
DURBAN – Internet Governance Update
Monday, July 15, 2013 – 16:30 to 18:30
ICANN – Durban, South Africa

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: We're going to start the session in a few minutes. If you want to come a little built closer, that would be more congenial, pleasant, so that we can actually see who we're talking to. Please come closer. There's a lot of room in the very nice seats in the front. The most expensive seats are still available.

Okay. So please, please, take your seats. You found it? Please sit down. So good afternoon, everybody. Please take -- take your seats. We're going to start momentarily. This session, as you've seen on the -- on the agenda, is called Internet Governance Update. My name is Bertrand de la Chapelle, by the way. I'm one of the board members, and I'm happy to be moderating this session. Internet Governance Update is basically an opportunity at each ICANN meeting to paint a little bit the landscape outside of the ICANN space for people who are following mostly the activities of ICANN to understand better what is happening outside. I want to highlight immediately that the goal is not to tell you you should be participating in those processes. It's fine if you do. But that's not the purpose. The purpose is mainly to explain how the environment is evolving and what are the trends outside that may impact ICANN or what are the discussions that are taking place that are discussing about ICANN sometimes.

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.

So on the panel today from the end over there, a few people you know that I'm very happy to have on the panel. Bill Drake, Jeff Brueggeman, Anriette Esterhuysen, Romulo Neves, Markus Kummer. We have Jimson Olufuye remotely. I hope he hears us, and we'll also have Nii Quaynor joining us afterwards.

So without further ado, I want to break out the session, as indicated in the agenda, in basically three legs. One is to have a look at the few events that happened in the last few months. Some of you may have heard about the World Conference On International Telecommunications, the WCIT that took place in Dubai. There were other meetings afterwards. In Paris at UNESCO, in Geneva for the so-called WTPF, the World Telecom Policy Forum. Then there has been the CSTD, the Commission On Science and Technology for Development, in Geneva. And those meetings have had different ambiances or different results.

We then look at the perspectives in the coming months or years because there are a few meetings again that will take place, it's an almost ongoing traveling circus, as we say. And there will be some important development -- events including the plenipotentiary of the ITU at the end of 2014 and the so-called WSIS+10, wherever that is, in 2015. And then finally, in the third -- third leg, we want to explore a little bit further a concept that has been addressed consistently and repeatedly in the environment of the World Summit On Information Society and the years afterwards and the WSIS follow-up, which is the term "enhanced cooperation" which was pretty controversial and which I believe is moving into a more common understanding acceptance at the moment. But maybe the panelists will say it differently.

Maybe I will start by launching a general -- a general question. Most if not all of you have participated in some of the events that I've mentioned in the last few months or follow them, be it the WCIT, the WSIS+10, the CSTD, and so on. What is your feeling regarding the ambiance, the environment? The WCIT was perceived as a strong tension. Has the tension subsided in a certain way or not? Who wants to raise his hand and start as the first one? Don't rush.

[Laughter]

Jeff.

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN:

Someone's got to start. You know, I think, speaking for myself, I remain very concerned. I think there are a lot of reasons to think that both some of the political divisions that occurred at the WCIT seem to be continuing, although the rhetoric has calmed down somewhat. And then another important point, and you framed this panel around, the WSIS+10 process is going to continue and that means that we're going to have a variety of U.N. proceedings over the next few years on these issues. So that raises the potential for reopening everything, including potentially the original WSIS text that we've been operating under for the past ten years. So, you know, with all of that said, I think there's reason to be concerned.

On the other hand, we have time to continue to build on what were some of the successes that I think we saw from WCIT which is that we actually can show the strength of the multistakeholder process in organizations like ICANN which are working every day to improve

themselves and we also can build allies and find ways to address the real issues that were discussed at the WCIT in ways that, you know, preserve the structure and the multistakeholder (indiscernible) and actually demonstrate that it is working for all countries of the world and all stakeholders who have an interest in these things.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Markus, you wanted to follow up.

MARKUS KUMMER: Yes, I agree with Jeff, I think the rhetoric has calmed down a little bit.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: No cold war anymore, no digital cold war anymore.

