
MARRAKECH – Multi-StakeHolder Model Good Practices

Monday, March 07, 2016 – 14:00 to 15:15 WET

ICANN55 | Marrakech, Morocco

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Check 1, 2. Check. This is the Multi-StakeHolder Model Good Practices meeting in Orangeriaie at 14:00 WET on the 7th of March, 2016, ICANN55.

ANDREA BECCALLI: Good afternoon. We will make a start in just a couple of minutes. I think we shouldn't waste much time because we have a lot in the agenda today, so let's take advantage of the little time that we have. Just two minutes more and we will make a start.

Okay. I think we are good to go. Cheating by one minute. My name is Andrea Beccalli. I'm the StakeHolder Engagement Manager for Europe at ICANN. First of all, thank you for coming to this session. Thank you for the presenters who agreed in presenting their work and their experiences in the Multi-Stakeholder Model.

This is the first time that we at ICANN have run a senior session, where we gather a number experiences on the multi-stakeholder model together to share their knowledge, to share their insights. Since it's the first time that we've done that, it will be also a test

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.

to see whether we can see some value from this session. We are not forcing you to come out of this room with a conclusion or with a negotiated document – nothing senior – but more with some insights on whether we at ICANN can be helpful in hosting this kinds of discussion, these kinds of confrontations of experiences. So you can count on us in supporting the continuation of senior discussion in the coming ICANN meetings.

Without taking too much time, because we have a good list of presenters, I'll pass now the moderation to my colleague on the left, Roberto Gaetano. He's an older timer in the ICANN community. He has been serving the ICANN Board. Now he's on the Board of PIR, but he will be telling you a little bit more about his experience.

I started this custom with him, this idea, already. I think it was in Dublin when we first met and felt, well, we should not only use the multi-stakeholder word as much as we'd like, as the ICANN community loves this word, but looking more into the meaning, into the practice, of this word and see what we can learn from that.

I'll ask you to introduce yourself once you take the mic, take the floor. We will have to be strict on time, so I will give you 5-7 minute maximum for your presentation. Then we will move into the second part you can see on the agenda. We'll have some

experiences from a group of researchers. Probably one will be joining us in due course. She's Marilia Maciel. She's in another session that overlaps. We have researchers from the University of Harvard following us online. We'll be able to share his findings of the work that the group, the university, has been doing on the multi-stakeholder governance model.

Without further ado, I will pass the moderation now to Roberto. Look forward for learning from – I will be taking a lot of notes, and also, at the end of this session, seeing from you whether we can bring this initiative forward.

Roberto, the floor is yours.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Thank you. Rather than spending time in telling what I have done in the past, which is by and large irrelevant for this meeting, I would like to give you a concept that was really being in my mind since we were heavily starting talking about multi-stakeholderism.

I think that a fabric is solid if it has wires that go in two dimensions. Right now, a lot of the things in the ICANN model are sort of vertical. We have all the registries, the registrars, the different At-Large communities. It's all people who have a

different business. Then we try to connect them horizontally in our multi-stakeholder model.

But there's another possibility, which is take country by country and see how the multi-stakeholder models operate, if there are multi-stakeholder models. Typically, we have identified the ccTLDs in most cases being one of those example of multi-stakeholder models running in one country. To operate the other way around, you have in your country the horizontal model, and we try to integrate vertically.

I don't want to spend a lot of time on this, but I think that the idea is clear. We need to build the links in every direction that we can in order to have a solid ICANN multi-stakeholder model.

ANDREA BECCALLI:

Yes, we have the honor to have a very good representation of geographic and solid ccTLD registries. We will start with Brazil. I will ask them to introduce himself. He doesn't need much introduction for many of you in the room. He's an institution in Brazil and beyond. I think it's the best way to open this session.

Please, Demi.

DEMI GETSCHKO:

Okay. Thank you, Andrea. I have a short presentation, but I don't know who's running the control here, just to check it. I bring a presentation that is too large, but it's good for information. I'll leave the presentation here for reference, if necessary.

The Brazilian experience in that area began in '89, when we got the .br delegation. We began registered names under the .br, of course for free at that time, until '97. Most of the registration of the world was free.

Then we began to erase the names. We built our structure under .br, that was basically the same that in the U.S. existed at that time; .org.br, .com.br, net.br, mil.br and so on and so forth.

This was basically in the academic community at that time, but it was clear for all of us that things were changing, and that, of course, there would be a very strong commercial input in the next years.

Then we had the struggle between protocols – if it's better ISO or better TCP/IP, as all of us, I suppose. In '95, there was something very important. It was two things. First of all, in our telecom legislation, there was the recognition that there is a separation between the layer of telecom that is very regulated by a very rigid concession of the state and so on and so forth. Over this very regulated structure, we built the Internet as an added-value structure without regulation. I suppose it was a very good

decision at that time that enabled the Internet to flourish in a very dynamic way.

After that decision, it was created that committee, the CGI Committee, the Brazilian Steering Committee. It was created under a government decree, but it's not a government body. It's a steering body that incorporates members from the government and members from the Civil Society. No single stakeholder has a majority in this representation.

The actual composition of the CGI is on the screen. There are nine representatives for the government, and the others are from Civil Society. They all are elected by the respective stakeholders. Each three years, we have a renewal of this steering committee.

The junction between the Brazilian registry that began in '89 and this steering committee that was created in '95 created some kind of a very efficient and maybe functional institution that CGI is using their results of income that we got from the Brazilian registry to return to the Internet in some way while what we got from the Internet.

