop in our countries is to have a good infrastructure. And that, for years, has been the responsibility or the task of the private sector, which has performed quite nicely, but the private sector makes investments wherever there is revenue. That is, where there is business. And it does not step

into anything outside. That's why it's a private institution, a private organization. And that has been the case for many years.

A few years ago, governments realized that if they wanted to see Internet grow in their countries, they had to find ways to see the infrastructure of those countries grow because, as I said, it was the basis for the development of all the rest. In some cases, that has been accomplished.

Colombia, for instance, undertook a successful, huge project. Over 90% of the country is connected over fiber optic. Brazil has also a significant project, which grows very slowly. Argentina also has a huge project to interconnect to the entire country over fiber optic, though it is quite advanced. It's still only by 60% and only 12% operational.

And finally, Uruguay, that for years, 100% of the country has been digitized. So as a result, infrastructure is no longer an issue for the purpose of Internet development in the country. In the other countries, there are still difficulties, hurdles, for the reasons I referred to before. But we also believe that traffic exchange points are a solution for, and before and after the infrastructure.

The success case and the case of best practices of Argentina is a case that I have been presenting for ten years in our countries. One of my responsibilities that on the repertoire [before] the

PCC I (or the Permanent Consultative Committee) of CITELE, which is the [inaudible] body responsible for telecommunications.

Through this organization, together with the other organizations, ICANN, ISOC, LACNIC, CABASE, and certainly with all the others we've been trying to make countries understand this philosophy and support the development of traffic exchange points. I have to be realistic. We have been quite successful in this.

Out of the three cases in our hands, two have been unsuccessful, only one has been successful, and I'm going to refer to this because I think it deserves it, which is the case of Honduras. Because when governments step in, they do not always understand what they're doing. And instead of solving the issue, they complicate the matter. It's not that I mean governments should not be involved. I think they should reflect upon before being involved, and Honduras made the homework very well.

They created a paper for a draft regulation of traffic exchange points submitted to consideration to be discussed both by the Hondurans and also those involved in traffic exchange point development. And it was very well devised because in addition to supporting this development, they were also involved in the creation, but there was a caveat – a clause – saying that upon

the creation of the Committee of Traffic Exchange Points, the government of Honduras was stepping back and becoming an observer.

And this was a true revolution in the region that a government approached it this way, not only leave, decide to leave because they're still there, but giving participation to the private sector to continue growing.

Unfortunately, as I said earlier on, we weren't that successful in other countries. First of all, because I believe that the CABASE model is a success case and the best practice, and it could be applied in other places, but there are some obstacles. First of all, the participants have to understand that having competitors working together is good, and this is a quite new and complex philosophy, but we are talking about Internet, so that's the way things are.

This is an obstacle we have overcome. And after that, we should also be able to get a carrier who is interested in participating in that business and in traffic exchange points, and this is not always the case.

We shouldn't forget that there are countries where there are traffic exchange points that have been more or less successful, and more or less inclusive. Some of them are very business-

oriented and some others are the CABASE model. So they should be pointed out.

But I believe that the future for Internet development besides being based on infrastructure, which is a government issue and not a private companies issue, unless we find a scenario where private businesses consider it to be perfect [inaudible] invest in infrastructure. I think it's the governments that have to develop infrastructure. But that is not enough because in Argentina, for example, we are developing a trunk network, but it still needs capillarity. With the trunk sections, you cannot achieve anything. You need the final mile. And this is the goal of a traffic exchange point, developing that capillarity. So there is still a lot to be done in the next few years and, fortunately, there are many organizations that support that school of thought and that carry it forward. Thank you very much.

OLGA CAVALLI:

I will say that 33% success is not that bad. I won't be that pessimistic. Besides, when you have a success case or success history, it's easier to share the story. If you have no success case, it's tougher. Now you may go back to the other two [countries] and say, "Look, this has worked and maybe you could replicate it." I'm always optimistic.

But thank you very much for your comments and now I'm going to switch into English so those of you who need simultaneous translation into languages.