MARKUS KUMMER: I think most people coming out of Dubai realized that it was necessary to calm down a little bit and after -- well, since Beijing we had the WTPF and I think there it was obvious that people wanted to fight back to a more constructive dialogue and the ITU secretary general himself was calling for -- called for building bridges among the different countries and positions, and I think it was a positive event in achieving that and going forward now the IGF has it's main theme also building bridges and I sense that many participating in the preparatory process of the IGF really want to have constructive approach and turn the IGF into a forum that can address these questions, delegation. And in Dubai the question there was, is a treaty indeed the best way to address these concerns. We think maybe not. Maybe sharing of best practices, exchange of

information is more conducive to finding solution, but the discussions will go on. As outlined we have more meetings to come, WSIS+10, there's the plenipot next year. But I would caution, I would not call it a competition between organizations. It is rather -- there are some governments who have a different vision who are less familiar with the multistakeholder approach and they're pushing for more governmental approach, as a classical intergovernmental approach, as it is normal in the United Nations system. And here we have work to do. We have to convince countries, reach out to them, explain why the multistakeholder system is best suited for the Internet. There's collective work ahead of us.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Just for those who are not familiar with that acronym, I should have indicated that WTPF, at the World Telecom Policy Forum that took place in Geneva but organized by the ITU as well. I'll give the floor to Anriette, but I wanted to ask not a provocative question but it seems to me that in the last few months there is this trend towards multistakeholderization of existing organization like everybody's trying - - sorry for the awful word -- but every organization is trying to demonstrate that they are more open, that they are including more actors. Is it just cosmetic or is it a real trend? Anriette and you can say what you wanted to say before.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I think that's an interesting question. And I think part of the tension is around the dynamic between these events and what these events are about and what -- and whether they fall within the soft power domain

or the hard power domain or somewhere in between the spectrum. And I think the event before WTPF was the IGF. That was not long before WTPF, and IGF is a classical open, inclusive soft power space where there's a lot of debate and disagreement but is generally quite constructive. But that's also because the IGF is not a negotiating forum. And then you have the WTPF in Dubai which became very divisive and where there was a real rift between developing countries and developed countries, or some developing countries and some developed countries. And there was an intensity around that engagement between governments as well as intensity around the legitimacy or the role of non-governmental stakeholders and whether they should be in the room or out the room and under what conditions, as part of governmental delegations or as ITU members. So it was actually a very fraught event. I participated remotely. So maybe it's easier to pick up on dynamics as a remote participant than when you're sitting in the room.

And I think this is one of the challenges of the multistakeholder process. I think both at a process level and at an institutional level. And maybe that relates to your question, as well. I think there's a general drive to be more open. I think there's a general commitment or recognition that multi -- that the Internet and Internet policy should take place in a multistakeholder way because the Internet is run and used and developed by different stakeholder groups. But when it comes to actual institutional processes and negotiations of agreements, it's not so easy any longer. And then that openness is challenged, either from without or within. I mean, an example of this is that after the World Telecommunications Policy Forum in Geneva, which was very inclusive

and open and with very constructive debate, civil society requested the ITU council working group to allow it to participate in the next phase, and that request was denied. So I think the process is still being negotiated. And I think we haven't seen the end of the tensions. And even if that -- that moment of Dubai, that moment of divisiveness has been diffused and things are in a constructive space again, it doesn't necessarily mean it's going to stay that way. It depends on what is at stake when the stakeholders get together to negotiate.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: And it depends on the type of document or outcome they want. Romulo, do you want to make a comment?

ROMULO NEVES: Thank you, Bertrand. Very quick comment on that. I would like to use your two words "tension" and "trend" to try to make an analogy with the Brazilian unrest we had a month ago, 40 days ago. For those in the Brazilian government or in the Brazilian local governments who are interested in keeping the -- the same situation, the unrest meant a very challenging situation. Challenging new thing that maybe not too many people understand what is it. I don't know if I understand. But a lot of people saw that kind of unrest as an opportunity to make some evolution in the Brazilian political system, to change some things that maybe were not so good, were not so positive, and maybe I would like to bring this kind of thought to this environment here. Yeah, there was a lot of tension. Not only during the WCIT time but before and before and before and afterwards as well. But I don't think we need to be scared of this.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Does that mean -- sorry to interrupt you. Does that mean you feel that the fact that there was a sort of clash in Dubai was beneficial to bring people back to a desire to cooperate?

