LOS ANGELES – 2015 and Beyond - An Internet governance Update
Wednesday, October 15, 2014 – 16:30 to 18:15
ICANN – Los Angeles, USA

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:    2015 and Beyond – An IG Update in the Los Angeles ballroom, October 15th, 2014, from 16:30 to 18:15.

NIGEL HICKSON:    Hi there. Do you hear me? Thank you very much. I've got you loud and clear. You're going to stay on the line now and the meeting will be starting shortly. Thank you. Bye-bye.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:    Nigel, can we start?

NIGEL HICKSON:    Yup. Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. Could we take our seats? We'd like to start this session. This session is on Internet governance, so if you've come for something else, you're very welcome to stay.

So without further ado, I'd like to introduce this session. We're going to discuss Internet governance issues. It's going to be in two phases.

Our moderator for both phases this afternoon, who will explain all about it, is our incoming Board member, which we're very pleased and delighted that she's agreed to moderate this session this afternoon, Rinalia Abdul Rahim, from Malaysia. She's well-qualified to lead these sessions, as she was involved in the first WSIS discussions way back in

2003. So it's with great pleasure that I introduce her this afternoon. Thank you.


RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:   Thank you, Nigel. Good afternoon, everyone. The objective of this session is to provide an Internet governance update to the ICANN community.

Before we begin, I'd like to have a sense of the room. How many of you believe that you are new to the topic of Internet governance, or relatively new? If you don't mind, just put up your hand so that I have an idea and so that the presenters know how to pitch their presentation.

Okay, we have a few new people. So the rest of the folks are basically veterans who have a clear idea and may want to propose changes in the system to make it more effective. At least that's my understanding.

The session will be divided into two parts. Part 1 will cover key developments in Internet governance, specifically three topics: the September 2014 Internet governance forum in Istanbul, the upcoming October ITU Plenipotentiary Conference in Busan, and the UN General Assembly High-Level Meeting on the WSIS Review in 2015.

Part 2 of this session will cover emerging models of collaboration in a distributed Internet governance ecosystem, and it will include an update on the NETmundial Initiative, and the other presentations will be a surprise.

In terms of time allocation, we have a hard stop at 6:15. I estimate that we have approximately one hour for Part 1 and 30 minutes for Part 2, and the rest of it will be essentially logistics and administration.

In terms of approach, this is how the session will proceed. I will ask each of the panelists a question or two about one of the topics. They will provide a three-minute response. After all the panelists have shared their thoughts, we will open up for questions and interaction with the audience.

For the first part of the program, if speakers stick to their time allocation, we will have about 25-30 minutes of interaction.

So let us start on Part 1. I'd like to introduce to you the panelists or respondents. First we have Janis Karklins on my far right. He's the Chair of the IGF Multi-Stakeholder Advisory Group. Janis unfortunately will have to leave us after his response, as he has to catch a plane, but Chengetai Masango, who is seated in front here, the Program and Technology Manager at the UN Secretariat for the IGF, will respond to questions during audience interaction.

We also have a phantom. He's on his way. It's Olivier Crépin-Leblond, Chair of the At-Large Advisory Committee. On my right, Olga Cavalli, Governmental Advisory Committee Representative for Argentina. On my left, dressed in fancy dress today, Mr. Jimson Olufuye, Chair and CEO of Africa ICT Alliance.

Also on my left, beyond Raul, is Bertrand de la Chapelle, Director of the Internet and Jurisdiction Project and former ICANN Board Director. Also on my left – Bill, if you could raise your hand – is Bill Drake, Chair of the

Non-Commercial Users Constituency in ICANN's Generic Names Supporting Organization.

On my immediate left here is Raul Echeberria, Vice President for Global Engagement of the Internet Society. And on the call, online, through remote participation, is Subi Chateverdi, who is Assistant Professor of Journalism and Communication at the Lady Shri Ram College for Women, Delhi University, India.

I will start with questions on the Internet Governance Forum, the first one directed at Janis. Janis, what were the innovations and achievements of IGF 2014, and what is your outlook for IGF 2015 in Brazil?

JANIS KARKLINS:  Thank you, Rinalia, for questions. Let me start by saying that I think that it's important to frame this discussion about IGF in the context of IGF ecosystem evolution and the ongoing WSIS+10 review process, because that will be the time when decisions about extension or suspension of the mandate of IGF will be taken.

Answering your question, we were really guided by number of inputs in preparing IGF 2014. That was community input. That was the recommendations of the CSTD Working Group on Improvements of IGF. That was also NETmundial guidance as IGF was the first big international meeting after the adoption of NETmundial outcome document.

What were the innovations? As you know, many ask for improved outcomes of IGF, and with that in mind, we did a number of improvements. First of all, the chair's report, which is traditional, but

this time it contains more focused information and state of debate for different issues. For instance, net neutrality, as suggested by NETmundial, freedom of expression, local content creation, and so on.

We organized five best practice forums that produced compilations of best practices on issues like online protection, fighting spam, how to organize certs, what policies should be put in place to promote local content creation, and how to manage multi-stakeholder model of Internet governance.

Equally, in response to those who are saying that IGF is just a discussion forum and nothing happens, information was compiled on actions and decisions which have been made as a result of engagement in previous IGFs. So all this information is available on the IGF website.

Maybe very briefly, as we do not have much time, I would outline what are the initial thoughts about preparation for the 2015 addition, which will take place in November 2015, from the 10th to the 13th of November in Joao Pessoa, Brazil.

First of all, I would like to remind that the MAG renewal process is ongoing, and until the 20th of October, you can propose your names, or communities can propose names, for new MAG members.

The first open consultations will take place from the 1st to the 3rd of December this year in Geneva, and you're all invited to participate, either on site or remotely.

One last element that I really would like to put on the table for discussion. As you know, the WSIS+10 Review Conference will take place in December, and as the UN General Assembly resolution

suggests, there should be interaction between intergovernmental negotiators and the other stakeholder groups, taking into account that the IGF 2015 Meeting is taking place in November.

It will be, in my view, interesting to think whether IGF cannot contribute towards implementation of that provision [inaudible] in general assembly, but of course that's a subject we need to discuss in the MAG, and we need to discuss also with the negotiators.

So this is very briefly, but I want to say – and my apologies, I need to leave. Chengetai will replace me for the rest of the session. Thank you very much.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:    Thank you, Janis. The next question is for Raul. The Internet Society has initiated the IGF Supporting Association. What is it doing, and is it sufficient to solve the IGF's funding issue?

RAUL ECHEBERRIA:    Thank you very much, Rinalia. You know that for the Internet Society, the IGF is a centerpiece of our strategy with regard to Internet governance. We really believe the IGF should continue being the place where all the stakeholders meet for discussing important things with regard to the Internet governance models.

Of course, we believe in the strengthening IGF and its evolution. In fact, we expect that we'll really achieve important improvements towards IGF 2015 in Brazil.

But one of the things that is important in order to ensure the stability of the IGF is the financial stability. When we think in the context of improving the IGF, even making IGF to produce the kind of outcomes that could be useful for the community, in this kind of process we need a stronger secretariat, or a strong secretariat – but I'm not saying that the current one is not strong. But we need to ensure the secretariat of this is strong, and [inaudible] all the process. For that, the financial stability is very important.

So the Internet Society has promoted this initiative that now is in the hands of the community, and the IGF Support Association was established and launched in Istanbul during the IGF.

