
MARRAKECH – Internet Governance Public Session
Thursday, March 10, 2016 – 09:00 to 10:15 WET
ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This in the Internet Governance Public Session on March 10th, 2016 in the Atlas Room, from 9:00 A.M. to 10:15 A.M.

NIGEL HICKSON: Good morning. Good morning. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. The session will begin in a couple minutes. I know some of you are very shy at the back here, but could we ask people to move forward? Is it possible to come into the front area? Because when we count the number of people here, we don't get paid if we don't get enough people. So if you could come in this front area because there's going to be quite a few questions to the participants.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes, sir.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thanks so much.

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.

It's always difficult to hold a session on the last Thursday morning when there's other things happening, and people are being at the gala too late and in the bar and celebrating.

I did try to make it rain so people would have an incentive to come inside, but it didn't work.

If you want to give it one more minute. Up to you.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible]

NIGEL HICKSON: When you say count, you mean the actual time? I'll ask if they [can].

That clock in the front, the red clock.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible] that guy.

NIGEL HICKSON: That guy.

You know the red clock in front of the chair?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

NIGEL HICKSON: That's a sort of countdown clock, is it?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It can be a countdown clock.

NIGEL HICKSON: Can it display the real time?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It can.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sure. It will [inaudible]

NIGEL HICKSON: Thanks so much. No, it's no rush.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

NIGEL HICKSON: I think I'll move over here. No, I'll probably sit at the end. (2:55)
Come and sit down [inaudible] or close the door.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [You might say] what the session is.

NIGEL HICKSON: For the what?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Instead of "this session," say what the session-

NIGEL HICKSON: -is, in case people are ...

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

NIGEL HICKSON: Okay.

Ladies and gentlemen, we're about to begin. This is the Cross-Community Working Group on Public Internet Governance Session. If you're here for that, that's fantastic. If you're here for

something else, that's equally fantastic. I'll hand over to our Chair.

MARILIA MACIEL:

Thank you very much, Nigel. Good morning, everyone. This is Marilia Maciel speaking, and we are about to start the public session of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance. This session has been organized by the members of the cross-community working group with the valuable support of ICANN staff. I would like to particularly thank Nigel Hickson for all the support he has given and to the work of the members of this working group.

This session has become very traditional in our ICANN schedule by far. I think this has become a very important moment for us to share the information about important developments in the Internet governance ecosystem, to assess them, and to discuss how ICANN will be impacted by what is going on outside ICANN in this ecosystem, and maybe inform the organization on how to better navigate these waters.

I think that maybe for the ICANN Board, the ICANN CEO, and ICANN staff, it has also become a moment, and for them to understand what are the concerns of the community when it comes to Internet Governance. We know that staff and the ICANN Board, they are called many times to represent ICANN in

meetings, in forums, that take place elsewhere. It's very important that they here the community and the positions of the community so that they voice these positions outside ICANN on Internet governance matters. So I believe that this session has become very useful to all of us.

Without further ado, I would like to walk you through the agenda that we have today. This session will be divided into two parts. The first one will be devoted to a discussion on the WSIS+10 review process. We will look at the WSIS+10 and discuss the outcomes of the review and what can we expect for the future.

For this part of the session, we will count of the participation of Ambassador Benedicto Fonseca from the Ministry of External Relations of Brazil, Mr. Peter Major, Special Advisor for IT for the government of Hungary, and also Chairman of the U.N. Commission on Science and Technology for Development. And we will count on Mr. Chengetai Masango, who works for the IGF Secretariat.

The second part of the session today will be dedicated to discuss a topic that has been in the agenda and has concerned many of us, which is fragmentation. So we will discuss the interplay between fragmentation of the Internet and openness. That's a very interesting report that has been published about this

recently, and we have the luck to have one of the authors of the report, Mr. Bill Drake, to discuss this report with us.

We will be joined later by Patrik Faltstrom, Chair of SSAC. He's in another meeting, but he will be here with us soon. We will also count on the presence of Mr. Ihsan Durdu, Advisor to Turkey's Ministry of Transport and Communications, and a GAC representative from the government of Turkey.

These are the topics that we are going to discuss today, but before we enter our first agenda item, there was a GAC high level meeting that took place a few days ago. We will hear a brief report about what was discussed in this meeting from Mr. Redouane Houssaini, who is Head of the United Nations Department – works for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Cooperation of the Kingdom of Morocco.

Mr. Redouane?

REDOUANE HOUSSAINI: Yes.

MARILIA MACIEL: Yes. Sorry.

REDOAUNE HOUSSAINI: Thank you very much. Bonjour. Hello. [inaudible] Co-Chair for this opportunity and for the invitation. Much appreciated. I prefer to speak in French. I hope that translation is ready.

Thank you so much for having invited me to present how our high level government meeting went about. As you all know, that meeting was held on March 7th, right after the official opening ceremony of ICANN55.

But before anything, I would like to bring back to your minds the use of this meeting. I would just like to touch on this to explain you what the background to this high level government meeting is. As you know, the first of these high level government meetings was organized in Toronto in 2012. The second was held in London in June 2014, and this meeting at Marrakech was the third.

The concept of these high level government meetings came about as a result of a recommendation that was made by the special meeting in charge of the first accountability and transparency review of the ICANN. It's a team called ATRT. This ATRT team recommended the ICANN Board to hold these sorts of meetings in order to increase the governmental engagement at ICANN.