I have to my left my dear friend, Asha Hemrajani. As I said, she is a member of the ICANN Board, but as she's keen to these technical discussions, I thought that she would be a very good addition to our panel. And she has been so nice to come and spend some time with us in spite of she has a very busy agenda.

One thing that I would like to, perhaps, talk about, and I want to share an experience with you in the last IGF in Istanbul. I was invited as a speaker in a workshop about zero-rating content. And I usually say yes to all the invitations because I really want to participate. And the room was absolutely crowded of people, and even people were sitting on the floor.

Discussion was very, very, very vivid and very... I wouldn't strong, but I cannot find in English other word, should be in Spanish. Passionate. Thank you so much, my ladies. Even there was an article the day after in the Washington Post about that workshop. So I was kind of proud of being that and I realize that it was a year ago, that it was becoming a good discussion.

And I was asking a question in that panel and what you think about that, perhaps, from a governmental perspective, and I said that it could be good that all people that would develop

content would have the same opportunity to deliver content through this rating content delivery.

I thought about, perhaps, a kid in a developing country or in a poor region in Latin America or Africa that would have a phone and could access Wikipedia. And that could somehow – perhaps, an article that they can read there could change their lives. Many things that I have read when I was a kid changed my life.

I studied engineer, perhaps, because I was a fan of Star Trek. Yeah, I loved that I usually watch TV. I’m an old lady, so at that time, we had not much to see, so that was part of my preferred TV shows, and that spaceship and all that they did there. I thought, made me think that I could become an engineer.

So there’s things that you watch and you share when you’re a kid, and if they have access to, perhaps, Wikipedia would be fun. And then somebody told me, “Well, but maybe that access to some contents could be not plural, could be to some contents, not to all of the contents.” So that, honestly, I don’t have a concrete opinion now how it is evolving, but I think it’s an issue that it’s worth perhaps to exchange some ideas. And Asha told me that she could, perhaps, address some comments about it. Maybe then we can debate.

Thank you, Asha, for being with us.

ASHA HEMRAJANI:

Thank you, Olga, for inviting me. My name is Asha Hemrajani and, as Olga mentioned, I am on the ICANN Board. But I'm here, actually, to speak on my own behalf because zero content is something I'm very passionate about. And I can understand why there was a lot of passionate discussion in IGF because one of the things – there has been a lot of movement recently about zero-rating, and there's been a lot of heated words in exchange, because there's very vastly different opinions when it comes to zero-rating.

Since we're in a Latin America-ranged event, I think many of you may know that Chile, in 2014, so two years ago – last year, rather. The Chilean regulator has said that they do not support zero-rating and they will ban it. But I have a different view and I'd like to share that with you.

So a little bit about my background first. As Olga mentioned, I'm a mobile radio network engineer and I spent 20 years building mobile networks all over the world. And so what is zero-rating? I'm not sure if everybody understands or everybody's familiar with the concept.

Zero-rating basically means that on this phone, on your mobile phone or even on your computer, you don't pay for the data that is sponsored by a particular company. So for example,

Facebook, which is the most famous example of zero-rating, they will say that you don't pay the user – the end user does not have to pay for the carriage of any data that is used in order to be able to access Facebook's URL.

So there are vastly different views, as I mentioned. Let's talk about the good and the bad. So the bad is... Let's start with the bad. The bad is, as I mentioned, the Chilean government has said they don't agree with this, they support this because they think it's a form of – it is not supporting net neutrality.

And in India, a journalist has recently very strongly voiced their opinions – journalists have very strongly voiced their opinions about zero rating. They call it a way of making poor people feel that the Internet is Facebook and there's nothing else on the Internet except Facebook.

And then, basically, steering poor people to think that the world is consists of Facebook and Facebook only, you can't use anything else, and so it's limiting their perspective on life. So that's one view.

The other view I have is if you go turn back the clocks, say, ten years ago, when we first started 3G mobile networks in the world. Now this is probably, I'm sure most of you are holding 4G phones. But when I started deploying 3G networks around the

world, especially in developed countries now – I will leave developing countries aside for the minute.

In developed countries, when 3G networks were first being deployed, there was very little data, even in Indonesia. Very little data being used in Singapore, where I'm from, in Indonesia, where you're from, in India, as well. Oh, my goodness. We had a very long time before people started actually using their 3G mobile phones – and actually, using data on it – for several reasons.