ROMULO NEVES: Exactly. But I'm not talking only about Dubai. I'm talking about conflicts. Not clash but conflicts of interest that instead of bringing people apart, it can bring people to a better understanding of the other side, of other interests, of other needs. So okay. I'm speaking from my personal point of view, but I'm -- I think and this is a Brazilian way to see it, that the conflicts may bring us to the middle -- in the middle but it's very important and useful to understand the other -- the others and understand the needs of the other stakeholder. And if we are talking about multistakeholder model, it's very -- it's a very useful moment to try to make the dialogue really multistakeholder or really productive. So I cannot say I like tension, but I -- I can see that tension can bring a lot of good results and positive results.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: So basically, do people feel, generally speaking, that there was an understanding that there is much to lose in excessive polarization, is that a correct qualification of what it was? Bill, how did you feel? You were following the WCIT and the other meetings afterwards.

BILL DRAKE:

Actually, I don't think that -- my sense is that people didn't draw that conclusion enough, that there was excessive polarization. In fact, I think it was a real -- I thought the WCIT was a real missed opportunity in the sense that those of us who sided with the 55 countries that didn't sign the agreement rather than the 89 who did not, I think, really manage to persuade people on the other side what they really thought the problems with the texts that were being proposed were effectively enough. And when concerns were expressed by the -- the 89, I don't think we -- we met them effectively. I think many countries voted to -- for the new regulations for reasons that had nothing to do with the desire to impose new regulatory restrictions on the Internet. They had other agendas which they thought were entirely legitimate and consistent with the historic role of the ITU and were baffled and unhappy that there was this mobilization against the text. And I don't think that we did a very effective job of bridging that. I don't think people took -- took the challenge of fostering the dialogue between the two sides effectively. They didn't take it seriously enough. I think that's very unfortunate. And so post hoc you get people talking about digital cold wars and so on. That's a little hyperbolic. But clearly there were some hurt feelings, some injured senses of, you know, we thought you were with us and you weren't and that kind of thing and just -- there's room to try to make up lost ground. But people have to rededicate themselves to the effort. And part of the problem, I think, there is that a lot of folks that I hear talking about the WCIT kind of say oh, let's not talk about it anymore. Let's move on. That's in the past. We don't want to reopen it. Let's sweep it under. Let's move on to healthy, happy productive conversations rather than saying, wait a minute, what actually happened? Why did we have this massive disconnect? Let's

have an honest and frank dialogue and try to understand where each other was coming from.

So my feeling is it was really a missed opportunity from that standpoint. And that's too bad. I would say more generally about the WCIT. The previous renegotiations of the international telecom regulations in 1988 turned out to be a watershed in the history of international telecom because up until that point there was a real effort by a large coalition of governments to use multi-lateral regulatory harmonization through the ITU as a way to stave off the spread of liberalization and privatization in telecoms. And basically what happened in Melbourne was that a neutral text was adopted that basically put an end to that effort. And afterwards we had a whole train of events that led to the liberalization of international telecommunications including through ITU mechanisms.

I think when we get a little further away from the WCIT we may find that the WCIT was also a turning point. I hear what Jeff says about we have to stay vigilant, we have to be on guard, we have to look out for all signs of growing multi-lateral intergovernmental regulatory stuff arising such as the recent statements we've had from Russia and, sorry, Brazil in the wake of the Snowden affair, but I think the reality is, if you look at it politically, it's just impossible for me to see now the math that leads to multi-lateral universal regulatory harmonization that imposes restrictions on the Internet or massively changes in important ways the key aspect of the Internet governance topography. So I think that there will continue to be tensions, but I think we should stop worrying so much about the sky is going to fall and having discourses that are based on that and start to recalibrate in a more meaningful way.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Well, what is fascinating is that at a few month intervals, basically the same states who had clashed during the WCIT on mainly a procedural issue regarding voting or not voting participating in other processes and actually produce consensus documents. So it's very interesting to see that there is a difference that comes also from the format of interaction. I just maybe ask remote participation, do we have Jimson on the line? Jimson, did you hear us?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, Bertrand, I can hear you. Thank you.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: And if so, do you want to make a comment?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, yes. Good evening all, members on the panel, distinguished ladies and gentlemen. I'm really pleased to connect with you remotely. I want to first say that this is a glorious opportunity for us in Africa. We want to really leapfrog and really experience the digital renaissance that we expect. When the current momentum is sustained, the momentum of inclusivity multistakeholderism. When we got to the subject at hand, we got to the WCIT 2012, I had the opportunity to be part of the Nigerian delegation business and for the first time I had the experience really of the negotiation takes place. Well, there's no doubt we are experiencing an evolution and it's an evolution that is quite dynamic, just like Anriette said. But we are going to need to engage. Every