They were also asked to support governments within the environment of ICANN, which is why we needed to start this

process: to see how ICANN could interact with the main high responsables and the heads of government in order to discuss public policy with them.

The Marrakech meeting, then, is a part of this process and is a part of the implementation of that recommendation. The meeting was chaired by Minister Elalamy, whom you have all met. He's the Minister of Commerce, Industry, and Digital Economy in Morocco.

Now, as to the program, I'd say the schedule was related to the context of our meeting, as was the case in London in 2014, given that the London meeting came right after the announcement by the American administration that they would start the IANA transition process. The Marrakech meeting is then inscribed within the context of the end of the process. So our schedule is related to the context, and we wished to reflect through our agenda the contents of certain strategic matters that had been under discussion within ICANN, and specifically at the GAC.

The agenda, which you've probably followed, was divided into four items, the first [two] of which dealt with the discussions that had been going on in Marrakech throughout the week. So they were related to the IANA transition and to the submission of the results that had come about at the end of our deliberations. The second item in the agenda was related to the enhancement

of ICANN's accountability and to the new role of governments within the context.

The two other items in the agenda were equally important since they dealt with public policy as related to the new gTLDs. And the last was related to how to enhance the capability of developing countries to further engage and to participate actively at ICANN's debates.

We were then able to see that there are many governments here in ICANN who participate. There was one session that was specifically related to the matter to explain the governments from developing countries what ICANN did and how they could participate actively in the ongoing debates.

After that, there was a closing session, which allowed the minister to present his summary, since he had chaired the meeting. It wasn't a summary of the negotiations that had been going throughout the meeting, but rather a report that summed up the debates which had been distributed under the sole responsibility of the meeting's Chair.

Minister Elalamy further announced to the ministers that, in a few weeks, he will be submitting his personal reports on the work undertaken at that meeting. That report will be published on the ICANN website. May I remind you that the meeting was held publically? It was open to all communities, not only to

governments, but also to the other communities. It was broadcasted throughout the world, and the minister wished for it to be that way.

If you would allow me, I would like to come back to the last item on the host country's appreciations on the development of that meeting. It's Morocco's appreciation of the meeting. The meeting carried out its objectives, given that the meeting gave us the chance to expose and to present to the ministers what the dynamics of a GAC meeting is, what ICANN does, what ICANN is, and specifically what the deliberations at the GAC are like and how they work.

We realized in that meeting that certain governments wondered what ICANN is, what the GAC does, so that meeting precisely allowed us as GAC representatives to justify our travel, which sometimes brings us far out into the world three times a year, and to represent what the nature of our discussions is. That is the main goal that we reached.

Regarding this goal, we also fulfilled another part because, given that there was so much participation here throughout the past few days, we had 185 participants at the high level government meeting. 97 countries participated. 97 governments were represented, and 22 intergovernmental organizations were also

represented there. So you see that there was much participation at the meeting.

We had 35 ministers, which represents a record, even vis-à-vis the London meeting. Among those 35, there were also over four countries that are not currently GAC members, meaning that our outreach efforts, in order to engage and involve a maximum of governments into the process, gave its roots.

So I think the purpose was precisely to prove that ICANN is an open organization and that we defend a model of inclusion, [a model] which is transparent and open. I think you can see that today with the GAC's communiqué. We have 162 member countries in the GAC, which is much more than certain other organizations, even including the U.N., which has currently 93 members. So you see all the efforts that we have put into our outreach activities and what the fruits they gave was.

The host country worked very much. I was myself a member of the team that worked on the organization of the meeting, but there was also an international team that worked on the preparation of the ICANN meeting, and specifically on the preparation of the high level government meeting. We sent over 190 invites through the diplomatic channels, through Moroccan embassies, and all our offices throughout the world; our

consulates, too. So we did a lot of work before the Marrakech meeting, and I see the results are here. They are clear to us all.

The format followed in the meeting allowed us to fulfill our goal, which was to have an important number of delegations participate at the meeting and to be able to listen to what their perspectives were throughout the four sessions. We had set it upon ourselves to be interactive among ministers and among ICANN officials. So there was a part of ministerial statements, which sometimes couldn't allow a minister to come here to Marrakech without making a statement. But I think ministers were very specific in saying what their statements meant, and Minister Elalamy clearly marked the three-minute mark for their interventions because having a single day to speak of all these four subjects was a clear restraint for the Moroccan government. They managed the meeting very well.

I'm now going to discuss with you the development of the agenda. As I said before, the agenda was related to the discussions that had been going on at ICANN. We had the transition, which was at the heart of our discussions, not only within the GAC, but also with other constituencies. We also had this matter of accountability.

I started working on the basis of inclusion approach by having an open discussion with the GAC members after the Buenos

Aires meeting in the past June. At the Dublin meeting, I also discussed the preliminary agenda with them, the draft agenda with them, and we held a number of calls which allowed GAC members to exchange. We also did so by e-mail, and that allowed us to put together the agenda on the basis of this inclusive and open approach.

The presence of ICANN officials at the meeting also allowed us to convey our message to ICANN representatives who attended the meeting together with us throughout the day. We discussed accountability, transparency, independence of ICANN among others.

To conclude, we had underlined the fact that there would be a new feature to the meeting because we had introduced a possibility for a past host to make a statement at the opening of the meeting. We had the Canadian Minister, who had attended and hosted the first meeting, and Minister Ed Vaizey, who also gave a speech, to present what the road that we had walked together was and what the purposes of the high level government meetings were.