There is an executive committee that I am very proud to chair, and there are many colleagues of the executive committee here in the world. I'm seeing and recognizing Tarek Kamel in the first row and Marilyn Cade. I don't know if other colleagues are here in the room.

Now in these first months, we are making some progress, trying to get ourselves organized. We are finalizing all the legal paperwork and all the things related to the bank accounts. We are setting up some [inaudible] mechanics for being able to receive the contributions from individuals. So I think that in the next few weeks, you will see in a more visible way the work of the IGF Support Association since will be ready for starting our work.

With regard to your specific question in the sense if it solves the problems of the needs. If it fits all the needs of IGF in terms of funding, I cannot say that. It depends on how successful we are. We really are

very optimistic that we will succeed not only in raising money, but also in getting more people on board.

There are financial fundraising activities, and also at the same time, an outreach activity, so I think it will produce not only more funding for the IGF, but also more people involved in IGF.

The biggest percentage will be directed to the IGF Secretariat through the usual mechanism used by the UN for that. We are working very closely with the IGF Secretariat and the IGF Chair, Mr. Karklins, in order to ensure that we are well-aligned.

Just for finalizing, I think that the only thing I want to recognize is the work that Markus Kummer has landed, and all the work in setting up this association that now it is [inaudible] by the executive committee.

Thank you.


RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you, Raul. The third and final question on the IGF topic is directed at Olga. What was notable for you with regard to the IGF this year, and were you satisfied with ICANN's engagement and role?


OLGA CAVALLI:     Thank you, Rinalia. Thank you, Nigel, for the kind invitation and for putting this panel together.

ICANN involvement in the Internet Governance Forum is interesting because it has been increasing over time. If I'm not mistaken, the IGF meeting where I personally noted a very important presence, especially

of the ICANN Board, was in [inaudible]. Since that time, then the whole Board and the whole leadership team of ICANN, and of course, the whole community of ICANN, started to participate more and more.

Of course, you know the IGFs are like ICANN meeting. Every year they gather more people and they broaden the engagement of the whole community and of different regions. So this has also been reflected in the IGF.

Many of the people that are involved in ICANN communities and stakeholder groups and SOs and ACs also participate in ICANN. They're like two groups that interface between them. But that is growing very steadily.

In relation with this year in Istanbul, I was really happily surprised to see, for example, a Board member participating in the human rights session that was organized by the Council of Europe and other colleagues. That for me had a special meaning because it's a very important issue for Argentina. Also we're talking about that in the governments and the Governmental Advisory Committee.

Having the Board members of ICANN, such a high leadership, representative of ICANN for me was really enlightening.

We also organized for the second time – the first time was in the ICANN London Meeting – a GAC forum. The one in London was the first one. It went well, but the one that we organized in Istanbul was really very much attended. The room was packed with people.

After we finished, many people came to me and said, "If I would have known this detail and simplified information about the GAC, I would have known what you do much before." So we enjoyed that session.

We repeated it this morning. It went very well. It was a little bit early. Sometimes early sessions are not so well-attended because people are tired, especially after karaoke and such a beautiful night organized by Afilias and [PIR], but I think it was a good session.

So in general, I think that ICANN leadership and the ICANN community is involved very much in IGF. And also, of course, when we talk about ccTLDs and technical community, there is much more present.

Thank you very much.


RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:    Thank you, Olga. And to the panelists, I call your attention to the panel that gives you the rundown on time to keep you on track. Just pay attention to that, and Mandy is also the backup for that if tech fails.

So we move on to the ITU Plenipotentiary Conference topic. I would like to go to Jimson. Jimson, why is this conference important for the Internet community? What would be discussed?


JIMSON OLUFUYE:    Thank you very much, distinguished chair. As a matter of fact, the ITU Plenipot is a very important conference. ITU, as you know, is the oldest UN-specialized agency overseeing telecom and ICT issues and has been around for the past 149 years. So as a matter of fact, next year, they'll be celebrating their 150 years.

ITU has played an important role in connecting people around the world [over these years]. But things have changed, sort of, in the sense that now we have Internet and new technology that is carrying data around the world through TCP/IP. So we have this community, the ICANN community, the multi-stakeholder community, the bottom-up consensus driving the policy-making community.

So this Plenipot community, from next week, October 20th to November 7th, has the potential of taking in some [inaudible] decision in favor of the current mechanism, or against the current mechanism.

[inaudible] talk about against, if we do not have proper coordination or consensus, it could lead to fragmentation. We don't want fragmentation of the Internet. It could also lead to a changed agency of the United Nations.

As we know, in 193 counties, members of ITU make the decision, but they're taking advice really from other stakeholders. But we never can tell. They could decide to [inaudible] into multi-stakeholder organization in line with what we have today in ICANN.

With regards to [substance], in the conference we're looking at the strategy plan of the ITU for the next four years, and also considering the number of resolution – what [inaudible] should also be involved in address allocation, the work ICANN is doing right now, etc., etc.

So it's a fluid meeting – a very, very important meeting. In fact, it's the last IG meeting of this year, and delegations I believe are welcomed from different stakeholders, so think the private sector can join their

government delegation to be right there, and I believe there will be webcasts of the proceedings at the event.

Though the stakeholders like myself in the private sector don't have the ability to speak. We cannot speak there. We can just hear what's going on. That is no good for the Internet. The Internet belongs to every one of us, and everybody must be involved.

That's the [inaudible] message, I want delegates to get today that the [inaudible] Internet of today must not be jettisoned. It must be sustained and reached. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:    Thank you, Jimson. For the next question I would like to go back to Raul. It's because there's a special rule that ISOC is playing here.

Raul, ISOC has a clear agenda for its engagement at the Plenipotentiary Conference. What would success look like in terms of desired outcome for itself and for the Internet community?

RAUL ECHEBERRIA:    Okay. Let me say, first of all, that the role that we are trying to play – because you say we are playing an important role, the role that we are trying to play in the Plenipot is just to help us [inaudible] of Internet technical community, or trying to articulate some of the discussions. But it's nothing else than that.

Of course, we have spent a lot of resources and energy in the work toward the Plenipot in the last few years. Now in fact we are participating with a large delegation in Busan starting this weekend.

What this looks like and the ideal outcome is that the ITU work at the infrastructure layer it means a cross-border connectivity spectrum and telecom standards is [inaudible] don't know expansion of scope of jurisdiction.

Also we would like to see more transparency, collaboration and openness in ITU activities around the world.

This is what in Internet terms would be us [inaudible] in our view. We have worked very much, as I said before on that, and we have engaged during the last couple of years with a lot of conversations with governments and also with ITU, looking for a positive and constructive approach, and offering collaboration, providing opportunities of collaboration with governments and with ITU.

In fact, the statement that probably you already seen – the document that we submitted to the Plenipot and has been kindly accepted by ITU as an informational document – and so with this available to all of the delegations who participated in the Plenipot has this tone of looking for a collaborative approach.

We have also prepared a matrix that is available on our website. Both documents are available on the website that show all the proposals that are being discussed, and how we qualify the proposals in terms of the impact they have on the Internet governance ecosystem.

There are some proposals that came up in the last few months, and those are not minor things. Some look for a more stronger role of ITU from the point of view of the regulatory way in the Internet governance matters.