One, because they're not used to it, they don't know what to do with it, the applications weren't there. And secondly, because, like, for example, in India, the tariffs were very high, and it was very expensive to use data. So what was the solution? So in came Facebook, and they launched a service called 0.facebook, which means if you use your mobile phone to play a game, online game, or if you use your mobile phone to surf the Internet, go to Google.com, you have to pay. But if you use your mobile phone to go to Facebook, it's free.

So, of course, people started using that. And usage... I remember when we turned this on in Taiwan, which is a very developed country. Overnight, we had a hundredfold increase in mobile data. So that made a huge difference in uptake of mobile networks.

So for that perspective, it was a very useful technique to have to, A, encourage mobile network – encourage mobile Internet and, B, to make people aware that you no longer have to be tied to your computer at home. You can use your phone and you can access the Internet everywhere. And that’s very important to know because Internet today, more than 50% of Internet access today in terms of volume, not in terms of instances, is coming from the mobile.

So in that sense, it was very positive, and I don’t believe... So coming back to the criticism of zero rating from developing countries, such as Chile and India. I don’t believe that it’s necessarily a very negative thing that people would think that the Internet is only Facebook or the Internet is only Wikipedia. Because, like Olga mentioned, it’s good to give people who wouldn’t normally use mobile phone Internet, mobile Internet, a chance to see and get exposure to the world out there.

Thank you for that.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much, Asha. As you said, there are many things around this issue. I think there is still debate and a friend from the audience came to me and said, “We can discuss about it.” Yes, we have half an hour to exchange some ideas, so we will welcome your comment.

I will switch a moment to Spanish. Sorry for these changes, but it's nice to have this opportunity to change languages. [inaudible] about areas or scenarios of participation, Ariel and Esteban, of participation and engagement. They have explained how CABASE has evolved from being a business association to being an association where there's a lot of involvement or engagement.

When you go to CABASE's offices, everything is ready for the meeting that is held there to be sent or shared with remote participants. There is always a camera, there is – I think it's very nice to have everything shared remotely because I think you have virtual meetings and you have virtual workshops. I think that, whenever you get into their offices, you feel that you are already exposed and in contact with different countries in the world and in Argentina because sometimes the environment where we hold meetings may be a limiting factor.

I'd like to go back to an initiative launched in Argentina, something that we're having for the first time in Argentina next week and I'm very lucky to have Fatima with me. She's also a friend of mine. She's from Argentina and she's a member of the At-Large Advisory Committee, and she's also a lawyer with expertise in technology issues. She has moved to Mexico but we still love here. She will come back to Argentina someday. And she's a member of a group that was set up spontaneously to

create the day of discussions and [inaudible] about Internet governance in Argentina. We'll have a day devoted to this in Argentina, there were some initiatives and some projects and some meetings we had organized involving the public and the private sector.

We thought it was a very interesting initiative and maybe you could tell us how this is being prepared. I think it will take place next week.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO:

First of all, I'd like to congratulate you for this panel. I am a fan of openness. You can look at it from the technical part and also from the point of view of policies and it's really great to have this discussed within ICANN to talk about next week's event on Tuesday, the 27th. I don't know what time we start, but I think it's at 9:00.

It's a daylong meeting, we call it Dialogue on Internet Governance in Argentina. It's the first time ever we will have this in Argentina. We would like the newcomers to these spaces and areas of local and domestic governance.

One of the recommendations, [inaudible] recommendations that these issues be discussed because they're already being discussed globally and regionally, and now they should be

discussed domestically. In Argentina, a group of friends because we are not representing organizations. We did it on our behalf. We say we're going to work to create this space.

We have a secretariat who is just there to make things run smoothly from the very beginning, work with great openness. We want it to be a facilitators of this space. We held a meeting on October the 6th, we invited all the interested meetings and all the stakeholders to – so that the agenda will be defined together so that the issues they wanted to be discussed would be included in the agenda to be dealt with on October 27th. Many people were interested and worked actively.