I think I have no time left. I'm going to stop here. If you have any questions for me, I'll be here to answer them. Thank you.

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you very much, Mr. Redouane, for this very comprehensive preview of what happened in the meeting. I think that the high level meeting has become a very important moment for outreach and to raise awareness between other governments of the important role that ICANN has in the Internet governance ecosystem.

Having said that, let's pass to the first part of this session here, which will be dedicated to the WSIS review process. As we all know, it's the World Summit on Information Society, and the first phase happened in 2003, 2005. Documents that have become references to the Internet governance discussions have been approved and mainly the Tunis Agenda – these documents they have foreseen that the review should be conducted ten years after the first phase. Many different international organizations and WSIS action line facilitators have become involved in this effort. Very interesting documents have been produced with regards to this review, and we would like to hear, I think, first of all, from Mr. Fonseca and his assessment of the outcomes of the review process and his view for the future. What are the next challenges?

Thank you, Benedicto.

BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you. I would firstly like to thank the representative of the Moroccan government for the report he has just given us. In general terms, I would also like to thank him for having welcomed us so warmly at this meeting and thank him for the excellent preparation and the organization that allowed us to carry out our tasks here at ICANN55. Thank you, and congratulations.

Dear colleagues and friends, we think WSIS+10 was an extraordinary meeting. I had the privilege and honor to participate in many of the preparatory phases for WSIS, particularly the UNESCO meeting back in 2013, the ITU process that converged to the high level event in 2014. All those processes and other processes, as well, involved extensive, broad consultations to stakeholders extending beyond government representatives.

We should also recall there were inputs addressed directly to the New York process. IGF was also a very important actor for providing inputs. I also had the opportunity to participate in our national, our domestic, preparations, which were also very extensive.

So I think this is the first thing I'd like to highlight about WSIS+10 because it was the convergence of many important processes that developed inputs for that. It's not only what happened in

New York, but also a sum up of very important developments that took place, even starting two years before, and even before that.

The second point I'd like to highlight is that WSIS+10 was an attempt to conciliate different cultures. By saying that, UNESCO, ITU, IGF, the national and regional bodies provided input. We are, of course, referring to different configurations, different cultures, that were involved. [And then] attempt in the end to make sense of all this.

For those who participated in the original WSIS back in 2003/2005, maybe this was already there, but certainly in the ten-year review, we have a lot more complexity and many more actors. [Then I'm confident that,] in regard to what took place ten years ago. This is the second point.

The third point is that the final result in our assessment was good. I think, when we consider that draft a weeks before the WSIS+10 New York December meeting, there were some doubts within the community and also within governments on whether it would be possible to achieve our final consensus outcome. There were some concerns that maybe the outcome of the WSIS+10 process would lead to a clash of expectations.

I think that, by having achieved a document that was largely embraced by all of us – governments and the wider community –

we succeeded in reverting that, let's say, very negative mood. Even though maybe not all the differences were solved, I think when we work in a diplomatic format, we try to find language to avoid to [explicit] some differences. So in spite of the fact that some differences persist, I think we have laid common ground for future work, and we expect very productive work.

We have reaffirmed the validity of the WSIS framework coming from the two phases of the WSIS process, and I think in itself it's already an achievement because we are reaffirming that, ten years after all those concepts, that some of those were the result of a very able and extensive, complex work of craftsmanship. Those are still provide us with a very good basis for our work.

I think this was also the result of some initial discussions, and I was present in all those preparatory meetings in New York. At some point, we thought it would be inappropriate to try to redefine, to rephrase, the WSIS outcome documents. There were some very important discussions but also some discussions that, in the end, showed us that it would lead us nowhere if we try to redefine what is multi-stakeholder, what is cybersecurity, and the conditions under which those processes should flow. We realized the framework, with all the balance and all the notions that have emanated from the WSIS outcome documents, still provide all of us with comfort in regard to how to proceed. I think this is also very important.

Of course, we also updated. We not only reframed, but we updated in regard to some aspects. Particularly, there was a very strong feeling among us that we should link anything we'll do from now on, starting this year, with the new sustainable development goals that we developed also within the U.N., since those provide a very strong, solid base around which the full community will be mobilized, energized. So it's very important to see and to make clear that what we do in regard to Internet governance fits into these sustainable development goals and can serve and can be of mutual benefit if we do so.

We have agreed to extend the IGF, which is also, in our assessment, an excellent outcome, although the Brazilian position all through the negotiations was that we could accept not only the extension of IGF but even to transform IGF into a permanent body. We are convinced that IGF fulfills a unique role, and we would be comfortable in making it a permanent, standing body, but the extension for ten years we think was also quite a good development.

At the same time, the commitment towards continuing to work in regard to further developing the concept of enhanced cooperation was also there. My delegation thinks it's important that we should pursue in both directions simultaneously, in regard to IGF, but also with regard to having better understanding and trying to operationalize further the concept

of enhanced cooperation, take into account they are different approaches and views on what enhanced cooperation means and what are the issues involved. But I think we need – there’s a wider community – more clarity on what [inaudible] in that regard.

So I think this brings me to make comments in regard to what is taking place here in ICANN, and I think, since this plan is taking place, it’s important to relate what we have been doing there with what is taking place here.

Then we have been saying this: we truly value ICANN as a multi-stakeholder, bottom-up entity. In that light, it is very clear to us that the outside world looks at ICANN as a multi-stakeholder body by excellence in which not only we discuss and we exchange reviews, like in IGF – I would not like to limit IGF to this because we are trying to strengthen IGF and make its outcomes more meaningful.