Then the NIC, the Network Information Center, of .br has us as General Assembly, the same Board of the steering committee. The steering committee has no judicial existence. It's not a body. It's just a committee. The money is all provided by the NIC, but

uses it under the resolutions and the deliberations of the CGI. Then the CGI is our General Assembly. We have an Administrative Council and an Executive Board, but this is not important to enter in these details.

We got our money from the Registry [inaudible], the basic registration under .br. It spread the money under all the activities we have, the security and incidents response, the statistics and indicators, the exchange points, and the research on networking, and the web research and all the supporting the W3C office in Brazil on our premises. This was the general idea.

Part of the question in multi-stakeholder I suppose is automatically answered by more or less the structure. CGI has no [judicial] personality. It's not something that has members, or employees, or something like that. There's no staff. All the staff is under the NIC, the very old institution in the physical world. But all the money we collect from the registry we, in some way, return it to the Internet.

The mission in the creation of CGI is not a regulator body, of course. It proposes policy, procedures, and recommendations. Of course, it coordinates the location of IPs and names under .br. It promotes research, etcetera.

Just to point to a single action, for example, the CGI manifests through resolutions through the whole community, and one of

the resolutions was to close the Port 25 to enable less spam in Brazil. It was a very successful measure, but was not, of course, mandatory. It was a recommendation. In this way is how CGI proceeds.

An example of research of NIC.br users by CGI is the two IGFs meeting in Brazil, also the NETMundial in 2014. It was in this [inaudible] part of the money, half of the money, came from NIC, and the other from ICANN. It was a joint initiative.

Then we can see the contributions of CGI is in legislations, regulations, and laws, and so on and so forth. I suppose one of the best things that CGI did in the last years was the Decalogue. It stemmed principles because it's very difficult to act in any law cases – in Brazil, we have just won another case some days before you remember the WhatsApp thing and Facebook and so on and so forth. Then we tried to put principles and make these principles in some way to be guidelines for future law or for future ways to proceed.

This is the Decalogue we built. It was built in consensus between the 21 members of CGI. As I said, government and private sector and academia and so on and so forth. It was very difficult to get consensus on all these points. We took more or less two years to get consensus, these resolutions for 2009.

One of the points, 7, is that the network is unaccountable. You cannot punish the network by actions taken by others. Then you have to focus your action to the direct responsible for the activities and not to the network itself. It's good to protect the Internet. And of course, there are other points here that can use it.

One of the results of this Decalogue was our Internet Bill of Rights that was signed in the NETMundial opening on April 23rd. I think it's a very good law that tries to protect the Internet. It's not a lot to regulate the network, but of course, if it's a law, it regulates the network, but regulates in a way to protect them from bad legislation or bad regulation that could happen in the future.

Just to enter in [inaudible] accountability, we go at the resource from NIC.br in use in the other bodies. What are the attributions of NIC.br? Of course we have to manage the original things, like domain names and the distribution of IP numbers. We are a closed registry just for Brazilians or enterprise that has some kind of presence in Brazil. We have the second level closed. We work with what they call the Open Registrar Model. Anyone can be a registrar, but we don't recognize the registrars as special entities. You can be provider and act as a registrar what you want.

We also have open EPP if you want to make a book registration of many domains. We are a thick registry. All the data of the users are inside the Brazilian registry. If the user has any kind of problem with his data, her data, it can be solved directly in our registry.

This is the [inaudible]. I think that we are quite, well saw in Brazil because the Brazilians choose to use .br. It's good for us. We have more or less 3,700,000 domains. Of course, we are growing less rapidly these last years. Of course, our national circumstances are now also international circumstances, but we are keeping more or less the growth rate in the last three years.

Security is important. We make some measures for ten years of measurement of Internet parameters for all the Brazilian Internet. I will leave these kind of surveys we have. We also have exchange points, 26 exchange points, through the country that is very important to keep the Internet with low delays, with low latency, and so on and so forth, and making the things easier and cheaper. Thank you.

ANDREA BECCALLI:

We started what has been probably universally recognized as the champion model for multi-stakeholder governance. It was very helpful, and I thank you for sharing all this information.

Let's leave some time at the end to discuss – we took notes – more details about the model. Without further ado, let's pass to the experience of Portugal. I see Marta, she is with us and ready for joining.

Please introduce yourself.

MARTA DIAS:

Okay. Thank you. Good afternoon to all. My name is Marta Dias, and I work for .pt, the Portuguese registry. I'll tell you, it's always difficult to speak after Demi and after knowing the experience of the champion, but I will try to say something interesting.

I will tell you the brief story for the association of DNS.pt. The association, DNS.pt, is nowadays the entity who is responsible in Portugal for the management of the .pt. But I have to travel back three years in time, and I promise to be brief.

The .pt was run by the national NREN since '88 to 2013. It was the entity that was responsible for the management of the Portuguese ccTLD. It was a private foundation as well. Due to a profound changing of the legal framework applicable to the foundations, FCCN was merged in the public entity.

By that time, we thought that it could be an interesting time to rethink the model of the governance of our ccTLD in order to have something more flexible, and transparent, and

participated. It was a long process. It was a time very difficult for us in Portugal, speaking with the Ministry and trying to have this opportunity to create a new private entity if possible.

We did manage to do it. We created a private entity that was participated by the government, the consumers, and the registrars. So today we have this association. It is a private association. We used to say that it is a multi-stakeholder association because the founders came from different sectors of the economy in Portugal. We have representations from the major association that protects the consumers in Portugal, which is DICOM. We have representation of the government, and we have representation of the registrars.