There are also some other ideas that have already been discussed in the past with regard to the addresses numbering and other things that are things we have to care about, and we are working on that from this constructive perspective that I mentioned before. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you, Raul. I now would like to move on to the topic of WSIS review. Bill, earlier Janis referred to the high-level meeting at the [inaudible] in December 2015. What will happen at this meeting? What are the threats and opportunities of this event in terms of continuity of the IG (Internet governance) agenda and platforms?

BILL DRAKE:     Thank you. I have no idea what will happen, so we'll start there. The General Assembly decided in July 2014 that there would be a two-day high-level meeting the General Assembly to be preceded by an intergovernmental preparatory process, taking into account inputs from relevant stakeholders.

The meeting will held at the highest level in accordance with the rules from the general assembly, and there will be a process for developing and intergovernmentally-agreed outcome document for adoption at the high level meeting of the general assembly that will supposedly take stock and map the way forward with regard to the WSIS processes.

If you read the text, it doesn't really seem dramatically different from something you would have seen from the General Assembly in 2005. To the extent that that's true, those of us who are living in the ICANN-IGF bubble of multi-stakeholder ism may seem progress and collective

**EN**

learning in a lot of interactions, but there are different parts of the governments and different parts to the UN mechanisms that are still working in a very different way, and we have to be very aware of that.

So it's hard to say [exactly] what the play will be on the part of governments that prefer more intergovernmental approaches. Will we be seeing a lot of new proposals for resuscitating ideas about creating new UN bodies or other kinds of mechanisms?

But obviously there will be a lot of tension and strain that will happen because of this. I think one significant difference from 2005, though, is that non-governmental stakeholders lack the whole institutional apparatus that we built up in the WSIS process a decade ago.

I think generally speaking we're not prepared from this. Within stakeholder groups, there's increasing fragmentation, and among stakeholder groups, we don't see – at least some of them; certainly civil society – and among stakeholder groups, we don't see a lot of new coordination efforts and so on. The One Net Initiative really seems to be struggling, to put it mildly, and other efforts to promote dialogue in a coordinated way amongst non-governmental actors really have not gone forward very effectively outside of the ICANN context.

So it's all a bit of a problem. I think people are very maxed out and preoccupied with the serial progression of all these different meetings and processes that they have to track. There are governments and some non-governmental groups that have full-time staff who can follow what's going on and keep their ear close to the ground in New York to hear what the moves are, but the rest of us are kind of outside of it.

We're going to have establish mechanisms to engage and respond effectively in these processes. This could be done in parallel streams of activity. I'd like to see something like the NETmundial kind of process of aggregating inputs from non-governmental actors around the world, perhaps creating a document of our own to review WSIS progress and so on. There could be working groups that would study some of these issues in more detail in the way that the [inaudible] have done.

And there's going to have to be some real effort to resuscitate dialogue among stakeholder groups outside of ICANN. So I definitely support Janis' suggestion of using the IGF as an umbrella mechanism to begin to try to coordinate some dialogue here, and I think once we get past the Plenipot and so on, people are going to have to really engage in this thing because things will start to come fairly quickly once we get into 2015. There is a real risk if we are not on top of what's happening.

I'll stop there. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you, Bill. I'd like to go to Subi, who is on the phone. Subi, if you can hear me, what are your view on the threats and opportunities of this event in terms of continuity of the IG agenda and platforms? It's the same question that I posed to Bill. Go ahead, please.

SUBI CHATERVEDI:          Hi, Rinalia. Can you hear me?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Yes.

SUBI CHATERVEDI: All right. Good afternoon [inaudible].

RINALIA ABDUAL RAHIM: Subi? I'm sorry. I'm sorry to cut you off, Subi. I'm sorry, but I've tried very hard to try to understand you, and the line quality is very bad. If you don't mind – and you should have access to the Internet – if you could type brief points about what you just said and send it in to the staff who was in communication with you, or to the Adobe Connect line for this meeting, that will be really useful. Thank you.

SUBI CHATERVEDI: Sure. I'll do that. Thanks.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Much appreciated. We apologize about the line quality. I'm going to go to Bertrand with the last question for the respondents.

Bertrand, how is WSIS and its review relevant to ICANN? What are your views on the threats and opportunities?

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thanks, Rinalia. As you all know, Internet governance was not at all the initial focus of the creation of the WSIS, but it rapidly became a major topic during the phases of 2003 and 2005. Some say that the major outcome were the creation of the IGF and the definition of Internet governance, if not the only outcome of the WSIS, actually.

Beyond the fact that there was the IGF that was created, there was a general recognition in the drive of those four years of the recognition of the multi-stakeholder approach. It was embedded and enshrined in the definition of Internet governance, and in many places in the document.

I see two tracks for threats and opportunities in the WSIS [inaudible] for ICANN – some that come from within ICANN, and some that come from outside of ICANN.

The first one within ICANN is directly linked to the IANA transition and the way we handle it. There are many other issues, but for sake of time, let's focus on this.

We all know that the question of the role of the United States government in the management of the IANA function, and the relationship with ICANN at the time, which was before the Affirmation of Commitment, was a major bone of contention in the discussions, if not one of the topics that might have derailed the summit.

The NTIA announcement in March this year has clearly changed the game because for the first time, this topic is addressed, which leaves with threats and opportunity. The opportunity is obviously, if we manage this process well, it is a remarkable international problem, which is potentially going away in the international spheres, not that it was so much an operational question, but it was a highly symbolic, political issue that was used for legitimate concerns regarding the inequality of states. But let's be frank, in many cases, it was also used as a political tool that allowed to block a certain number of discussions because of that.

So, opportunity if we manage this process? Well, it is increased credibility, and the problem is that if we don't, it is a major danger. One of the big issues I would like to highlight is, if there are a certain number of governments who do not engage in this process that is managed by ICANN because they don't want to engage, then there will be a possibility for them afterwards to say that they were not participating, and that therefore the result is not appropriate.

So it's almost a call to all the governments who are participating here. It is the benefit of the whole process and to the governments to make sure that all of them, even those who are reluctant, do participate and are heard.

Quickly on the second element, we've talked about the preparation of the WSIS+10. The main danger is that the process will become so much intergovernmental again that actually the WSIS+10 will be less multi-stakeholder than the WSIS ten years ago. We need to be extremely regarding how the balance will be achieved.

One of the things that might be explored is that because the IGF will take place just before, and because in the WSIS the WGIG, which was a multi-stakeholder exercise, was actually producing the best contribution, I think that we might consider having or exploring multi-stakeholder panel discussions that may feed in the IGF and be picked up by the negotiators in the end.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you, Bertrand. Olivier has finally joined us. I will ask him the question that was targeted at him.

Olivier, why is the ITU Plenipotentiary Conference important to ICANN, and should ICANN be involved?

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Yeah, thank you very much, Rinalia. Sorry for being late.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:    It's okay, but please note the time running.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Oh, I'm going to be very fast. It's important for ICANN because it can affect ICANN's operations. It can affect ICANN's future. Ultimately, whilst we all know that the ITU is really supposed to be dealing with matters that are not Internet-related, at least according to the discussions that we had during the World Conference on International Telecommunications in 2012, there was much opposition to the ITU getting involved with these issues.

There certainly have been some member countries that are indicating the fact that they wish to be putting forward some proposals that would ultimately affect Internet operations. We're dealing with some of the allocation of IP addresses, and there might also be some proposals relating to domain names. So this is really one of the big concerns out there.