I think we have been working in that regard, but there is qualitatively very clear differences between what we do in IGF and what takes place in ICANN. ICANN is a truly multi-stakeholder entity that produces results. Decisions are made within ICANN, and we think for the outside world, it’s very important because what takes place in ICANN has an impact on

how the outside world perceives and values the multi-stakeholder approach.

So in our view, it's important that ICANN should evolve, take into full account the framework that was provided by the WSIS, which is, again, a framework that applies to each and every instance of Internet governance. Of course, we are convinced there is no one-size-fits-all solution, so in regard to what takes place in ICANN, we have a focus on management of Internet-critical resources. We are confident that the multi-stakeholder, bottom-up approach is clearly the preferred and the most suitable way to do it.

That might not be the case, for example, in regard to cybercrime, cyber defense, and other areas of Internet governance that may require different configurations. But we are totally comfortable in working in the ambiance of ICANN in that sense with the present configuration.

Yeah. I'm closing [out.] This is the important thing that I'd like to say in that regard. Then I refer to the positions. We have been holding all those processes. We think it's important to ensure that we have, at least from the part of my delegation, that we have consistency between what we say and what we have said about those processes and what we say here. So we think it's important. The very central notions that, in our view, emanated

from WSIS, is that the multi-stakeholder model is the preferred and the appropriate way to deal with Internet governance of any – independently of the issue – that in allowing full participation of our stakeholders.

As I have said, there's no one-size-fits all. It has to be seen according to each issue, how this [will relate], but it's important to ensure that all stakeholders will have in place the mechanisms and the approaches to allow them to fully exercise their roles and responsibilities.

We truly hope that ICANN will continue to evolve, to evolve in a direction towards that goal that we think is totally compatible with the framework that emanated from WSIS. I would think this would be totally aligned with the message that emerged from NETmundial just two years ago, that we're honored to host in Brazil, in which the wider community expanding beyond the ICANN community sent that very strong message toward this process that this should lead to ICANN being evolved to become an organization that will be truly guided and crafted by the wider international community.

We think what we have been doing here is a first step in that regard. We look forward to continuation working within ICANN and with you also in other foreign processes to make the vision that we have agreed on back ten years ago a reality. Thank you.

MARILIA MACIEL:

Thank you very much, Benedicto. Thank you very much. I'm sure that you have questions for Benedicto. I do have questions for Benedicto, but I think that we should move forward and listen to the next speakers. Benedicto portrayed a very good framework of what happened in the WSIS review process, and now we would like to turn to Peter Major to hear more about the particular point maybe that was present in the outcome document, which is the upcoming working group on enhanced cooperation.

Peter has extensive experience with the topic. He was Chair of the first working group on enhanced cooperation that produced a very comprehensive mapping of the different organizations that are involved in Internet governance and a mapping of the different understandings on the table with regards to enhanced cooperation.

So, Peter, what do you expect for the next phase? And if you can tell us a brief few words. I would like the speakers to speak for five minutes so we can have time for interaction with the audience. Thank you.

PETER MAJOR:

Thank you, Marilia. I'll go on in French for a few minutes in order to thank the Moroccan government for the organization of ICANN55. I would particularly like to thank the representatives who organized the high level government meeting, which so contributed to the success that allowed the GAC members to sign the final report of the CCWG.

Marilia mentioned that the outcome document of the WSIS+10 gave the mandate to the CSTD to establish, or if you wish, to re-establish the working group on enhanced cooperation. Please don't ask me what is enhanced cooperation. They are a real knowledgeable people who know about it. We should content ourselves that this is a kind of diplomatic expression, to me at least, that gave some notion about the ICANN IANA functions and the stewardship of the United States.

We are in historic moment right now, in my mind: that all chartering organizations have took forward the proposal of the CCWG to the Board, and from the Board to NTIA. I think this may change the basic meaning of the terms of reference of the working group on enhanced cooperation.

As has been mentioned, the idea came up in the Tunis Agenda [early in] 2005, asking the Secretary General to start immediately consultations on these issues. [inaudible], who some of you might remember, was a legendary figure of the Internet

governance. He started the consultations in 2006, and I think he had a consultation in 2008. There was a consultation in the U.N. in 2010 and '12, more or less a multi-stakeholder approach.

Of course, there were countries who weren't satisfied with the outcomes of these consultations, so it has been decided to create a working group within the Commission of Science and Technology for Development. Probably the idea also was that, after the successful working group on the improvements to the IGF, which is also in the CSTD, this commission will be able to contribute to this topic as well.

As Marilia said, the working group has been established. It was a multi-stakeholder working group in the sense that we had 20 member states from the CSTD itself and two members of the original WSIS process – that is, Switzerland and Tunisia – and we had five representatives from each stakeholder group. All together, we were 42.

The group itself started working, just compiling the questions about the important aspects of what we thought were relevant to enhanced cooperation. From the responses, we started to sort out the issues. What are the real issues for enhanced cooperation? We started what has already been referred to as a mapping exercise. What are the existing mechanisms where these issues are being dealt with?

Of course, as a result of that, we can also identify the gaps. What are the gaps where we should improve? Or we should establish something?

I believe this was a very useful outcome, and I think it has been used by other fora in the Internet governance ecosystem as well. But of course, we didn't have enough time to complete our work – if this work can ever be completed.