When I say “representation of the registrars,” in fact it is a representation of the association who is responsible for the digital economy in Portugal. But the registrars are associated in that body, so that’s why we used to say that the registrars are represented at our association.

The association has been running very good. We have a very nice growth run of 13% last year. We are, of course, a small registry. We run less than one million domains under .pt, but the model has been working very good.

Looking at our governance structure – I’m sorry because I don’t have a presentation here with me – we have the corporate

bodies. The corporate bodies are the General Assembly. All the founders are represented at the General Assembly. Then we have the Board of Directors, our Fiscal Council, and our Advisory Council.

The bodies are elected for three-year mandates, and the presidency of the GA rotates each three years. Regarding the Board of Directors, it can vary between three and five members. They are all appointed by the General Assembly, and the General Assembly decides about its Chairman and the final number of directors.

Just a brief note concerning our Advisory Council to say that it is widely participated. We have around 20 entities that in Portugal are represented there. They used to send us their contributions in order for us to be able to do our operating plan, our budget, and all the reports that we use to communicate and to produce in order to have a guide to our daily activity. That is to say, that's our daily activity. It's always participated. It is open. It is transparent. The community can always participate, and we are very keen on that.

Just to say a brief note about our resource, they just came from the registration of the .pt domains. We've been supporting several national initiatives in order to promote the use of the Internet in Portugal.

In fact, in our bylaws, we have a formal sentence where it says something like that, that we are annually obliged to provide a certain amount of our income in order to help the promotion of the use of the Internet among our community. So it is an intention that we have, but it is in fact formally stated in our bylaws, so we are really obliged to do that.

I don't know if there is any point that I would like to focus more.

ANDREA BECCALLI:

Marta, thank you. No. You actually stuck to the five minutes, and it's perfect. It's good for now. We will keep some time at the end, and I'm pleased to see how many people are joining this session. It will be very interesting to see whether we can go through all these topics.

Let's not waste more time. I'll pass now the presentation to [inaudible] for the Serbian model. Let's hear what you have been doing, something extremely interesting on this side of the world.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I'm coming from Serbia, and I'm representing RNIDS, which is the acronym for the Serbian national Internet domain registry. We are a ccTLD managing .rs and [inaudible], Cyrillic one, IDN. My organization is old – ten years – so we have been existing for ten years and practicing multi-stakeholderism for ten years.

I can explain the whole structure of my organization, but it will be, let's say, boring after these two presentations because we have similar things. Maybe mandates or some policies are different, but pretty much the same. We are a foundation. We have a General Assembly. We have near 100 co-founders. Those are organizations that represent a wide community. We have ISPs. We have state agencies. We have a lot of small and big firms inside the GA.

They are electing the Board. We have our bunch of commissions working groups, etc. They are electing the Board. The Board is electing a CEO, and we have an office which is doing practically operational things.

I will not go into details. I will explain why we are practicing this model in Serbia. Back in 1982, we obtained the .euro domain name. It was directly transferred from Jon Postel to one of our ICANNs in a registry meeting in [inaudible]. Inside the university, which was common in those days, they were managing .euro until 2006, when it became very difficult for one person with a bunch of students to manage such a job.

Basically, from 2000 and 2001, many of us were trying to transfer this job into any state-owned agency, but our state didn't have any wish to get this job, to deal with this job. Basically, in a bottom-up matter, 30 organizations at that time, those were

only privately-held companies which were dealing with Internet ISPs, hosting companies, etc. They formed this organization.

That's why we should have practicing on the roots of ICANN. ICANN was a role model for us. We are practicing multi-stakeholderism. We have a lot of practice and a lot of things to share, but in five minutes it's simply impossible.

Basically, I will save some time for Andrea, and I will answer the questions afterwards.

ANDREA BECCALLI:

Thank you, [inaudible]. I know it's a challenge because I'm asking you to represent the work, sometimes of 19-year-old institutions or 10-year-old institutions. But I expected that this would be the case, but as I said at the beginning, that's just a first start. But it's good already. I'm capturing different elements here and there that we can probably link after this session.

Let me pass to Lianna for the experience in Armenia. Yes, thank you, Lianna.

LIANNA GALSTYAN:

Thank you for the invitation our experience of Armenia. My name is Lianna Galstyan. I'm a Board member of the Internet Society

of Armenia. I will tell you our situation and the multi-stakeholder model experience we have in Armenia.

I have here some bullet points which I will tell you about. The TLD is AMTLD. We are a manager for .hye as well, which is the Armenian IDN [inaudible]. The AM ccTLD is managed by ISOC Armenia, which is an NGO, and it was formed in 1994.

Previously it was called Armenian Internet Users Group, [AMUG]. The only requirement for us to get .am by Jon Postel was for this group to involve all stakeholders. At those times, it was not called stakeholders and multi-stakeholder, but the idea was the same, so that all the stakeholders are being engaged in this group.

This group was formed accordingly. Later on AMUG was renamed to Internet Society. Thus, AMTLD is managed by the ISOC Armenia, as I told you.

We have members from private and public sectors, the technical community, academia, and government, all in their personnel capacity. Even more, our VPs – actually represent all the stakeholders. So we have five VPs in ISOC Armenia, and they are from all our stakeholders.

Currently, we have more than 100 members. We have one President, five VPs, and 23 Board members. We hold our

meetings once in two years, and we have elections for all these positions. I want to say that for these years, just from the foundation, the President of ISOC Armenia is reelected all the time, and we are really very happy of the job he is doing. All the VPs we're reelecting as well, so we're changing mostly the Board members.