Now, whether it will ultimately affect ICANN or not is a different story. I think that there is enough gravitas against these recommendations from many other countries, but certainly these topics are on the table, and

we have to be aware of that. Certainly, ICANN has to be aware of this, including all of the other ISTAR organizations.

That's it. 30 seconds.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:    Perfect. Thank you. I love short responses that are substantive.

Okay, I would like to go to the audience now. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free. There is a microphone right here. To the people on the panel, you can respond to the questions or comments if you want to, but it would be good to have as many comments and questions from the audience as possible, so please to allow for that.

Anyone? Oh, and we'll start with a remote question.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:    This is from Mike [Nelson] and he has a question for the panelists on the ITU Plenipotentiary. The question is, "How will the change in the Secretary General affect the agenda, procedures, and priorities of the ITU?"

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:    Can you repeat the question?

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:    The question is, "How will the change in the Secretary General affect the agenda, procedures, and priorities of the ITU?"

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:    Anyone? Who wants to take this? You want to take it? Okay, Raul.


RAUL ECHEBERRIA:    This is just a matter speculation. It's [inaudible] not formal yet because the Plenipot has not started yet. Everybody knows that the next Secretary General will be Houlin Zhao. Houlin Zhao has been in ITU for a long time. He has been really involved in things related to the Internet community. He's a well-known person to all of us.

Really, I don't know how it will affect what ICANN says. How I hope it affects it, I expect that Houlin Zhao works in strengthening the relation between the ITU and the Internet organizations, respecting our respective roles. I think that he has been involved within for enough time to understand the value of the transparency and openness that this community embraces, so I think I really respect that he takes steps in that direction to improve the transparency and openness of ITU, and build together with us a collaborative path for working. That's my wish list.


RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:    Thank you. Jimson wants to jump in. Please go ahead.


JIMSON OLUFUYE:    Yes. Thank you for that question, Mike. It's actually important to note that it's not only the Secretary General position that will be affected. Council election also will happen. Many of the positions will be filled, so you are going to have a new set of leadership.

I want to believe, with the momentum that we're saying in ITU, that we'll continue to make progress in that regard. It's good for the global economy. It's good for the relationship of people around the world. I think [inaudible] leadership, this will progress better. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you, Jimson. Any other questions or comments? Yes, please.

UGO AKIRI:     My name is Ugo Akiri from Nigeria. My comment is not on the IANA transition or the ITU Plenipotentiary or WSIS. It is rather on the corporate governance of ccs. I think it in part of the Internet ultimately. I wish to suggest that a conversation should commence on promoting good corporate governance in ccTLDs, generally, in order to ensure that there are several efforts to promote the growth of the Internet and the adoption of the penetration. Particularly in some areas, it's not [inaudible] willfully, but inadvertently.

This is with particular reference to ccs in Africa. I know it is not particular to Africa, though. So I think there should be sessions to discuss the imperatives of good corporate governance and administration at every level in the next IGF. It is not sufficient to dismiss this or gloss over it on the illusion that it is an internal with specific countries. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you for that comment. Does anybody on the panel want to respond to that? Chengetai? Do you want to come?

CHENGETAI MASANGO:     Sure. Thank you. We are having our first open consultation and MAG meeting on the 1st to 3rd of December, and I do invite you to come to the meeting, and also to submit a paper with your suggestion. I think it's a very good one. The MAG will look at it and may take it up, and it will affect the agenda and schedule of the 2015 meeting. So yes, we do welcome that suggestion. Thanks.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you very much. Any other questions or comments? Yes, please. There's a gentleman on that side.

EPHRAIM KENYANITO:     Hello. My name is Ephraim Kenyanito from Kenya, and with Access [inaudible]. My question regards Resolution 133 of the ITU Plenipotentiary. It talks about the role of administration of member states in the management of internationalized multilingual domain names.

I just wanted to get more take on this, especially since we see a proposal for ITU to have multi-stakeholder discussion on this. I don't know, does that mean that the discussions on this issue at ICANN are not multi-stakeholder enough by this country that proposes this? So it's one of the proposals for next week – the Plenipot. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you. Does anyone want to take this question? Jimson?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:  Well, thank you very much for that question. This is my opinion. I think the value of IGF is quite instructional to us. It's a big lesson that we could learn because IG is [inaudible] to understand better the issues.

So if we have many other fora where we could discuss a number of decisions, I think it is something that is good for the ecosystem, and we should all have an open mind and an open heart to look at the structure of that discussion. It should not be multi-lateral, rather multi-stakeholder, bottom-up, and consensus-driven. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:  Thank you. So what I'm hearing is that we're not proprietary about the multi-stakeholder approach. We actually want to spread it all around the world, and we want every organization to adopt it to enhance their effectiveness and inclusion in the decision-making process.

Any other comments or questions?

Okay. Rather than me asking the panelists – okay, Marilyn, please.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:  There is no mic. There is a mic stand.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:  The microphone is missing up front.

| MARILYN CADE: | Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. I wanted to follow up on the question Ephraim just asked and say that I guess I would give a slightly different response than you did. |

I would say that multi-stakeholder processes are not created equal, and they're not created the same to address every problem. But the concept of multi-stakeholder engagement and open and inclusive engagement needs to be considered in a consultative process, as well as a decisional process, when decisions are taken that affect the public interest.

So it's very possible that in fact that IETF fully meets the criteria of multi-stakeholder, but it's generally engineers that go to the IETF. We practice multi-stakeholder engagement differently at ICANN than we do at the IGF. At the IGF, all parties act on an equal footing.

I would just say as one business person that in fact I don't think that every decision can be addressed in the same way, and I would, for instance, say from my view there are areas where we as citizens have decided to delegate decision-making to governments.

But I think this concept – and I would give an example, for instance, of the role of NATO or Interpol – but I think this concept of multi-stakeholder outreach and engagement is what we are trying to spread around the world.

Ephraim and others may want to comment on this. We need to step back and understand that we may need to take more of a developmental approach in some countries to build not just the stakeholder awareness, but the support for bringing the ability to

participate more down to the local level to then build the multi-stakeholder engagement.

I'm a white girl, in case anyone has missed that, from North America, but I work a lot around the word, and governments in developing countries in many cases have not yet developed for their own use in their country practices and events that allow them to interact with stakeholders. Sometimes that's because stakeholders haven't yet realized that they need to also insist on that interaction.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Marilyn. That's a very valuable comment. Developmental approach is certainly critical in dealing with very complex issues that are global in nature.

Any other comment or questions? Yes, I see a hand up.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you. Matthew Shears, Center for Democracy & Technology. I would like the panel to do a little bit of crystal ball gazing: worst case outcomes of the WSIS high-level event next year, and best case outcomes. What are they, and what are the implications for ICANN.

Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thanks. Bertrand, that was actually your question.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE:   Well, the quick answer is that the worst case outcome is that, for you who have already participated in the last ten years in the production of resolutions in the Commission on Science and Technology for Development every year, we are basically doing ten years. The only content of those resolutions in the rehashing of the documents that have been written in 2005. That's the bad outcome.

If ten years after the WSIS, the governments together, with whatever process, are not able to produce anything more than just putting together a reiteration of everything that has been said ten years ago. This would be a very bad outcome, not only for them, but for all of us.

The positive outcome that I could see is that there will be in any case a sort of process that will produce some sort of this. When you look at the documents in the WSIS, a lot of the paragraphs we don't make reference to really. They are there, but they are not operational.