Anyway, we had five meetings, and as a result of the WSIS+10, the working group is going to be reestablished. If you read carefully the outcome document, it is saying that we shouldn't start from scratch, so we should rely on the existing resource.

I have been tasked to establish the working group. I launched the process itself, and I made it clear that I really want to have the working group a multi-stakeholder working group, including the Civil Society, including the technical community and academia, the business sector, and the international organizations as well, in addition to the member states. Basically, I set out the process in the way that we will arrive to have a similar composition of the working group as we had before, which proved to be quite useful.

To me, it's always the bottom line to have the trust. This is the basic thing. I hope to build this trust among the participants of the working group. As I said, we are not starting from scratch. We

are going to rely on existing documents, so I think it's also very important to have new and old members as well. I think institutional memory is very important in this work as well.

The process itself has started. We are going to have the annual meeting of the commission in May. I will announce the list, I think probably by the beginning of April. We shall have the approval of the commission in the annual meeting, and it will be forwarded to the U.N. Well, the U.N. is a very complicated system, so it has to be forwarded to the so-called Economic and Social Council, which will approve it by the end of July.

As I said, I think by that time it will be a bit clearer where are we with the transition. I think if the transition – and I firmly believe it will happen – then our task will be to concentrate on issues which are not related to the stewardship. So we can concentrate on issues which we have already identified. I really hope to have a very successful outcome of this working group.

We are tasked to come up with the result by the middle of 2018. That is, we have the end of 2016 and 2017 at our disposal. I plan to have about five meetings – four or five meetings – and as I said, I am, as always, optimistic about the result.

I'm ready to take questions if you have them. Thank you.

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you very much, Peter, for sharing your experience. I'd like to pass the mic directly to Mr. Chengetai Masango. Your highlight telegraphic messages about the outcome in the IGF and the future for the IGF after the review.

CHENGETAI MASANGO: All right. Thank you very much, Marilia. Unfortunately, I'm speaking last and I'm right next to the Chair, so I have to be very brief.

As you all know, and as has been said by Ambassador Fonseca and Peter, member states acknowledge the role of the Internet Governance Forum as a multi-stakeholder platform for discussion on their Internet governance issues and extended the mandate for another ten years; this mandate which is set out in Paragraph 72 and 78 of the Tunis Agenda.

I'd like just to thank all of you, all the stakeholders, governments, Civil Society, the business community – everybody – because this was a real community effort to have the mandate extended, not just for five years, which was what people were expecting, but for ten years. I'd like to thank you all. It just shows the importance of the Internet governance discussions and the multi-stakeholder model.

The member states also said that the forum should continue to show progress on the working modalities and the participation of relevant stakeholders from developing countries and also mentioned that they supported the recommendations of the CSTD Working Group on IGF Improvements and called for their accelerated implementation. I'd just like to mention on that part that UNDESA and the IGF are seriously committed towards implementing these measures, and we are doing everything we can. We are encouraging developing countries' participation.

The Secretariat has been strengthened. I've been asked by team in Geneva to say hello to them, and I would just like to mention their names. We have Anja Gengo, Eleanora Mazzucchi, and Brian Gutterman, who are Geneva right now, remotely participating and viewing this webcast. Just give them a hand because they've been working very hard. Thank you, [inaudible].

Also, the IGF is also committed into incorporating the [SDGs] into our work, and we look forward to doing so within the next ten years.

Just briefly, as you all know, we had the IGF 2015 in Brazil. I'd like to thank the Brazilian government and the Co-Chair of the process, Ambassador Fonseca, and also Hartmut Glaser and CGI for their incredible work they did. I think that those of you who were there know that it was really the best IGF ever.

The next IGF is going to take place in Mexico, and we have our first open consultations 4-26 (April), next month. We are still waiting for the new MAG to be announced, and it should be announced, if not this week, hopefully next week.

I think I'll just leave it to questions.

MARILIA MACIEL:

Thank you very much, Chengetai. I would like to open the floor for questions, but I have a difficult decision to make here because I think we're very short on time. So what I'm going to do is to pass straight to the next section on fragmentation. We will have all the questions in the end. I would just ask the speakers to be very brief so we have time to take at least some questions in the two blocks.

Bill Drake, could you please give us an overview of your very interesting report on fragmentation?

BILL DRAKE:

Thank you. As I suggested to you on Skype, I think we should skip this section. There's no time. So why not just have the remaining speakers respond to the issues we've been discussing? Because we've got about 20 minutes left, and there's no way you can have a conversation about fragmentation and also have Q&A that covers all these other points.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If I can just [inaudible]

MARILIA MACIEL: Olivier?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: If I can just comment, we have ten minutes extension, so actually we will have plenty of time.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I'm sorry. I need to leave, so I cannot stay. We have run over time. It's because some people were using more time than they were allocated.

BILL DRAKE: So, as I say, since Patrik can't stay and I don't think we have time to have any kind of real conversation about it, I suggest we just – the topic can be held to another time.

MARILIA MACIEL: But maybe I would like to feel the room. How do you feel we should proceed? Continue discussing WSIS and allocate maybe the discussion on fragmentation? Which is a very interesting one. I apologize.

BILL DRAKE: We can talk about it at the next meeting if we want to.

MARILIA MACIEL: Should we leave it to the next meeting, or there are protests? Are we okay? Thank you, Patrik. I apologize for that. Marilyn Cade?