This model of multi-stakeholder engagement we replicated later on a full national registry to a high level of Internet governance. I will probably talk about that later after this because we are talking about ccTLD registry.

This model work in Armenia, a different one, which is the Internet Government Council, and we have all stakeholders, including government, which is the Ministry of Transport and Communication in charge of it. ISOC Armenia is the Secretariat of this council. That way, we're an NGO and we keep all the processes transparent for this.

Coming back to our registry, the policy for .am and .hye TLDs have been developed by a community, as I told. We are covering our stakeholders there, so these ISOC Armenia members have developed their policy for registry. All physical and legal persons, residents and non-residents, can register a domain name in .am, unless they exercise something improper or illegal, in which case the domain name can be revoked.

For such cases, we have an Improper Content Working Group within ISOC Armenia members. We have a dedicated hotline for e-mail and phone numbers. Whenever something improper happens in this zone, .am, we get an alarm. This working group reacts, according to the rules and procedures we have adopted. By the way, I'm a member of this group as well.

All problematic issues are mostly resolved out in the negotiation process. If nothing happens, no reaction we see from the registrant side, then the domain name will be revoked. But we do not have such kind of practice, actually, so far.

We closely work with our registrars. Currently we have 20 registrars for .am and eleven registrars already ready for .hye. We have started to add a free registration process on March 1. So we are pretty new in IDN registration. We are still working on this to promote the .hye IDN TLD.

These are the principles. We have all these principles adopted, and we're working with this. Probably if the group here, if we see that we have this discussion and interest for the multi-stakeholder model exercised, we can later on talk a little bit about different models, not only in registry level, but in different types of organizations as well. Thank you.

ANDREA BECCALLI:

Thank you, Lianna. Yes. You actually made a very good point. For this session, we are gathering examples of management of the registry. The registry, for those of you who may be knew to ICANN, basically is the institution that manages the national top-level domain names – .br for Brazil, .pt for Portugal – which basically is a public shared resource of our community. It represents a particular regional geographic community on the Internet, which doesn't have a physical border.

In a way, the resource in itself presents a challenge on its governance. That's why we see all these models of multi-stakeholder governance that have to respond to this challenge of being able to represent every single user of this particular community on the Internet.

Okay. Let's pass now to another good example that we have here present from Kenya. Abdalla, if you are ready to go with your presentation, you have five minutes, and I'll give you six.

ABDALLA OMARI:

Thank you, Andrea. My name is Abdalla Omari from Kenya. I'm in charge of the Kenya Network Information Centre. That's the name of the .ke registry. The .ke registry is about ten to eleven years old. It has passed through the usual normal challenges where you have to grab it from an individual, but currently we are happy. We have a certain structure in place.

As you can see from the presentation, our decision structure of KENIC, we are recognizers and a profit-making organization within the statutes. We are described as a PPP. That is public/private participation. That's a partnership between the government and the Civil Societies.

The structure of KENIC is we have four Board members – those are the registered Board members – and an extra three Board members.

Now I'll explain the four Board members and the three Board members. One Board members is from the government. That one is appointed by the government from the Ministry of ICT. Then we have a Board member from the Registrars Association. In Kenya the registrars for domain have an association called the Domain Registrars Association of Kenya. What they do is they elect a member and they send a member to KENIC to join the Board.

Then we have the ISPs, the Internet Service Society. The ISPs [inaudible] Telecommunication Communication Providers of Kenya. What they do is, the organization where they also send us one member who is accepted as a Board member of KENIC. Then the academia – those are the universities – they universities come together and send a member to the Board.

So those four Board members are basically technically the owners of KENIC.

Now, three other Associate Board members are added from professional organizations. Currently we have Board members from the Marketing Society. That Board member is to assist in the marketing of the .ke domain.

Then we have another Associate Board member from the Accountants Association. He's to make sure that our books are in good order and we are able to comply with the government requirements of returns.

The third Associate Member is from the Law Society. That's a lawyer on the Board. They're to assist us to go through legal matters.

Now, the difference between the four Board members and the three, the four Board members serve a period of three years, renewable. The three Associate Board Members have a period of two years, renewable.

Now, the appointment of the Chair. The Chair is voted in by the representing organizations, that's the Board. The Board, when it's formulated, they voted in the Chair, the Vice-Chair, and the other Chairs of the committees.

At KENIC, we have four committees. We have the Audit and Risk Committee. We have the Marketing Committee. We have the Finance Committee, and we have another Technical Committee to look at technical matters. These committees meet each quarter at the minimum level, and they report to the full Board each quarter on what has been deliberated.

The CEO is appointed on a three-year term, renewable. It's a competitive position. It's usually advertised. People apply, and the normal appointing processes, so the CEO position is a three-year renewable position.

Accountability stakeholders. When KENIC makes changes in policies, they to be posted on the website. Comments received from the ICG community before any policies change. Our policy is put on the website for about 30 days, and all the contributions are taken into place before changes are effected.

The other level of accountability is we have an annual general meeting where the audited accounts of KENIC are looked at, and the communities get a chance to question the Board. It is [inaudible] a chance for the rest of the community to question the Board on their accounts.

Then we have a quarterly breakfast meeting for registrars. Each quarter, KENIC holds a meeting with the registrars. By the way, we have about 200 registrars. What happens is, first of all, we

give them presence on the number of domains registered. So the person who has registered the highest number of domains for that quarter gets a prize. The person who has done the least [inaudible] gets a prize, and a registrar with the most innovative products given out to the market gets a prize. This done on a quarterly basis, and they usually forward for it.