We defined the agenda to be dealt with. We had some financial support, ten fellows from seven provinces of Argentina will be attending this meeting because we wanted this to be a [fairer] meeting because of time constraints, well this is all we could achieve.

We also want to have this meeting and, in time, we hope this will grow better and get all the stakeholders involved. This meeting is there for everybody. We want to come together and discuss Internet governance issues in Argentina and we want to get involved in advance of the global IGF to be held in Brazil next month.

And basically, this is what we aimed at. Those of you who are from Argentina are invited to participate. We were also in a remote participation, and we want you all to cooperate so that we can get better in the future, and I hope many people will attend this meeting.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much. Thank you very much for developing this project. I always thought about it but now it has come true. The rest of our colleagues and friends sitting around the table. I don't know if you have any comments. Tim? Tim asked, for the floor, he wants to make some comments about zero rating. Tim, use a language you feel more at ease, and you're welcome.

Sorry. Are there any comments from remote participants? No. Okay. Remote participants, I tell you, you may ask questions through the chat, if you want to.

[TIM]:

Former federal regulator in Canada and the CRTC and we had a decision on net neutrality traffic management. We called it traffic management because, basically, it somewhat depoliticizes the question.

Network operators have legitimate rights to defend their networks from attack, and yet, people have – recipients and

users of the Internet have legitimate rights that their traffic will not be interfered with or that their ability to access information and communicate information and upload stuff will not be.

So there's a balance act to perform and I recognize that there is a balancing act. I would say that the recent discussion in the United States about net neutrality was insanely exaggerated. The usual US political nutcase. But there is an argument to be made for net neutrality and there's an argument to be made for the rights of network owners to operate their... To take effective action to prevent technical harm to their networks, and some balance must be achieved.

The second observation I would make is in relation to net neutrality. The arguments against any regulation of this matter are really that you can trust your carrier more than you can trust your government. And most people, when considering the option that way, tend to think that their government regulators might be able to intercede for them against the interest of carriers.

And so what are the interests of carriers? And here's where we may or may not have a disagreement. It seems to me that the Internet works on abundance. Abundance of addresses, abundance of bandwidth, abundance of every kind of technical

infrastructure to prevent the creation of what I would call chokepoints.

If you have scarcity, either of addresses or bandwidth, the carrier can squeeze it for money. And so zero-rating is essentially, as I see it – and I’m open to discussion on this. Zero-rating is an attempt to or the ability to favor one kind of traffic over another by pricing it at zero, or you don’t pay for this, but what about all the other stuff that someone will want?

I think that it also allows the carrier to interpose themselves in the transaction between the supplier and the end user and say, “Look, we have a special deal for you. This stuff is free.” But the hidden catch is all the other stuff has to be paid for, so that your attention is directed forcibly to what is for free and not to what you now have to pay for.

So I think that zero-rating is yet another attempt of the carriers to save an old kind of charging for traffic model out of the telephone era, and I think it’s probably not going to – well, it raises important questions for the neutrality of the Internet towards various classes and origins of traffic, and I think that is the issue, which is engaged by that.

So open to comment or we can leave it, I don’t know. ut that’s what I would think.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you, Tim. I got a comment from Asha. She said that the adoption of mobile phones increased – I think, I noted the percentage – through this free access to some applications of the Internet because that’s what it is. Can we see it as a good thing? A bad thing? Is usability or adoption of mobile phone an issue? Would we see it as a positive thing?

And my first impression is yes, but maybe... What do you think or what the audience think?

[ARIEL BRUNO]:

Yes, [I need to] make a comment. Yes. I think we should define in Internet respective of the way we access it. Now we have computers and phones, we don’t know what device will give us access in the future. The possibility, the chances of using the Internet and the definition of the Internet from the technical community is the interconnection of autonomous systems.

And there is no other definition, so the layer model leads me up to the upper layer above the application layer, the so-called political layer – the eight number eight, the level number eight. Why?

I think we have to separate the discussion to take it away from the physical device of access because it could be wireless, fire,

fiber, telephone lines. So the theory in the discussion should be independent from the means and form of access. This is for the purpose of creating debate.

OLGA CAVALLI: Tell us your name an affiliation so we know you. Thank you.