As I was trying to indicate at the end of my comment, if the process that is driven and managed by the governments potentially takes into account at whatever moment something that will have been prepared on the side to feed in and proposed valued elements – again, picking things that come from NETmundial – it can be a working group on a specific topic that says, "We would like to make a recommendation on this, but this group is multi-stakeholder. It has some government, some private sector, some Civil Society, works in a transparent manner."

And the two paragraphs of the outcome are actually making the reflection moving forward, that would be a great outcome. As Marilyn was saying, not all multi-stakeholder processes need to be the same. You can have an invalidation by the governments in the General

ICANN
LOS ANGELES

Assembly of something that has been prepared through parallel process.

So for me, that would be a great outcome.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you. Raul wants to jump in. Go ahead.

RAUL ECHEBERRIA:     Yes. I would not answer. I will answer the opposite question, maybe. But I feel sometimes that the parts of this community is underestimating the importance of the discussion on WSIS. I think that since it is a pure intergovernmental process, the final decision will be taken at the General Assembly of the UN without the participation of stakeholders [inaudible], not strong involvement.

I think there is a risk being taken decisions not in the best informal way. The impact of those decisions could be big. So I think that this is something that all of us have to pay more attention and try to influence from our respective positions on how to get a little more openness in the process, and talk to their representatives of their countries in New York that this is not a minor thing, that we have spent years going to Geneva, and now the decision and the evaluation of the WSIS will be taken in New York, just with different people than the one that has been participating all the time in this.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you, and that's a very realistic worst-case scenario. Bearing in mind also what Bill said earlier, we are not really prepared to this and

we are not well-coordinated, and it's something that we will need to address together.

Olga, you wanted to say something?

OLGA CAVALLI: Yes. For many things in life, we are never prepared. But we face them. I think this multi-stakeholder should not be taken as a concept, but more as a process. If some of us – or perhaps hopefully many of us – can engage in a constructive dialogue among our colleagues and among our other stakeholders that are in our environment, this process will be much enriched by the whole participation and the outcomes will be much better.

We all must be open-minded, not only the governments. Sometimes I feel that some constituencies or some interest groups or some stakeholders – [inaudible] government – sometimes are very also closed to engaging in a more open dialogue with even governments.

So I encourage everyone in this process to be as flexible as possible and as open as possible, because in my modest opinion, this is the way to face this new challenge that is brand new, and if we engage, it will be much better for all of us. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. Yes, a question in the back.

DOUG BARTON:

Hi. My name's Doug Barton, and I'm speaking only for myself. Bertrand, with respect, I have to disagree with you on two points in relationship to your definition of a worst-case scenario.

First I think if your version of a worst-case scenario is that nothing happens, I think that ignores some really obvious dangers that the WSIS process poses to the multi-stakeholder model. I think that there are some significant actions that could be taken by the UN and by individual governments or groups of governments that would be extremely damaging to that process. I think we have to realistically look at that as a worst-case scenario, and be prepared and work towards avoiding that outcome.

Secondly, and more humorously, in the United States, we have a saying in regards to politics. It refers to gridlock. That happens when politicians can't agree and can't move anything forward. That's not necessarily a bad thing. Oftentimes, the fact that politicians don't get together and create an action benefits the people that they claim to represent.

So those are my two points of disagreement. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:

Thank you very much. Did you want to comment?

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE:

I do not fundamentally disagree with you. I may have downplayed the risk of actual agreement that is detrimental. The reason why I didn't mention it so much is because I believe that, given the stake of the discussion at the international level, if there is a split, and there is real

disagreement, we will get into the second point you're making, i.e. there will be a gridlock that will be reproducing the things that we're seeing in all the meetings that have taken place in the last ten years.

I do not see, honestly, in the UN General Assembly, unless there is a decision that is making the review by a majority vote, and we saw what it produced in the WCIT, I do not see any possibility – but maybe I'm too strong an optimist – but no possibility that an agreement among all governments would be detrimental because there will be no agreement. There will be a gridlock in my view.

But again, I might be optimist. What I think is the worst-case scenario is just the continuation in the international environment of a lot of time wasted in negotiating documents that are useless. Here I speak with all my former colleagues [inaudible] French representative: the nights, the days, and the months spent for documents that are filed the moment they're signed is a waste of not only taxpayer money, but also intellectual capacity.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you. We now have deciphered Subi's remarks about WSIS, and Nigel will read it out for us.

NIGEL HICKSON:     Thank you, madam chair. These are the remarks that Subi tried to make to us earlier.

"While the ongoing efforts to include a diversity of opinions are appreciated, they leave a lot to be desired. Yes, we hear a lot about

high-level, and that's only part of the problem. While the efforts to engage with the governments are appreciated, this meeting will decide the future of a multi-stakeholder initiative called the IGF amongst other things, and the decision taken will be through a high-level intergovernmental process." She's referring the UN General Assembly resolution.

"While there must be respect and engagement for the Tunis Agenda, both phases, Geneva and Tunis, there is some evolution which has happened as far as the IG ecosystem is concerned. While governments are increasingly engaging with Internet and IG issues, it is mostly responsive. First an issue crops up, and then a solution needs to be mapped. The gaps in understanding exist because a lot of them are neither deployers, creators, or lead users of the technology, which links countries and continents.

"Hence the importance of a multi-stakeholder participation, a review of what was envisioned as rightful roles and responsibility of stakeholder groups back in 2005, and a clear mandate as an opportunity.

"Mapping the fragmented IG ecosystem is also important. Paragraph 72 specifically speaks to the question of capacity-building enhancing and facilitating developing countries' participation. Women and gender are also two issues which need more deliberation.

"While the MDG 2015 are missed opportunities, the SGDs 2015 must include the Internet as a goal. Universalization of broadband and the quality and nature of access are important points of deliberation."

"While countries may not agree on specific issues, freedom of information and human rights remain both important and contested. But there was unanimous support for the continuity of the IGF, and a clear definition of the relationship it has with the UN.

"There is much hope from the review process, but the next billion users are waiting and hopeful, and I speak for the margins, the minorities, and for connecting the unconnected so that we may have more of us in the room, and the quality they align or the cost of participation doesn't become deliberative. Thank you for the listening."

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:    Thank you. Thanks, Subi, for her remarks. I'd like to wrap up this part of the program with a 30-second final thought from the panelists. You've heard a lot. You've heard from each other. Give us your final thoughts, starting with Olivier.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:    Thank you very much, Rinalia. When listening to Internet governance-related discussions, I often wonder whether there really is a threat of countries cutting themselves off the Internet, of the whole Internet falling apart and going back to what it was before: life before the Internet.

Throughout the 90s, I have I guess tracked Internet connectivity, from '93 until '98, which was the time when there was a real growth of the Net worldwide. We never imposed the Internet on anyone – we as in the Internet community. We never imposed DNS on anyone, but it's

ICANN
LOS ANGELES

used because it works. We never imposed a multi-stakeholder model on anyone, but it flourished because it works.

So when I hear that there are threats, whether at WCIT, whether in the future WSIS+10 process, or whether it is at the Plenipot that's coming up, I always wonder whether these threats are actually real or not.

A few countries in the world do not have the Internet. They don't. Very few. But the ones that don't are not exactly the flourishing countries that one would be imagining. I think that the majority of countries out there, if not all of the ones that are on the Internet today, see that there is a real economic benefit to be on there.