We have monthly reports, which we send to registrars. This is basically to ensure and to give them information to keep abreast of what their performances are like. That report basically shows the number of domains that you have registered for that month, the number of deletions you have done for that month. This report is basically to prepare them for the quarterly breakfast meeting so that each month, as the months pass by, you are aware if you're going to win a prize or not. Thank you, Andrea.

ANDREA BECCALLI:

Thank you, Abdalla. Thank you so much. Okay. So we have now time for the last presentation. We really actually went from west to east. No, we're going to east, south. We're going to Debbie. She will give us an overview of the New Zealand experience. Thank you, Debbie. You're welcome.

DEBBIE MONAHAN:

Thank you. I'm going to add a degree of complexity to this discussion because why have one organization when you can have three? I'm going to briefly go through how .nz is structured, the roles that they do, and the governance of it very quickly. It's quite complex, so there'd be heaps of questions afterwards, I'm sure.

Essentially, we have three organizations all involved in .nz. When you're around this meeting, you'll find three different business cards all associated with New Zealand.

[inaudible] .nz is the parent is the parent organization that holds the delegation. They're a membership-based organization. Basically, anyone can become a member of [inaudible].nz; individuals, organizations, and everything. They've got round about 500 members at the moment.

They've set up two subsidiary companies that actually run and operate .nz for them, the Domain Name Commission Limited [inaudible] and [inaudible] Limited, which Jay Daley leads. What Internet NZ has is a hall of objects, the objects of the society which are all very charitable and all about promoting and protecting the Internet in New Zealand. The two subsidiary companies sign up to those objects as well, and also sign up to principles that are agreed across the whole group.

The role of Internet NZ is actually not focused on .nz. They actually focus on the broader Internet aspects of New Zealand. Because the registry is a subsidiary company, Internet NZ is funded by way of a dividend from the registry. They're involved in policy matters affecting the Internet in New Zealand, so a lot of government links and associations with them. They operate a public mailing list for discussing their views on different things and are very much involved in the Internet Governance Forum. They are the designated manager for .nz.

These are the two main parties, actually, in the operation of .nz. The Domain Name Commission is, in a sense, the market regulator. It sets the policies. Those policies are developed in a very open and consultative process. So a lot of public consultation. We got out government. We got out to a wide range of individuals and organizations.

The last consultation we seemed to have about 5500 e-mails, about 1000 letters, in that whole range of groups. They're all open. Everyone can see the submissions in the public. Even our Board minutes are published and anything like that.

We also administer a free to file dispute resolution service. Then you have [inaudible] Limited, who do the technical side. They run the registrar.

Now, because Internet NZ is an incorporated society run by its members, the members actually elect a council. They have a council of twelve. They serve three-year terms. Those open members can actually pick their own and elect their own governors.

[inaudible] the subsidiary is actually a limited liability company, so they have a Board of Directors. Those directors are basically, with the exception of one, who is a councilor – they're like the shareholder rep – all the rest are actually appointed. Registrars actually cannot be on the Board there's a self-interest all that. We have a Registrar Advisory Group, which is our key way of getting the view of the registrars, but they can't actually be on either of the two Boards.

They can serve a maximum of nine years of terms in between one to three years. The Chair is a joint agreement between the Board themselves and the shareholder. Then we report report kind of regularly, too.

This is how it all links together. You can see you've got [inaudible] and their Chief Executive, and the Domain Name Commission. Now, you'll see the arrows between NZ [inaudible] and the Domain Name Commission are all one way, and that is because the Domain Name Commission oversees the performance of the registry. We monitor and regulate the entire

market, and the registry's performance is a part of that market regulation. That is why those lines only go one way NZ [inaudible] to the Domain Name Commission.

We each report on .nz matters, but we also report to the council on financial and how the companies are actually operating at that sort of level. So dual reporting.

That in a nutshell is how .nz kind of is run .Very, very quickly – and I apologize for talking so fast – whether we had [inaudible], which some of you might have heard.

The next slide illustrates it: three organizations, three different logos, three Chief Executives. As I say, why make it simple? Thanks.

ANDREA BECCALLI:

Thank you, Debbie. Well, that was marvelous because we went geographically around different cases, but also we went around different models of governance, all of them multi-stakeholder but with different characteristics, probably related to the environment where they're operating and the culture where they're operating, but nonetheless pushing a bit forward a governance structure that is not in a textbook.

I used to study political science, when I went to do my course in international organizations, I never found the multi-stakeholder

word even mentioned in a footnote. We see these are very vibrant fields, not only of practice but also for status.

So that's a segue to introduce one more presenter, who has been starting and investigating the multi-stakeholder governance model from an academic point of view. What can we learn from him, what we can learn from other environments where the model can be applied?

Ryan Budish is from the University of Harvard's Berkman Center for Internet and Society, and he's part of a network of universities that have a particular interest in the Internet and society. Ryan, are you online? Can you hear us?

RYAN BUDISH: Yes, I can hear you. Can you hear me?

ANDREA BECCALLI: Perfect. Yes, loud and clear.

RYAN BUDISH: Great.

ANDREA BECCALLI: Ryan, if you can just give an overview of the work that we've been doing, what actually brought you to the work, and a little

overview of what's on the findings. I will leave you five to seven minutes, probably something more. I just learned that there is no other session after this session in his room, so we can squat in the room a few minutes more. Please, go ahead.