stakeholder needs to be involved, and that is why I really congratulate Baher and ICANN for putting this session up and for everyone that is engaged in the process. We need to continue the process, the current impact of governance in Africa is quite positive, but we can do much more by bringing in the 89. What I found again was that many of officials involved in this discussion, they do not really understand even the new architects, the architects of the current Internet, TCP/IP, talking about telecom, they're more of consent, renewal of the old architecture. And so that has some kind of effect, even in the judgment underlying. So there is need for us to be more involved, more engaged with the government in particular because in Africa, the government holds sway mostly and the business sector really need to come up, civil society come up. But everybody being involved and of course now that they have been engaged, I'm sure the dynamic will eventually get towards what Bertrand said, multi -- multistakeholderism or sorry for -- I cannot get that language very well -- but the realization of organization. But that is the way to go.

But that is the way to go. And I think we must continue to talk about it.

Thank you very much.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you, Jimson. I'm happy that the connection is good, and don't hesitate to raise your virtual hand if you want to intervene.

At that point, is there any question or any comment in the room or questions to ask?

MARY UDAMA:

My name is Mary Udama, and I am from Nigeria. I know Nigeria was strong. During the WCIT, I was on the team, and all effort were made to help my country to understand where the -- the value in multistakeholder approach and what was supposed to do and what we are not supposed to do. Especially when we are voting. You know Nigeria voted to say what happened in the WCIT.

But come back to Nigeria. We have a local multistakeholder advisory committee on IGF.

I am the convener. And you look at this magazine, you will see our minister was there; okay? Our regulators, they were there. The civil society, Internet society was part of it. And the press, the young people.

We had over 600 participants in our own IGF, Nigerian IGF. And we have a local --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE:

Sorry, was it the first? Second? Third edition?

>>

No, this was the second fully multistakeholder. I started it last year. And this year it was like a boom. Everybody wanted to participate.

And it was an inclusive thing. Even the challenged group, the women, everybody had to be there.

So -- And we have seen the value in that because we did a lot of discussion, a lot of suggestions. And even we discussed the model of

policy and regulation of the Internet. Should the Internet be regulated. And issues that were -- The government was there to hear us out.

So it is spreading. The value -- We are taking the message back to our countries. And at the West African level, we also held one just this month, and there we're talking about multistakeholderism.

So it is a message that is going on. Everybody is taking it. Even when we shared about our -- managing our ccTLD, it's a multistakeholder group that is managing the ccTLD.

So there are values there. Thank you.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Okay. Great.

Sala.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMAR: Thank you. Sala Tamanikaiwaimar, for the transcripts.

Just very quickly I'd like to say that it's critical that in discussing this we separate the fluff from the actual substance of the matter in terms of the content that was discussed in Dubai.

Having said that, I'd also like to add that there were some regions in the world -- I can't speak for other regions, but certainly in my region, what actually happened was things that went on the agenda was a result of a thorough multistakeholder process of issues that network operator groups raised -- civil society, governments -- which got into the agenda.

And there were some really interesting things, like access for disabled persons and those sorts of issues.

So it's very critical that we zoom into what actually were the points of contention.

And I think if you -- if you remove the fluff, bottom line, the core of the tension was the general perception that who actually owns a public -- you know, whether the critical Internet resources are public good or not, and that sort of thing.