So I would say don't be worried about the worst-case scenario, but ultimately there were a lot of worries before WCIT 12, and ultimately we ended up with the status quo. Did it change us? Did it change the Internet? Did it change anything? No.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you. I think you caught up with the time that you gave up in your initial comment. Chengetai?

CHENGETAI MASANGO:     Thank you very much. My parting words is just that the coming year is a very important year for Internet governance, and the power is also in our hands to stay engaged and make sure that the outcome is something that we want. So I encourage you all to stay engaged within all the processes – the IGF, the WSIS, and ICANN as well – just to make sure that the outcome is [inaudible]. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you. Olga?

OLGA CAVALLI:     Thank you. Thank you very much, and I agree with Olivier and Chengetai. I think we are facing changing times and challenging times, but at the same time, I think it's the effect of the Internet that connects us all and brings us so many new opportunities of thinking, developing and learning.

I think it's a great time to use this magnificent tool and engage, as I said before, in a constructive dialogue. Try to be open. Try to be calm, and nothing wrong will happen if we can all think in the right way and towards better things. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Raul?

RAUL ECHEBERRIA:     Okay. 2015 IGF is key. We have to achieve a very successful IGF. For doing that, we need to improve IGF. We need to look for innovative approaches, based among other things on the lessons learned from NETmundial.

This is a world that starts today. There is an open consultation in December. Decisions have to be taken there. ITU and WSIS are [equivalent] in terms of challenges. We claim for more openness,

ICANN
LOS ANGELES

transparency, and collaboration in order to expand the ITU mandate and that sort. Let's work together.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Bertrand?

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: On a larger level, the Internet was based on the notion of trust, cooperation, cross-border approach, and a global reach, and mechanisms for security or for solving tensions come afterwards as a result of problems that emerge.

The problem we're confronted with is that the traditional mode on interaction among governments – and it is not a moral judgment; it's a factual judgment – is based on the separation of sovereignties on the fundamental notion of mistrust by default and cooperation to build trust, and to potentially co-create when needed.

The legal system is a fundamentally fragmented environment. The trust and multi-stakeholder architecture for the governance of the infrastructure of the Internet is still prevalent and still respected and imposing itself.

When we begin to talk about legal aspects regarding the governance on the usage of the Internet, we get into the difficulty of reconciling this dimension of the fundamental, fragmented architecture among governments, and the necessarily cooperation.

I think this is the biggest challenge, and I still hope that the next year will be the moment where this combination and this coexistence will

become possible because so far they've been operating a bit in a tension.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Jimson?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:     Thank you. Two quick comments. In response to Ugo's question or comment concerning corporate governance I think is a very valid point and is a message for IGF's Secretariat. We need to find a way of linking national, regional, and global IGF more closely for a standout governance framework.

Lastly, I think governments are listening because they are part of us, and they deserve the wellbeing of the people. So it's now [inaudible] for all stakeholders engage [inaudible]   ITU basically is opening up and listening, so it's just to encourage us to also engage, and engage and engage. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you. Bill?

BILL DRAKE:     I'd say my priority concern would be that we take seriously the NETmundial statement language on strengthening the IGF, and move towards doing something creative and sustainable, and actually productive with regard to intercessional work, focus on a few tractable issues that could then be the subject of global input, and then a focused

discussion on one day out of the four days in Brazil last year, where perhaps we could either get if not a sense of the room recommendation, at least a report out on "some actors feel this, and some actors feel that" in a way that's structured and useful.

I would love to see the IGF taken seriously and built out more. There's many other things I could say, but there's no time.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:    Thank you. Please join me in thanking the panelists, and after that, we will start Part 2.

[applause]

May I invite the presenters for the next session to please come forward?

There is a mystery content with regard to this part of the presentation. I am also quite curious to see what comes up. The umbrella of the discussion is emerging models of collaboration in distributed Internet governance ecosystem.

We have three panelists. Bertrand de la Chapelle you know. I have already introduced him, so I will introduce the other two gentlemen. The gentleman on my left is Virgilio Fernandes Almeida. He is Secretary of Information Technology Policies of Brazil's Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation, Chair of the Internet governance Committee in Brazil (CGI). He served as the Chairman of the NETmundial meeting in Sao Paulo.

On my right is new to me. Urs Gasser is the Executive Director of the Berkman Center for Internet and Society at Harvard University. He's also Professor of Practice at Harvard Law School, and I think he has a rather interesting presentation to share with us.

In terms of order of presentation, Virgilio will go first, Urs will go second, and Bertrand will wrap it us for us. With that, I will hand it over to Virgilio, whom I believe will talk to us about the journey since NETmundial and what is the follow-up.

VIRGILIO FERNANDES ALMEIDA: Okay. Thank you, Rinalia, for the introduction. Well, the title of this session is "2015 and Beyond." However, I will not try to predict the future. Instead, I'm going to highlight some important facts and events from the past that will help us as the community to construct the future for Internet governance beyond 2015.

In order to do that, I think that what I'm going to say is going to be based on my personal experience with Internet governance in Brazil, so I'm going to present some facts related to the experience of Brazil in the context of Internet governance.

So that's the Brazilian roadmap for Internet governance. It started 20 years ago when the cgi.br, the Internet Steering Committee, was created by a presidential decree. It is a multi-stakeholder body that has been in place for 20 years. So we have a lot of history and a lot of experience.

Another important event in this roadmap was the construction of the principles for Internet use and governance, and that was constructed by

the members of CGI interacting with their constituencies and interact with the society. That was approved by all the members of the CGI.

Then finally in 2011, the Marco Civil, which is the civil rights framework, was sent to Congress. It has some interesting aspect that I will show later.

Finally in 2014, we had NETmundial in Brazil. I think these are the events that mark the evolution of Internet governance in Brazil.

The CGI, as I said, was created in 1995, with the goal of proposing policies and procedures, recommending the standards, establishing strategic directives, promoting studies and technical standards, coordinating the allocation of Internet addresses, promoting specialized research, and collecting, organizing and disseminating information.

But what is interesting about this governance body is its formation. It consists of 21 members: 9 from governments, 4 from the Civil Society, 4 from the private sector, and 4 from academia and the technical community. No single stakeholder has the majority of the votes, so it means that everything must be negotiated among the members of the Board. So that's a real important point.

The second important aspect of CGI is that CGI is not funded by government. The budget of CGI is based on the revenue of domain names in the context of .br. So that's the source of revenue for CGI, so it does not depend on government funds.

That's the legal framework for the Internet in Brazil. We have the CGI principles for governance and the use of the Internet. We have a law that provides open access to information. We have the principles for the

**EN**

Web. We have the civil rights framework for the Internet, and now as a government, we are going to start the process of discussing private and personal data law. So that's basically the main components of the legal framework in Brazil.

The Marco Civil defines principles, rights and responsibilities for citizens, companies, and government agencies. It has some specificities that were considered [advanced] for the process. There were several public consultations through the Internet to construct the proposal of the law. So it was characterized by the participation of the Society to construct the law.

The bill was inspired by the principles of CGI, and in 2009, we had online consultation and it was based on an open source platform. Finally, the law was sanctioned by the president during NETmundial.

The keys points are rights and principles, data retention, net neutrality, and intermediary liability. Important value. It minimizes legal uncertainty for the Internet environment in Brazil. The regulation is not completely done yet, but it will be completed soon.