RYAN BUDISH:

Great. Well, thank you so much for giving me this opportunity. My name's Ryan Budish, and I am a Senior Researcher at the Berkman Center for Internet and Society based at Harvard University. The work that I'll be sharing a little bit about briefly was work that we conducted as part of the Network of Internet and Society Research Centers, which is a group of about 50 Internet and Society centers based at universities all over the world, including many in the global south.

We, collectively, the network of centers, really wanted to try to understand better some of the elements of successful multi-stakeholder groups. In order to do that, we conducted across the network of centers several conversations and ultimately from those selected twelve initial case studies of what appeared to be effective multi-stakeholder groups.

We conducted interviews with the participants of those various groups. Those case studies came from a variety of environments, both inside and outside what one might consider the Internet governance sphere. It spanned case studies, for

instance, that looked at CGI.br, which was presented earlier today. There were actually two case studies on CGI.br, one looking at the Marco Civil, and one looking at their attempt to reduce spam by addressing the Port 25 issue that Brazil was dealing with.

There were also case studies looking at the management of Bitcoin, the Bitcoin developer community. There were case studies looking at the deployment of fiber-optic cable in Switzerland, a case study looking at Creative Commons. So there were several that looked across a variety of different environments.

The work is still ongoing. We are adding additional case studies and continuing to look at this space. So what I present are initial findings, but certainly not an end-point.

What we took away from looking at all of these case studies is that there is really no single model for success, for effective multi-stakeholder groups. Instead, what we observed was that most successful groups had conveners who were able to adapt the group to changing circumstances, changing environment, and changing political and economic context. That flexibility and ability to adapt was key.

We observed that this flexibility took the form, generally, of three steps. The first step was that the groups tend to establish

clear success criteria, meaning there was a really close fit between the goals of the group, which were clearly defined, and then the processes that they would use to achieve those goals.

The second step was that the conveners of the groups set the initial framework conditions, and processes, and tools that the group would use. I will come back to that step in greater detail in a moment.

The third step that I've already alluded to is that the conveners and organizers of the group would continually revisit both the goals of the group and the processes that the group uses in order to readjust both of those over time.

Now, to go back to that point about setting the initial framework conditions for the group, we observed in the case studies five categories of tools and levers that conveners of multi-stakeholder groups can activate strategically, invariably to achieve the goals of the group.

Those five broad categories are inclusiveness, transparency, accountability, legitimacy, and effectiveness. Within each of those categories, there is a set of tools that groups can manipulate. By that, I mean there's a variety of options and choices that groups can make. What we observed in our research was that groups adjust those traces over time.

I'll briefly highlight three of those five categories just to give a sense of what I mean by that. First, inclusiveness. By this, we mean who can participate and how to participate. As we all just heard from the fascinating presentations moments ago, there were a variety of answers to those questions in the different registries. We observed the same thing in our case studies.

For instance, in almost every of the groups that we looked at, there was curation of stakeholders. The different stakeholders were selected and enabled to participate, and who those stakeholders were changed over the lifecycle of the groups that we looked at.

Similarly, how people participated, how stakeholders participated, changed over time in the life cycle of these groups. For instance, many groups chose to have, in addition to the main multi-stakeholder decision making body, working groups that worked alongside creating inputs for the main body. These working groups often had a different set of participants than the people who participated in the main multi-stakeholder body. This was a way to provide alternative participation mechanisms for people who could not or would not participate in the main multi-stakeholder body.

Additionally, we observed in the case studies a variety of different participatory technologies, things like the Adobe

Connect that ICANN is using today, as well as a variety of other means, some of them not as high-tech; things like a Google Doc, where stakeholders can make edits to documents. That was something that we saw used in several different case studies.

A second category, transparency. We saw that different groups had very different approaches to transparency. Some fell more into the radical transparency category, where everything they did was open and public, whereas others had transparency more selectively. One group that we observed had a designated spokesperson, and that spokesperson would make regular announcements, sharing certain minutes after the group met.

What we saw is that there was generally a push match between the historical experiences of the group and the type of transparency they chose to use.

For instance, groups that had stronger political involvement from governments tended to not use the more radical forms of transparency. When they did choose to use that, we actually heard from participants that that actually led to problems because government representatives in many cases ended up being less willing participants, or ended up being less flexible in their views when things were more transparent. So there were choices that groups had to make about when to make things

transparent and when not, depending on the objectives of the groups at any given point.

A third one that I'll mention is accountability, where one example is the choice that groups make between voting in their decision making and consensus. We observed across almost every case study that groups did not uniformly use one or another, but that they often started with consensus, but then, where a consensus could not be reached, fell back on mechanisms like voting.

The point that I want to leave you with is just that the adaptability of groups and the strategic use of these various tools was something that we observed very strongly in these case studies. And that it's often tempting to think of multi-stakeholder group as having one structure, or one set of decision making tools, one set of participants, when in fact what we observed in our work is that all of those factors change over time, and not randomly but usually as the result of very strategic, careful choices in trying to advance the objectives of the group.

Our research is all available off of our website. All of the case studies are available for you all to look at. So if there are any questions about that, I encourage you all to look at the work

that we've done. Thank you very much for giving me this opportunity to share this.

ANDREA BECCALLI:

Thank you, Ryan. Very insightful. Even if you went from west to east, we weren't really able to cheat time, so we're really running late a little bit in this session. But we would like to start with one question. While you were doing your presentations, Roberto was very dutifully taking notes on what you were mentioning. There is one question that we would like you to address and then start the discussion from there. Please, Roberto.