So if you peel the layers, remove the fluff, go to the core. And one of the things that I'm really hopeful of, was really, really remarkable, was to see both ICANN and ITU saying, look, we respect each other's space. We recognize that we're not going to step on each other's toes. So I agree very much with Romulo when you said sometimes tension is good. It allows for people to see that diverse perspectives can be healthy, that we can come around the table and discuss professionally, as humans, and not to say that, look, my view is better, your view is not -- is inferior, and for you to take over.

So in essence, if we're going to speak about multistakeholderism, it's very important that we don't be dogmatic about it but we come with a spirit of humility and collaboration.

(Scribes lose audio connection)

>>

...reality what Bill said about him not seeing the (indiscernible) I actually agree because I don't see how there could be an agreement within the ITU with regard to the -- putting more control over the Internet.

However, the WTPF in May was very different from the WCIT. I was at the WTPF and I witnessed the surprising phenomenon of all the representatives, of all the countries agreeing that the concept of multistakeholderism is something that is very desirable.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Sorry to interrupt you. What is your interpretation? That the very same countries, in one context, seem to completely disagree and, in another one a few months later, find a way to cooperate and --

>> It's just their definition of multistakeholderism is different.

And although WTPF was not a treaty or an agreement event, it was a place for discussion on Internet related issues.

They all agreed on the six. related to the Internet.

Now, with regard to getting down to the basics and to talking about what really matters is the fact that they had a seventh opinion that was proposed by Brazil, which asked the question of what the role of government should be in Internet governance. And that is one area that ICANN actually is being criticized for, because the governments -- although we have the GAC, GAC does not have a voting right. And that is something that many of the countries during the WTPF pointed out very poignantly. So that's -- I mean, with that in mind, I think we should actually try to define for ourselves what we really mean by multistakeholderism. Because, although all the countries agreed that multistakeholderism is important, they all had their own definitions.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Interpretations. Thank you. I would close the queue at that point. Because the characteristic of a good panel is, when there are more comments from the floor than people on the panel -- but keeping in mind the possibility to come on the 7th opinion and how you see it potentially addressed afterwards. Stefano.

STEFANO TRUMPY: Okay. Very simple considerations. In multistakeholder systems, we have to compensate different interests. And no doubt that after what I called the failure of the WCIT in the sense that it was a war, in a way. And after this, the partners -- I mean, the part of those going to normally ITU meetings and those going to ICANN and so on started to collaborate, started to talk to each other. And in the presentation this morning we witnessed the declaration of love between Hamadoun and Fadi.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Clearly, the relationships have changed somewhat.

STEFANO TRUMPY: This is relevant. But the observation I make is that there will certainly progressing in this way, crossing influences in the sense that ITU starts becoming more open, more multistakeholder little by little. And, while, as it was recalled by the Korean lady, the governments would like to have more power, even inside ICANN.

So -- and this is something that, going ahead, perhaps, the parties, the private sector from one part will say that the evolution is not in favor of that while the governments can say the contrary. Because they don't accept the idea of a company like ICANN that is private sector related. So -- but it is important. It will take time, maybe several years before these different worlds really converge to a good interpretation of the multistakeholderism.

So there is a positive sign, I see, but with some difficulties and a normal amount of work to be done in order to progress in this way.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you. Olga.

OLGA MADRUGA-FORTI: Yes, I'm Olga Madruga-Forti, a member of the ICANN board, global citizen. And you can usually find me in Buenos Aires, Argentina, where I hope to see you soon.

I want to come back to two comments. Bill made a very interesting observation in that the WCIT can be seen over time as a type of bellwether. And certainly it was a wake-up call to many. And the -- when you answer that wake-up call, you find that there are people, that there are governments all over the world that feel that certain interests and preoccupations are not being met under current models. In the face of that, Jeff mentioned, well, we need to be vigilant.

So my question for the panel is: Having been vigilant and having opened the door and listened to these global preoccupations, where do

we go from there? How do we answer those concerns? We're working on the ICANN strategic plan now. What does this mean for us from now going forward? And you don't have to be very vigilant to hear some of the concerns being expressed around the world. Thanks.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you, Olga. Pierre.