So then it comes to NETmundial. That's the chronology of events. It started in September of 2013, when the President of Brazil gave a speech at the United Nations, and she asked for discussions for a new order for Internet governance.

After that, there was the Montevideo meeting, which involved several Internet societies, and finally, we started a process – I have five or ten minutes?

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Five.


VIRGILIO FERNANDES ALMEDIA: Five. Some I'm going to skip several of these things. So the goals of NETmundial principles and roadmaps. I'm going to skip that.

So what do we have for the future? I think that the future should, in my personal view, look at the points that are present in the roadmap for the evolution of Internet governance. So we have the importance of strengthening the IGF. We have the importance of getting complete results from the IANA transition. We learned a lot of things from the NETmundial experience, in particular that the multi-stakeholder is an important way for the future of Internet governance.

So what comes next? NETmundial, based on the roadmap, should fit into other Internet government processes and forums – Busan, IGF 2015. Innovations introduced in NETmundial should be considered by IGF 2015.

There is the NETmundial Initiative. Also important issues related to Internet governance talks, such as security, stability, and cyber security should be considered in the future.

But I think that for me, the most important aspect of the future is to strengthen national bodies for Internet governance in light of the NETmundial principles because if we have a system of national bodies that work and represent the society of different countries, that will be the basis to construct a global Internet governance system.

So I think I'm going to stop here. Just this last slide is that almost all discussions about the Internet in Brazil starts inside the Internet Steering Committee, the CGI, and then some of them can become law when they are adopted by the Congress to discuss as a project.

Then they can also feed in the global Internet governance process. So I think that, as I said, the importance of having strong, national bodies for Internet governance. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you, Virgilio, and I appreciate that he has to squeeze a ten-minute presentation into five or so. That was a misunderstanding on the organizers' part. I'm looking at you, Nigel.

Anyway, let's go to Urs. I looked into the crystal ball and believe that you're going to tell us about models of distributed Internet governance. Would that be correct?

URS GASSER: Well, partly. First of all, thanks so much for having me here. I'm delighted to share a few reflections and thoughts on the role of academia in the debates about the future of Internet governance going into 2015.

Academia and academic values, as you all know, have played a key role in the development of the Internet – the protocol stack in particular, of course – but we also see still today some of the core values of academia reflected in the Internet governance ecosystem. Bertrand also made the point that openness, trust and collaboration are of course values and go

ICANN
LOS ANGELES

back to the academic environment, where parts of the Internet were developed.

Against this backdrop, I would like to make two key points upfront, and hope to have some time to explain them further over the next few minutes.

The first point is I'd argue that now is a good time to renew the commitment of academia to contribute systematically and from diverse perspectives to the debates about the future of Internet governance.

The second point is I'd like to propose an enhanced role of academia going forward, which builds up on a generalized and strategic vision regarding the function of research, education, and facilitation, with an emphasis on interdependence, rigor, and global participation.

I will describe in a minute what I mean by "enhanced role of academia," but first, why should we reimagine the role of academia, and why now? The short answer is because there is need and because there is opportunity.

Let's treat opportunity first. Since the early days of Internet governance, the world of course has dramatically changed and so has the academic environment, believe it or not. When ICANN started, to take just an example, only a handful of academics engaged in what we call today Internet studies or Internet governance studies. Some actually are in the room today here.

Today of course, Internet studies, and Internet governance studies in particular, have become a separate field. We have now chairs, journals, diplomas, and dedicated centrists dealing with these issues.

But perhaps more importantly, we see more and more young people – Masters students and PhD students from all disciplines – interested in this area of research and work, who also share an increased interest in commitment to interdisciplinary studies.

We also see an increasingly diverse community of young scholars working together, including young women and amazing young people from the Global South. Again, a number of them are here in this room today.

I'd argue that this generation shift and increased diversity, as well as the interdisciplinary, and the new institutional homes provide a unique opportunity for coordinated and sustained academic collaboration that we should harness.

In other words, we have a chance to approach old and new Internet governance questions with fresh eyes from different and more diverse perspectives, with new motivation, new creativity, and new leverage.

But it's not only the opportunities. It's also an increased and pressing need that calls for a re-imagination of the role of academia. We all acknowledge that the Internet environment has become more complex and that the stakes are much higher, and the issues often more contested.

In such an environment, it's particularly important to build up on the great work of the early scholars and expand and accelerate the efforts and work towards institutional approaches and develop global capacity.

Now, what do I mean by enhanced role of academia? I already mentioned some of the key elements: institutional approach, systematic

and sustainable engagement with scalability in mind, introduced to plenary research and building global capacity development with focus on Global South, bringing in new perspectives and talents.

An example in this category is the recently-launched Global Network of Interdisciplinary Internet and Society Research Centers that brings together over 30 centers in a bottom-up way, more than one-third from the Global South, with many young researchers and women working on Internet and society issues.

One of the initiatives we're currently working on actually is a global research initiative that we see very much as a proof of concept or a pilot looking into distributed and collaborative Internet governance groups in particular. So we're studying based on a diverse use of case studies how distributed governance models and mechanisms work, how such groups are formed, how they operate, and how effective they are.

We hope to present and share the case studies together with a [inaudible] document, as well as a takeaway piece and lessons learned early next year.

We hope that this kind of research is not only a proof of concept of a global academic network, but also shows the kinds of contributions academia can make as we go forward and implement some of the NETmundial principles and reports that fall out from there.

So in a sense we see this initial pilot also as a contribution to the NETmundial Initiative as it is in the making, and I would be happy of course to share more details, but we are running out of time here.

So let me just conclude by saying how excited I am, personally as well as together with my colleagues, that we have this opportunity to think hard about what we can do for Internet governance, and not only what Internet governance can do for us. Thank you.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you very much, Urs. Now I understand why Bertrand is speaking last. It's because he is being asked to comment on what has been said by Virgilio and Urs.

So Bertrand, tell us about the added value of NETmundial, its follow-up, and the initiatives that Urs has mentioned. How would this support Internet governance?

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Well, the thing is that the NETmundial was probably the first illustration of a process that in a short period of time has produced a formal document adopted by a group of actors, including governments and other principle of rough consensus.

To be frank and to give credit where credit is due, UNESCO in the WSIS+10 process that they organized already did in a very short time the co-drafting of a document, but it didn't have the same kind of amplitude that the NETmundial, nor the amplitude in terms of consultation that the NETmundial produced.

The reason why this is important is the following. I usually make, as many people know, a distinction between governance of the Internet and governance on the Internet. ICANN, RIRs, and all the entities in the

ISTAR community are basically dealing with the governance of the Internet – the names, the numbers, the protocols, etc.

The big challenge is the governance on the Internet, and the governance on the Internet is everything that people do with the Internet. That includes issues of freedom of expression, privacy and whatever you may think.

The reason that NETmundial and the IGF are important is because we have the instruments basically for governance of the Internet, and in particular we have the instruments for framing issues, developing recommendations – it can be standards, it can be recommendations, it can be law, or whatever. You have the mechanisms for validating those things, for implementing them, and reviewing.

On the governance of the Internet, the [inaudible] is not perfect. It can be improved. It should be improved. But it is almost complete.

But if you think about a matrix that takes those five stages that I just mentioned with two lines of governance off the Internet and governance on the Internet, most of the boxes up there are empty. You have just a tick box in the two first things, where a little bit of the issue framing is done by the IGF and it still has the potential to go further.