[VIDESH]: My name is [Videsh] [inaudible]. I belong to an Internet service provider. I also happen to be Vice President of ISP Association of India. Now [inaudible] explained the net neutrality, let me put other perspective. What happens is in India, 95% of Internet is controlled by three operators. Now that is the market dominance.

So it happens as the Internet service providers who held typically [reasonable], they do not have the power to be able to negotiate such arrangements like zero-rating. So as a result, this market dominance comes into play.

Second thing is once they have market dominance, the mobile operators who have the dominance, then they charge ten times for the non-zero-rating traffic compared to what [dwelling] ISP is able to provide. So that is the situation, which needs to be seen and guarded against. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you very much. Someone wants to react to that. I'm not an expert in those figures.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Thank you, Olga. Actually, I wanted to address all three points that were made earlier. So I agree with Tim. Tim, right? That there has to be a balance between network neutrality and the right for carriers to recoup their investment. Because of this point, I have to disagree with one point you made about separating the physical layer, that it doesn't matter – the form of access doesn't matter. Because it does in the sense that it costs a lot of money to build a mobile phone network, much more than a fixed line network in certain countries.

It depends, of course, on the topology, on the country, on the nature of the landscape, and so forth. But the reason why zero-rating has been launched or introduced in mobile networks first is because mobile networks are so much more expensive to deploy, and that's why it – and because mobile networks tend to reach parts of countries which are not necessarily served by fixed networks. It's easier to bring in a mobile network to a rural area than it is to lay fiber. So that's another reason.

And regarding unlimited resources. Yes, we have unlimited IP addresses and so forth, but another challenge with mobile networks, which also makes it so expensive – and that’s why the carriers need to recoup their investment – is spectrum is not unlimited. That’s very unfortunate but true. India is actually the leader in the whole world in terms of using spectrum efficiently.

Some countries have a huge amount of spectrum and they don’t have this issue, but as many countries in Asia and in – actually, yes, because Asia and actually also Europe. Many countries in Asia and Europe have challenges with using with spectrum because the usage of mobile and Internet is so high, partly because of zero-rating because it’s brought up the usage to be such a high level, that they’re running out of spectrum, and then it becomes very, very expensive to be able to add another user.

So I would agree that is a balance between neutrality and the right to recoup the investment, but I think it very much depends on the country, on the network, and on when and where. It very much depends on when and where. You can’t have... I feel you can’t have one rule that fits all countries at all times. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Thank you very much. And the gentleman there, I’m sorry I didn’t see. As we are not using those [cartelitos]. How do you say

[cartelito] in English? Cards. I just didn't realize. I cannot see your name in the [cartelito] from here. Sorry.

GARTH BRUEN: I like to speak in Spanish, but you go too fast, and it is, I think, better in English. Thank you.

I think I want to say that the Argentinians have been very, very excellent leaders in participation in all of these spheres, and I wish that people in the United States were as involved as the people in Argentina. It's been a real model to observe.

And as an American, I have to respond to my colleague, Timothy's, comments about American nuts.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Correction, they're not all nuts, but the debate was hyperbolic.

GARTH BRUEN: People may trust their carriers more than the government. That doesn't mean that they trust their carriers very much. In surveys year after year, cable providers, Internet providers, and telephone companies are the most hated companies of any industry. That's of all industries. The top hated companies are those types of service providers. Because there's an issue of consumer trust and consumer trust is one of the cornerstones of ICANN moving forward.

And unfortunately, I had ICANN staff sitting right here in this room on Tuesday rejecting the concept of consumer trust, rejecting that it was a cornerstone of the Affiliation of Commitments, and rejecting that it was important to his department’s mission statement.

We spend a lot of time talking about the balance between the community and governments and trying to limit the authority of governments over Internet use. However, we also [inaudible] very concerned about ICANN becoming a government in and of itself, which is unaccountable.

So whenever I have the opportunity, if we’re talking about openness, we have to talk about the consumer trust. Because if consumers don’t feel safe, they’re not going to spend money. And the commercial model won’t work if the consumers aren’t spending money. So all of this stuff has to work together and consumer trust has to be at the forefront of all of it. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Fatima?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks, Olga. I am better talking in Spanish. I will be speaking in Spanish.