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. I think we have a lot of new people here, and I am so thrilled to see both the colleagues who have been participating in these issues in these sessions over a long period of time and all of the new folks. We, even in this segment, have raised a lot of complex issues and complex topics, so perhaps we should take advantage of the opportunity, schedule the next session for a deep dive on fragmentation. Give all of us a chance to read the excellent, by the way, 80-page paper.

Let me go back to asking a couple of very pointed questions. But let me first confess that I was a member of the CSTD Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, so I want to ask Peter a direct question. I was also present in the negotiation of the Tunis language, which resulted in the phrasing about enhanced cooperation.

At the time, I agree that the issues and questions related to the IANA agreement and the unique relationship of one government to that function probably were the main drivers around the development of the focus on and enhanced cooperation consultation and focus.

However, in the meantime, the Internet has grown from fewer than a billion users – we were about a billion users then – to 3.5 billion, and the issues and interests, both of governments, widely, within various agencies, and of companies and of individuals and NGOs, because of the importance of the Internet and the online world, have evolved. In my mind, the interest and the definition of work in enhanced cooperation must also [evolve]. It can no longer stay just about that one question.

So, Peter, can you perhaps comment about trying to frame a little bit for the new folks in particular, and for me as an old folk, how you see the evolution of time impacting the next stage of work on enhanced cooperation?

PETER MAJOR:

Thank you, Marilyn. I have to admit that the original idea of enhanced cooperation has been brought up from time to time quite regularly, [claiming] that governments should have equal footing in the management, not of the day-to-day operation of

the Internet, but generally of the policy issues of the Internet, on an equal footing.

Now, I think what we have achieved here in ICANN is one of the examples of this enhanced cooperation, which shows that it's more than that because it's not only governments, but all stakeholders seems to be on an equal footing now on these issues.

So I think it gives us a big impetus to proceed with the work and to concentrate on other issues, such as privacy, human rights, and multi-lingualism, and so on and so forth, which may be of concern to many of the stakeholders, including governments. I believe we can be able to concentrate on these issues. I think most of these issues have been already identified, so we have to just recall what we have been doing and eventually complement it and go forward. Thank you.

MARILIA MACIEL:

Thank you, Peter. I see that Mr. Durdu has stayed with us, and I thank you for that. Please feel free to jump in any time if you want to comment on this topic or make a connection with the fragmentation discussion that you were going to present to us.

Next in the queue, please?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hello. [inaudible] for the record, NCUC and [SCG] participant. I would just like to put on the CCWG Internet governance radar the work done by OECD, Civil Society constituency, and SSAC. The Civil Society will be present in the OECD ministerial meeting in June 2016. From the declaration, which will be distributed at this meeting, there are a few objectives SSAC is pursuing, which are closely related to ICANN topics of interest. I also bring [inaudible] SSAC liaison to this session.

On Internet governance: Internet governance structures should reflect democratic values and be transparent and publically accountable to users. Global Internet policy making should involve equal participation of all people, countries, and stakeholders. We call upon OECD member states to support the Internet Governance Forum and to promote the multi-stakeholder process of the World Summit on Information Society.

On open standards and net neutrality: Standards making processes should be open and should encourage competition. This promotes innovation and development with support of [inaudible] government policies that promote open standards, open data formats, and free and open software. We further recommend that OECD member countries oppose discrimination by network providers against particular applications, devices, or content, and preserve the Internet's

role in fostering innovation, economic growth, and democratic communication.

I'd just like to know [whether] the views presented here acknowledged and taken into account into actions; these efforts. Thank you.

MARILIA MACIEL:

Thank you very much, [inaudible]. I will give the floor to the next one in the queue, but we also have a remote hub from Pakistan that wants to connect with us. So let's go to the next in the queue and then to Pakistan. Please, go ahead.

CHENAI CHAIR:

Okay. Thank you. My name is Chenai Chair for the record, and I am with WSIS-ICT, Africa. I'm from Zimbabwe and I work in South Africa. I'm also NextGen.

I have a question directed to Chengetai Masango around Internet governance. You mentioned that you are encouraging developing country participation. My first question is, what exactly are the outreach strategies to encourage developing countries' participation? And is it targeted at top level? Is it government? Is it Civil Society? Or is it youth? Thank you.

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you very much. Chengetai would like to react.

CHENGETAI MASANGO: Yes. Thank you very much for the question. We are targeting all stakeholders and in a couple of ways. The first way is encouraging people to attend the IGF meetings and the open consultations. If you go onto our website, under Funding and under the MAG, there is some instructions on how you can apply for funding to come to attend.

Also, we are encouraging the regional and national IGFs, and we're encouraging the summer schools as well to build the capacity so that people can interact better in the arena. Thank you.

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you, Chengetai. Do we have the hub from Pakistan ready? Please go ahead.

[Sound] in the room, please. We cannot hear you. Maybe there's a problem with the mic. So let's go to the next one in the queue, and we will try Pakistan again.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Okay. I would like to speak in French. Okay. Thank you very much for all the members of the panel. My question is that, given

your experience, what would you say is the ideal model for the governance of the Internet? I am a NextGen Fellow and I attended the different sessions, so I would like to know what you think the best model for Internet governance is.

And specifically thinking of the sustainability of this project in different countries, would you see we need to have [legal] status for the local governance model? Or would you say we have to follow the international model? Thank you.

MARILIA MACIEL:

Gosh. That's a very interesting question. One of our speakers would like to take this question. Ambassador? Please.

BENEDICTO FONSECA:

Thank you. It's a difficult question because what we defend is that there is no one, unique model for Internet governance. What suits in the case of ICANN management of critical Internet resources might not be the appropriate [inaudible] configuration for other issues.