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Yeah. I probably need 20 seconds to explain the question. The multi-stakeholder model has obviously a lot of advantages, and it's amassed in certain situations like ICANN in order to have a better legitimacy of the organization. But for sure, it's sort of a complicated model in the sense it's more complicated than just a plain organization with somebody who takes the decision and says "We do it this way," and you have to live with that.

Since the multi-stakeholder is now under scrutiny by a lot of, I would say, the outside world, the world outside ICANN, other organizations that are looking at this model are being faced also

sometimes with the questions. Okay, we see the benefits, but are there any drawbacks?

One of the questions that was in the initial questionnaire was, “How does, in your experience, in your organization, the fact that you operate with the multi-stakeholder model affect effectiveness, efficiency, effect legitimacy?” Obviously maybe the answer is obvious, but “How are outputs also affected? What would change if you were operating with a different model?”

I don’t think we have a lot of time for the answers, but if we can have a quick answer from each of you on this.

ANDREA BECCALLI: [inaudible], you go first. Debbie, please.

DEBBI MONAHAN: I think for us it’s the quality of our policies. When we go out, it’s a genuine consultation and what impacts on people has actually made our policies a lot stronger. It can take longer. It’d be much easier to just sit down and write what we wanted. But going out to the community and getting reviews about what they need, I believe, makes our policies more suitable for the New Zealand Internet. Which means that people are satisfied and happy with the job we do. I think getting people alongside and getting

support of them is actually a key part of multi-stakeholderism, when you're proving you're actually listening to them.

ANDREA BECCALLI: So basically quality, and then byproduct is also legitimacy because you have been doing this process that takes all views. [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: This is a crucial question. Efficiency of multi-stakeholderism is – well, say let's say different. The multi-stakeholder model is not a fast model when you are talking about decisions, policy building, or whatever. But this question is about another model. Every other model is a top-down model, so if you use a top-down model, you're not completely satisfying your base, your multi-stakeholderism.

If you want to use top-down, it's faster. You will get decisions and everything jumped on very fast, but is it okay about the whole community? You don't know. So this is the first question.

The second question is where you have a difference between multi-stakeholderism and, let's say, a typical organization/association.

For example, we have CENTR, which is maybe represented here, but never mind. It's an association of ccTLDs, country code top-level domain registries. Where is the difference between us, all of us who represented multi-stakeholderism, here, multi-stakeholder organizations, and CENTR?

In the word, "multi." You need to cover all stakeholders. If you have in your organization, in your GA, only one type of stakeholder, you're not taking part of multi-stakeholderism. This is the crucial thing. I think it's touched the essence of the answer.

ANDREA BECCALLI: Thank you. Demi?

DEMI GETSCHKO: I follow the "D" letter with Demi, [inaudible], and [inaudible]. I think most of it has been said already. But as I said, we took two years to gather the Decalogue [inaudible]. Speed is not a characteristic of multi-stakeholderism, of course. But on the other hand, you just can't have decision, strong decisions, if you've got consensus. It's impossible to balance the two or three representations to see if they are on equal footing, if you really have the same weight on each side of the balance.

The only way to get strong decisions in is when you have consensus. This is why in the building the Decalogue in CGI we look at it for consensus, and this took us two years.

But if you want to really have efficient work, you have to have this in two chambers. They have the decision chamber, the steering committee that makes the decision through consensus normally, not voting. Then you have the execution via the NIC that's the usual normal institution that has to go after the decisions.

For example, if the CGI decides that it's good to have the profile of the Internet and they have to spend the money to see how is the Internet in the country, how is the Internet in the homes and the industries and so on and so forth and the location and health, then this decision is done by consensus, then NIC has to run after that and get the information and distribute it. Thank you.

ANDREA BECCALLI: Thank you, Demi. Any other point on this question, or? [inaudible] and then Marta.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Just to add a little bit on this consensus point, which is really very difficult to read. In this sense, it's very important to make

sure that everybody knows the issue, so that the information sharing and explaining all the situations, all the points, and coming to this consensus is really very important. Just to add this.

ANDREA BECCALLI: So transparency, as we also heard from Ryan about the importance of having full transparency of the process. Marta?

MARTA DIAS: I do agree with all those ideas, but I would like to add another word to these. It's the word "trust." You have to trust in all the stakeholders that are with you, with the same aim, with the same mission. So it's the idea of having different perspectives on the same issues, on the same problems, but having always in mind the idea of trust, working together and trust each other. That's it.

ANDREA BECCALLI: Thank you. Do you trust me?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Yes.

ANDREA BECCALLI: Thank you. So you can go ahead.

ROBERTO GAETANO: My sense is that we have consensus on one thing, which is that the multi-stakeholder model is probably not bringing a fast solution, but the solution is more solid, and the outcome is more solid and has more continuity. Also, because we are mentioning it, if it's a top-down, if the top changes, then the whole structure has to change, whereas if it's based on the multi-stakeholder model, the fabric holds. That's basically my point to take home.

ANDREA BECCALLI: Okay. We have one question from a remote participant. I'm going to read it out. It's from Carlos Alfonso. The question is for Debbie. If you could describe your community program? We do not have one, and we are interested in knowing how it works, who it benefits, and so on.

DEBBIE MONAHAN: Our community program for Internet NZ? I'm going to assume it's Internet NZ because their community funding benefits anyone and everyone if it's Internet-related. You can apply for grants. These public grant rounds that they actually have, where, if you've got a research project that related to Internet

work, you can bid for money. I think they give out about half a million dollars per year, based on that.

They also have about four or five partnership organizations, things like NetSafe, and organizations that are promoting work around the Internet. They help fund those organization to do good work as well.