The only part where we have had on the governance on the Internet some kind drafting, here's the test that NETmundial has done. It is a proof of concept. It has shown that it is doable, provided that there is a framework and a process, a convener that is playing the mutual role, and a multi-stakeholder process that has been experimented, and I

think has established a certain number of principles or methodologies that people will be reusing.

But the key problem is that on all the other things afterwards, drafting other types of regimes that are operational, and the roadmap of NETmundial has not highlighted a timeline, but topics. And in particular, there are some topics like net neutrality. There was surveillance and there were other issues. I know that jurisdiction was among them.

The topics are identified, but we don't have the instruments to develop regimes in that regard. This is where the connection with what Urs was saying is important because we need to have systems that develop regimes for governance on the Internet that function exactly the same way in a distributed, multi-stakeholder , bottom-up manner that the institutions for the governance of the Internet have been built.

So we need another layer of the ecosystem that is not one single institution that says we now are going to deal with everything, from privacy to freedom of expression and the rest.

The problem is a need, and this is what Urs was alluding to. There's a need for what I call issue-based governance networks. The report from the panel chair [inaudible] has taken the name of distributed governance groups.

Whatever the name, the notion is that for solving issues that are related to the governance on the Internet, we need the same kind of methodology that is aggregating the relevant actors around the topic on an issue-by-issue basis, and allowing them to develop things, to frame the issue, to draft something, to validate, etc.

The problem – and I'll finish with that – is that those two pioneering elements are pointing towards the need for an overarching framework that explains or develops how certain initiatives are going to be catalyzed and supported.

I would remiss if I didn't mention that. A certain number of you know that I run this Internet and Jurisdiction Project, which tries to be a test bed for search mechanisms.

How to identify the relevant stakeholders, how to make them work together, how to avoid duplication and overlap with other initiatives, and how to find the financing past so that the resources humanly and monetarily are sufficient is a big challenge.

So the connection between the two is that I credit on a personal basis NETmundial for having established once and for all that when people want to do a co-drafting in a multi-stakeholder manner, it is possible provided that the desire is there and that the convener is facilitating.

Second, what Urs is alluding to is the importance of academia to have information that supports the processes so that all development of regimes are fact-based. So I think the two go together.


RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you for clarifying the link, which I think was very well done. We have only a short amount of time because we have to wrap up at 6:15.

But if you have quick comments and questions, please flag them now. I'll take a few in a row so that the panelists can respond.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:     I'm sorry. We had a comment from one of the remote chat rooms. This is from Alejandro Pisanty, who says that, "National bodies for Internet governance is one possible approach. It mostly goes against the cross-border nature of the Internet, negates its benefits, and goes against the proven problem-solving as-needed-form-follows-function history and forecasts future of Internet governance mechanisms and approaching which one or few countries as such mediate relationships is contrary to the proven benefits of multi-stakeholder engagement, and turns the clock backwards 40 years, back to an intergovernmental, multilateral approach that has accumulated failures for over four decades."

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you. I'd like to hear from Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE:     Thank you. Thank you for your comments, but I guess I'm feeling a little bit like I had a truth in advertising crisis here.

I expected, because most of us expected, to get an update on the NETmundial Initiative, and I think you owe that to us, or Fadi owes it to us, or somebody owes it to us, and I suspect if I ask for a show of hands in the room that it wasn't just me that expected that. So maybe we could get an update on the NETmundial Initiative.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you. Would someone like to address that? Virgilio, please.

VIRGILIO FERNANDES ALMEIDA: The NETmundial meeting was a one-time initiative that produced one document with two classes of results: principles and roadmap. So it finishes there.

So now we want to see how these principles can be adopted by Internet governance bodies, by international bodies that are responsible for Internet governance.

So the idea of NETmundial Initiative is not to have another conference. It's not to have another event like NETmundial. It's to construct or to propose the construction of an open platform that will function as a clearinghouse that will have on one side, issues, and on the other side, solutions.

So we had a fruitful discussion with Fadi. When I say "we," we were several members of the Board of the CGI, the Brazilian Internet Steering Committee. After this discussion two days ago, the suggestion that we made was, "Let us work on platform," that, as I said, will function as a clearinghouse. There will be in this first [stage] no coordination council. There will be at list of contributors that we call them in the meeting ambassadors of NETmundial principles. That's going to be open to people to register to become a part of this list.

Then we are going to start to construct what will be the organization of this platform. But in the beginning, it's going to be just a platform, and it's going to be open to everyone that wants to participate.

Then these people that will be participating will define what services are available and how this platform will work. That's basically what we have decided in this meeting two days ago.

In the next two weeks, we should have a document with these ideas that will be publically available. That's basically what we have.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you. We probably have only one question that we can accommodate within the time, so Milton, it's yours.

MILTON MUELLER:     Okay. Is this on? Good. Yeah, Milton Mueller, Syracuse University. I just wanted to address this alleged reimagining of the Internet governance studies that's going on. I think it kind of, in some ways, demeans what's been going on for a while to talk about it that way because I don't see any generational gap here. What I see is a growing field, an expanding field, that started with a few people, like myself and Bill Drake, who were active academics doing studies.

Then more and more people just come up to us and say, "I want to study this. I want to get involved in this. It's academically interesting." We started GigaNet back in 2006 right after WSIS, and we got, again, a growing sort of crowd of independent academics.

There is, however, some kind of divide that I do see developing in the field, and that might be what you would call, or what someone from the Frankfurt School used to call "between critical and administrative academic research." That is, people who are somewhat independent and critically aligned with these institutions, trying to make them better by actively investigating and criticizing what they're doing, and then people who are more funded by the players in the game who are seeking certain kinds of research to support one case or the other. I

think that might be a more interesting way to talk about the growth of the field.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM:     Thank you, Milton. Urs, would you like to comment on that?

URS GASSER:     Well, I think I tried to make the point that we're building up on the great work that many of the early academics have been doing. I will be happy to discuss in greater detail the questions around fundraising or funding of the work in this area.

I think it's a valid question. We have big research questions and big problems. Obviously, even after ten or 15 years of studying them, we haven't come up with the final answer. Otherwise, we wouldn't sit here. So there's definitely need for more research, which is the good news.

And how do we go after those? I think that's a valid question. What we're trying to do is to approach these questions through a network to model of collaboration that also incorporates diversity of viewpoints, something I'm sometimes missing attending certain academic meetings on Internet governance.

Obviously, you've been part of these conversations and can report back how we're doing in listening to people who have different viewpoints.

So I don't see kind of a tension between what you're saying, but we'd love to discuss in greater detail the founding challenges that I think academia faces when dealing institutionally with big questions that are

of societal relevance. That's certainly not something that is limited to Internet governance.

Whether you think about public health, or medicine or any other area, you have similar questions. Where do we get funding from to do basic research and applied research? So that's an interesting conversation to have. I agree.

RINALIA ABDUL RAHIM: Thank you. We come to the end of our session. I did say we need to have a hard stop at 6:15, but I acknowledge Marilyn's question that a lot of people are interested in the follow-up to NETmundial, specifically under the umbrella of NETmundial Initiative. I myself am interested in that, so I think we need to convey this to the organizers and say, "Please make sure that the information is shared with the community. If it is ready, that would be much appreciated."

Please join me in thanking the panelists.

[applause]

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**