I agree with Garth in terms of the consumer protection and the other topics that were discussed in At-Large, in which not so much relevance was given.

To add an additional layer to the debate, to our discussion, and maybe from a more academic point of view, but also with practical consequences, perhaps we should see the zero-rating to which principle core, core principle value is it affecting. Is it also intact in the openness or also this principle of end to end? Because I think this is different things. The two different focuses we could take if it has an impact on the openness or if it has an impact on the end to end principle.

Maybe this is for future discussions. We don't have to see it now.

OLGA CAVALLI:

[inaudible] the perspective of the user and trust of the user. I personally think... This is just to add another layer. I think about the user from accessing content and I understand that there is a bias when you have something which is free and what is not free, so you will tend, of course, to use free access.

But that may be... And I see it from a perspective that the person that has no access to content and no way to pay things, and to access some content that could be enabling the education. I think that's powerful, and I tend to think that for some

communities... I was born not in a rural area, but in the west of Argentina, and I know how it is to look from the distance to what is happening in the big capital. I know how to look from the distance to the advantages.

Of course, this has changed a lot with the Internet. Luckily, we have this glue that brings the, is the Internet that brings the globalization to all of us and has, luckily changed a lot. So this is why I like so much this technology and I invest so much time in trying to enhance it and contribute.

But looking from that perspective, I think that it's highly empowering having access to content that could enhance the education of someone. So this is what I like from it, but at the same time, I understand that you can be biased to really access only thing.

Other thing that I like is that enables people to use devices or services that, in a way, they may not use. So this adoption person [page], I think it's relevant. For example, my mother uses Facebook and Gmail because when I travel, she wants to be in touch with me. So the enabling is what pushed her to do that.

So there's a reason – and maybe there's people that has access to the content, then they have other incentives to keep on moving forward. Ariel, you want to say something?

[ARIEL BRUNO]:

Yes. I want to say something that may be subject to various interpretations. Nothing is for free and massiveness is not for free, either. So we can have all the effects resulting on the fact that someone is paying for that. It has not been paid by the end user, but it is being paid by someone else. So that creates sensitivities or suspicions.

I just put it on the table because I agree with Asha that networks are expensive and also with our Indian colleague because I am ISP. I will be an ISP forever. I am an ISP and I know that developing a network is expensive. I have wireless networks in Buenos Aires, which is one of the largest cities in the world. I also fixed networks, and it is also very expensive.

A lot of amount of money in taxes to break up street, to lay fiber or cable, and the procedures and the permits are even more expensive than technology itself. But technology is not for free. Someone pays for it and the issue of openness – and now I'm asking and reacting to Fatima's words – I think it is good to understand this and this question you're posing, I like it because the principles that may be affected by this is understanding that those paying for something that other gets for free could create a very particular vision.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: It looks as if we are praising each other, but that is not the case. It gives me the opportunity to say that, okay, nothing is for free. One of the arguments of civil society in these discussions about zero-rating is that you pay with data, with personal data. We are giving away our personal data to get free access to a limited portion of the Internet or to just one part of the Internet.

That's something else to take into account. It also has to do with user education. That is to say be able to know whom we can give our data, who's going to look after it and safeguard our data. We do have experiences that our data not being protected by anyone, by governments, by private organizations, so this is something to take into consideration. What is the cost of getting something for free?

OLGA CAVALLI: I always say to my children that the only free thing is what I give to them, and that this is something they should remember for the rest of their lives. When I was a girl, I only had open air TV. I didn't have cable TV. I didn't have Internet, and it was sustained with advertising. It was not for free, but nobody went crazy or was conflicted because you had to watch a soap opera, but it was many years ago.

I do not like this comment. We have a comment from our colleague from Venezuela [inaudible]. It's a remote question.

While they write the question in the chat, we have our friend from Venezuela.

HAROLD ARCOS:

I will speak in Spanish. Following up on the concepts on the users, I want to make a comment. Although users in the ecosystem we face this challenge of understanding all the layers from the most technical one to the most Political one with a capital P, it is also a challenge for the industry and the businesses to understand the environment where we are operating.