But I think one thing that unifies, that is a unifier in regard to different configuration models, is the basic assumptions that emanate from the WSIS meetings: that it should be multi-stakeholder in the sense that it should allow full participation of all stakeholders in their roles and responsibilities. We think that

this formulation can be adjusted to different issues, different topics. So what allows full participation of all stakeholders in different roles and responsibilities within the ICANN environment entails one configuration that would be different than what you'll apply, for example, to the [inaudible] of cybercrime.

Just to be clear about that, in regard to cybercrime, the Council of Europe has shown us a way to address this. They developed within the Council of Europe a convention. It was developed between countries with the full support of the multi-stakeholder community. So it is an approach that is substantially different from what was taken by ICANN in regard to Internet critical resources but led to an outcome that is fully embraced by the community, by the multi-stakeholder community, even though it was not multi-stakeholder, bottom-up in each operation.

So this is just to demonstrate there is not one single model. There are models. But the unifier – let's say assumption – that it should follow involve stakeholders in roles and capacities. I think that this is the guiding principle for all of us. Thank you.

MARILIA MACIEL:

Thank you very much, Benedicto. I would like to try Pakistan again. After that, I don't see anyone else in the queue, so I would

to hear from the other speakers with regards to reactions from the comments that we heard before from [inaudible] and others.

Yes? Please, Nigel.

NIGEL HICKSON: Madam Chair, we have the question from Pakistan. We can't get the audio back.

MARILIA MACIEL: Perfect. Go ahead.

NIGEL HICKSON: The question was from [inaudible] from the General Secretary of the ISOC Pakistan-Islamabad chapter. "It is very encouraging to see that the draft proposal" – this is the IANA transition proposal – "is approved by all chartering organizations. We would like to congratulate ICANN on this. While it is a big step forwards, the IANA stewardship transition, we would like to ask the panel and also ICANN if, in their view, there is any backup plans if the NTIA after their review do not accept the proposal. There are so many man hours already put into this effort. It would be a big disappointment to see this work not succeed." Thank you.

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you very much, Nigel. I see one person in the queue, and then we'll move on and listen to the speakers.

ARSENE TUNGALI: Thank you. This is Arsene Tungali from the Democratic Republic of Congo. I'd like to ask my question in French, if you don't mind. My question is specifically addressed to Chengetai Masango. I saw that he was apparently surprised to see that the United Nations had extended the term for the WSIS and for the IGF. So instead of five years, it lasted ten years. I would like then to know why they extended it to ten years and what warranties the IGF Secretary can give the community. How can they guarantee that they will go on serving the multi-stakeholder model for ten years? Thank you.

MARILIA MACIEL: Chengetai, would you like to react? And then Peter.

CHENGETAI MASANGO: Thank you for the question. First of all, ten years was one of the options – five years, ten years, or indefinitely. So we reached ten years, and I was just trying to thank the community for that because it couldn't have happened without the full support of the community and everybody saying that the IGF was a useful thing. So it was just my acknowledgment to the community.

What guarantee can I give you that it's going to carry on with the multi-stakeholder approach for ten years? Well, it's up to the community as well. UNDESA and the United Nations are committed to it. We will follow the wording of the Tunis Agenda. It's written there. It's written in the mandate. And it's also up to the community to continue to be active and to continue to engage. That's how we can all guarantee that it's going to do that. Thank you.

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you, Chengetai. Peter, would you like to react to the comments that were made before by [Marilyn] and others?

PETER MAJOR: You mean to the comments Marilyn made?

MARILIA MACIEL: Yeah, or your closing remarks because I think that we are reaching the top of the hour as well.

PETER MAJOR: Well, I would like to follow on what Chengetai said: that probably it's a commitment of all of us to continue the IGF in the same spirit as we have been doing it right now. I think it gives us a good framework – what we received from the U.N. outcome

documents – about the extension of the ten years, which really shows the confidence and the usefulness of this forum. I believe that it will continue in this way.

Having said that, I just want to mention the involvement of ICANN also in the improvement of the IGF itself and refer to the previous working group of the CSTD on these issues and the enormous help we got from ICANN and the example we got from ICANN about the multi-stakeholder model, which served us quite well.

So I think those fora, including IGF, ICANN, and other in the U.N., kind of converge in their working methods. Of course, there are natural differences because of the setting, but I think we are on the right track. Thank you.

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you, Peter. Maybe, Ambassador, would you like to say the last remarks?

BENEDICTO FONSECA: Thank you. When I reply to the question from the audience, I just refer to the model. But I think you also made a question in regard to domestic mechanisms. I would just recall that, in our case, we have an experience of more than 20 years working with a body that is truly multi-stakeholder, that is in the charge of the

management of some aspects related to the Internet, which is the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee, and has an advisory capacity on all other issues.

Two years ago, we had also adopted legislation we call Marco Civil, which is, we could say, the Internet civil rights legislation that was developed with very broad consultation. I think both CGI and then Marco Civil provide a very solid domestic basis for this. Of course, our example is what we have done internally. This cannot be automatically replicated in other – it requires to be adjusted to each country’s characteristics and culture. But we are confident that it is important to develop internally [domestic] mechanisms further.

If I can just add, in regard to the future of Internet governance and the discussions we are going to have in other foreign processes beyond ICANN, I would say it is important to try to build on what we have achieved so far and the consensus we have around some ideas, some notions, that should guide us.