On the last slide, there were e-mail addresses. Feel free to send an e-mail to either Jordan Carter or myself, and we can address that in more detail.

ANDREA BECCALLI:

Thank you, Deb. So we are now officially five minutes late, which [inaudible] is not a problem. [inaudible]

Are there any other questions that you'd like to raise from this session? Any other point that – please. Introduce yourself.

EDMON CHUNG:

Sure. Edmon Chung speaking here from .asia. Actually, the title of the session is very interesting for me, and it's good to hear the background.

I'm curious as to what the going forward intention of this exercise may be because I think, in fact, in a couple of sessions at the Asia-Pacific IGF and at the IGF, I've brought out this

specific topic about the multi-stakeholder approach, that not all are actually the same and that there should be better standards for what we call the multi-stakeholder approach and the accountability and the transparency. That's just starting points, but how to balance the interest between the stakeholders, the stakeholder group boundaries – all those kind of governance questions.

In some ways, we can call a dictatorship a multi-stakeholder approach, all the way to a participatory democracy a multi-stakeholder approach.

I guess my comment is this is a great start. Is there a next step to put these experiences together into some sort of a good-practice document or, even further, a kind of a checkmark or audit of how well a multi-stakeholder model is actually doing and how really it can be called a multi-stakeholder model?

ROBERTO GAETANO:

Well, my first reaction to this is that, if we can now with a plan say we're going to do next this, this, this, and this, we would be not in line with the whole point. So I think that this has been the first session. We have been thinking about doing this for quite a long time. I think that the idea is to – this is a first meeting, and those points that you raised are very important. I think that we need time to develop and to get some more input.

For instance, I don't know. Probably ICANN staff can answer better this question, but probably schedule something for ICANN 56, maybe some homework so that we can bring new ideas and maybe new participants. Because the multi-stakeholder model is not just for ccTLDs. It's also on other parts, so we need probably to broaden this.

I think that we have plenty of ideas, but we have to realize that this is a first moment, and we have to grow from this.

ANDREA BECCALLI:

Yeah. Actually, thank you for raising this issue. That's something that we briefly mentioned at the opening of this session, that is a first step. We wanted to see whether there is interest from the community.

As ICANN staff, we are more than happy to help and to see how we can move forward. I can give you a goal that could be more my personal view in the medium long-term.

I'll give you an example. I was two weeks ago in a meeting in Barcelona, a very large meeting on the Mobile World Congress – 100,000 people participating. We have bilaterals with different stakeholders. The Minister of a very tiny African country shows up, and he has the letter from IANA. He says, "I just got the re-

delegation of my national ccTLD. What do I have to do now? How can I go multi-stakeholder?” Really, that’s what he said.

I wish at that moment I had something that had the ICANN logo on, but it wasn’t ICANN-produced. It was a bottom-up community produced document. Probably that’s something you can look at to go ahead.

In the same meeting, we met with the senior management of the GSMA, which is probably the largest organization that deals with a very important sector of the industry, the mobile phone sector. They have been working as a membership association since the past 20+ years.

But suddenly, if you into their meeting, you see that what used to be a meeting about mobile phone operators turned to be a meeting of mobile phone operators with app developers that had formed with mobile phone producers, with network operators. They look at us and they say, “You have a multi-stakeholder model, don’t you? How has it worked? Because we think that our model is getting rusty for the environment.”

Again, if I had like a booklet or something, that would be my ideal medium-to-long-term goal. How to reach there? It’s [inaudible] between. If you have ideas on that, we are here to help you and to gather your insights. [inaudible]?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I want to add [inaudible] metrics. There is no menu on building the multi-stakeholder model. ICANN can try, can form working groups. Multi-stakeholderism is depending on the environment. For example, how the stakeholders in Serbia think about multi-stakeholderism, and how is the political wheel – for every stakeholder matter, the opinion of everybody is on the stake.

So basically, there is no menu. There is no metrics. Metrics, maybe. The Serbian model will not be good for you in Hong Kong, but it's good for us in Serbia. Our metrics is our stakeholders. They're giving us votes for are we good or bad?

ANDREA BECCALLI: Thank you, [inaudible]. To close on a funny note, I was [inaudible] a short anecdote. You want to reply?

EDMON CHUNG: Yeah, just quickly. I agree with that, but you just described a framework, actually. The metrics? We can talk about it, but I think, with the people around the table, at least there's enough interest to get us on that path. I'd be more happy to jump on a mailing list to further this discussion and prepare for the next meeting.

Whether we come up with a very, very broad picture or more narrowed down, we will see at the end of the journey. But I think it's worthwhile to take that journey.

ANDREA BECCALLI: Mailing list? Okay, how do we do that now, because I didn't –

ROBERTO GAETANO: [inaudible] Don't force me to help you again.

ANDREA BECCALLI: No, no, no, no. Well, you volunteered, actually.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [inaudible]

ANDREA BECCALLI: Yeah. If everybody was interested, you can send an e-mail to my address, which is andrea.BECCALLI@ICANN.org, and I will take care of that.

Probably the easiest step would be, for the next ICANN meeting in Helsinki, to organize this session probably more bottom-up this time, not us [inaudible] and also the structure.

Just to leave you with a little anecdote, I was once going from a meeting to another one after a really long day with Fahdi. We were speaking about the multi-stakeholder model and he goes to me and says, “You know, Andrea, everything should be multi-stakeholder. It just makes sense, you know? Even when I discussed with my family, actually the multi-stakeholder...” I said, “Okay, okay, Fahdi. Maybe.” But I think it’s –

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]