And in the case of zero-rating, there is a point of convergence, which is marketing. It is clear that marketing strategies are aimed to that, and this is basically one of the – this is just one initiative. I'm sure we will see many more. However, considering the circumstances, there are challenges, such as Internet IRG where the traffic is in a pipe, and in countries such as Colombia, the Colombians themselves cannot publish their papers because the papers there are from libraries that are registered in this Internet IRG. just one case to be mentioned.

So obviously, marketing, we know that as a strategy in the business model, we have many justifications. But from the perspective of the users, which is what we are, and this is what I want to bring to the table, one of the challenges in the industry

is to check for the respect of these rights of the users which are very diverse in many countries.

There are countries like Venezuela where accessibility is a high percentage, but we should not talk about quality. There are major challenges in terms of quality of service. And there are other countries where the service is high in terms of bandwidth, but accessibility is not so much.

Now there is also a responsibility of the industry, but also a responsibility of the user. The user has to go to the last mile and this is a definition of this ecosystem to move inside each country in terms of policy proposals to fill in these blanks.

One of the industry challenges is not to leave the weight to the marketing and advertising to justify [inaudible] such as Internet IRG or zero-rating where, although these are options, [many there] a la carte, it is the user, the one who makes the decision. Either he takes it or leave it.

Then there are other concepts at stake such governments might be promoting or favoring some corporations, perhaps preventing the emergence of new ones, maybe even national ones, and that is a challenge for countries when we say that the largest corporations are those that have the capability of generating these promotions, these offerings, that are so appealing. And there are other factors from the GAC, from

governments because they'll be taking the snapshot [inaudible] share in the picture with Google, with Facebook, and maybe turning their backs to potential national initiatives in such a vast environment and with such a high return on the investment.

In the report of Telefonica for Latin America, we could read how the chart on the increased traffic of Internet access. It's like diagonal line. It's a half parable while the number of persons getting access has a very minor rise. This report by Telefonica and other organizations from Latin America not only refers to this increase of the traffic, but also to the means of access, the device, and as our colleague said, it is certainly mobile phones, mobile devices.

So there comes again a challenge for the industry for the sector. And the argument of lowering the price, by lowering the prices of mobile devices, they are providing a service, so it is a concrete way to keep control.

And finally, but eventually, it deepens the need to articulate industry, governments, and above all, users. So this is our contribution we want to make to this debate and say openly that these are shared responsibilities from the cable, the civil rights, and as users, we must be concerned about the technical layer as we expect that all layers should be concerned about users. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thank you. We do not have any more time. At the end, to the right. I'm so sorry. We are almost over time, so you're welcome.

TOM SMITH: My name is Tom Smith from Ireland Technical [inaudible] ISP. One question I have about zero-rating and the policies. Can we form a best practices where if it is to be used, that it wouldn't be used so that it would present monopolistic view to an audience that can't afford options?

So for instance, if you go on to, say, social media is free, then all social media is free and not just one particular corporation. And that if we are talking about extending a hand down to people who can't afford huge data plans that, perhaps, educational sites and stuff like that, that if you are going to do zero-rating for commercial gain for some bigger companies, that there would be a social responsibility, which in the way you alluded to with your free-to-air experience as well as mine in Ireland, as well, that we didn't have all the commercial channels. Thank you.

OLGA CAVALLI: Thanks to you. And this was precisely my comment in that crowded room that I found last year in the IGF. I said exactly the same. I mean, if we can be, perhaps, more democratic in the

sense of delivering content at zero-rating, not only commercial-oriented, which is fine in a way, but not limited to that.

If we are responsible, social responsible or, perhaps, delivering educational content or encyclopedia content, or educational videos, I find that very powerful for people that cannot access. So that's my... Maybe it's my heart as a teacher that tells that.

So we don't have much more time. I have to close the session. Thank you very much to all the panelists. Thank you to the remote participants.

Thank you for being with us. Thank you to all panelists. Thank you very much. I think it was fun. And as always, we have more questions than answers, and that is a good thing. Thank you, everybody.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]