But we should do it always in an [ambiance of] mutual recognition, mutual respect. I’m referring to relationships, basically, between government and non-government stakeholders. It’s important that we are in a situation in which we can all look at one another and recognize the [rate of] participation and be open to participation in their roles and

responsibilities. We think it is important to avoid the rhetorical aspects of discussion and not to revert only to rhetoric but to look into practical ways we can do things together.

In that sense, the enhanced cooperation exercise is very important in our view because it will allow us to identify very concretely what are the issues, what are the existing mechanisms, what should be done to improve those if there are any gaps that we should address, working with this overall very encompassing guideline and that we should promote always full participation of our stakeholder in their different roles and responsibilities.

We think this is taking place in other places beyond ICANN, in other organizations that are traditionally multi-lateral, [therefore] opening up for more participation from stakeholders. It is important that those organizations that were, let's say, initially with very strong multi-stakeholder non-government participation should also allow appropriate space for government. We think it's important that these would take place in both direction simultaneously in order to allow us collectively to move ahead in regard to improvement of the overall Internet governance ecosystem. Thank you.

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you, Ambassador. Mr. Durdu, would you like to share your thoughts with us?

IHSAN DURDU: Thank you. This is Ihsan Durdu. I've been advising the Minister of Transport and Communications of Turkey since 2005. There are several issues that have been talked about here. Since we don't have that much time, maybe I can touch on a few issues. Yes, as the Republic of Turkey, we believe in the multi-stakeholder model [bottom-up] top decision making processes of Internet governance processes.

We showed our support for the Internet governance model by hosting IGF 2014, [the ninth] IGF in Istanbul, and with more than 3000 attendees. Again, I know how difficult it is, and I have to thank here our successful Brazilian colleagues for hosting the [attempt] and their successful one in Brazil. Let me just thank Harmut Glaser and also Ambassador [Francisco] on his efforts in hosting that IGF conference.

Let me just talk about something else since we couldn't really get to the point. But first, I would like to also thank our Moroccan colleague for hosting this ICANN meeting and high level delegate meeting in Marrakech, the beautiful city of Marrakech. It is an amazing, successful, and enjoyable experience for all of us.

Let me just talk about capacity building part of this. If you don't have Internet, you don't have Internet governance issues, either. So it's very important for governments and the policy makers within the country to make sure that they have the right Internet infrastructure. Maybe sometimes this is overlooked by many of the developing countries. They take it as granted, but for many countries who lack resources or commercial justification for many of those Internet [fiber] projects to take place, it becomes quite a difficult issue since we have to make sure that enough promotion and support for the infrastructure and for the applications are there.

Maybe I can give a few examples from Turkey. We tried our best. The ministry was in charge of the Internet broadband policies and ICT applications in Turkey, which is my ministry. We did our best to pull all the resources together to make sure that there's enough infrastructure. Right now, we have more than 12 million. The country size of population is 45 million. We have more than 12 million of [fixed] Internet subscribers, and our mobile subscribers increased more than 72 million. Then 45 million of these total subscriptions are in the broadband area, so we're quite proud that broadband's subscriptions are increasing in Turkey.

Again, we did our best to make sure that youth have the opportunity, a chance to learn how to use the Internet and get

used to the local content. That's how we developed some major projects, like the Fatih project, one of the projects that we are really quite proud of, which connects more than 600,000 classrooms all over the country and the 16 million students that are affected. So we give each student a [tablet] computer and we make sure that there is an interactive class board in each of the classrooms so that the whole education content can be transferred to international electronic formats. That also created the opportunity for the local content developers to develop educational content in Turkish.

We really paid attention to e-government applications, and we have now more than 25 million e-government users. Our e-government services numbers – well, we have close to 1400 services of more than 200 government institutes being offered to the public now through Internet.

So these are all major projects that we make sure people have a good access and basic needs and utilization of this Internet – as a government of a developing country, if you don't make sure that there's enough reason for the Internet to be used, you tend to stay away from the digital globalization taking place in the world and you [risk] the citizens of your country to stay away from that digital revolution. Thank you.

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you very much, Mr. Durdu. We have no time left, but I will pass the microphone for the concluding remarks.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much. It's not a concluding remark, but it's just one remark regarding the issue of capacity building. I think that the capacity building is a very important part of how to bring people together – all constituencies, governments, Internet users, Civil Society, NGOs, and the others. So I think bringing people is very important, but how to ensure active participation during those forums.

I think that the model of ICANN is a very important one with the team engagements in Africa and Asia and Latin America and other countries and other regions. It has given very important results.

I would like also to underline the importance of how to bring financial support for least-developed countries and developing countries to attend those meetings. ICANN has done a very good job to assist bring more people from Africa, from Asia, and the other regions to assist to the Marrakech meeting. I would like from here to thank for that. Thank you very much.

MARILIA MACIEL:

Thank you very much, and thank you all for being here and for your patience. I do apologize for the change of agenda today, that we did not have the time to discuss fragmentation. But I do feel that there's an interest to do it, and I hope that we can take maybe more time in the next meeting and dive into this topic that I do feel we have an interest from the community.

But I would like to thank our speakers. I think that we now have a very broad overview of the WSIS review and about details that some of us were wondering about – the continuation of the IGF, the CSTD working group. I know that there is interest from people in the community to become members.

So thank you very much. I think the discussion was enlightening on this topic. Let's discuss fragmentation next time. Thank you for your patience and for your attendance.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]