PIERRE BONIS: Thank you very much to the panelists who have shared their view on the last month's discussions that we all had on Internet governance. I'd just like to comment the idea that the WTPF is a kind of result in its openness of the failure of Dubai. I'm not very sure that we can see that that way. Because, of course, Dubai was an international intergovernmental treaty organization. By definition it's intergovernmental. And by definition a forum is more open. So WTPF has not been designed to heal Dubai. It has been designed to be more open than Dubai. That's the first thing.

The second thing we're talking about the failure of Dubai. And I still don't understand what was the problem in Dubai? I understand the problem that it's an intergovernmental treaty, and we don't want to discuss Internet-related things in an intergovernmental organization. I can understand that.

But I would like the panelists to explain us from their point of view what was the main reason why half of you signed the treaty and the other half didn't sign it? What was in the text that justified this divide globally? I've read it, and I don't see it. Really. Thank you.

SAM DICKINSON: Hi, Sam Dickinson, LinguaSynaptica. I just wanted to respond to your question about why were some states who couldn't reach agreement in WCIT able to reach agreement in WTPF.

I think what happened at WTPF within the context of the outcomes of what we, as an Internet community, wanted. The opinions reflected multistakeholder, open, transparent values.

I had the opportunity to follow what was happening at the ITU council meeting a few weeks ago. And what happened there was in the discussions about the CWG Internet, we had the prime multistakeholder community saying hey, WCIT was this wonderful success and this is a sign of why we should open up the CWG Internet. You then had those that didn't want to open it up saying, actually, WTPF wasn't the great success that you guys keep talking about. We actually feel blindsided.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Not WCIT. It was, just for the record, hey, WTPF was this wonderful success. That's what you meant. Not -- just for the transcript.

SAM DICKINSON: A lot of nations felt blindsided. And if you look back on what happened on the WTPF, second to last day, last day, you had some countries, particularly some from Latin America saying why can't we talk about these issues? Why can't we edit these documents? And, at the time the discussion was well, hey, we've had this wonderful informal experts group. They've developed it. It was multistakeholder. Fantastic. But a

lot of the states who hadn't participated in that for whatever reason expecting to come to a meeting like a normal ITU meeting felt that they had been frozen out of the process of developing this text. So, for those who believed in multistakeholderism, we got kind of what we wanted. But, for those who had felt frozen out of the process because they're often from developing countries, felt once again that WTPF had actually reinforced that. So I think that's something we need to reframe how we're thinking about WTPF. Because a lot of states don't see it as the success that we do.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: So, basically, that's an interesting transition. And we'll come to the second part, which is basically looking forward on the lessons of this. Again, this session is not about getting into the details of all those elements but to give an impression of the tension between different types of processes, of different types of approaches. And what Sam was saying is very important. Sometimes the reading of the same event by different actors is completely different.

And you can draw very different lessons from the WCIT or for the WTPF, depending on which side of the road you are.

Looking forward -- and in the months to come, we will have the IGF in Indonesia. And correct me if I'm missing things.

Next year we have the WSIS+10 second meeting after the one in Paris. This next one will be in Sharm El Sheikh. If I'm not mistaken, there's also an ITU meeting almost at the same time or just afterwards, which is, I think, WTDC, World Telecom Development Conference.

And then, at the end of 2014, is the ITU plenipotentiary, which is, for those of you not familiar with the ITU, is every four years is the big conference that the ITU holds. And this one in 2014 will be particularly important, because there is a renewal of the leadership. Hamadoun Toure and most of the other directors -- not all of them, actually. But Hamadoun Toure, in any case, has made two mandates. And so there will be a new Secretary General for the ITU at the end of 2014.

Then in 2015, in a format that is not clear yet, is the WSIS+10 review. WSIS was the World Summit on Information Society, 2003-2005. So we're 10 years later. And there is a discussion today on what is the format for this WSIS+10.

So I'm going to the panel and asking you how do you see those different events knowing that, on the one hand, we have very structured events like the plenipot where there will be negotiations on resolutions, intergovernmental, and the IGF and other processes that are much more informal? How do you see those two tracks moving forward? Markus and then Romulo.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Yes, thank you. Well, there were many thoughtful comments, and I would like to expand a bit on some of them.

Again, I start with looking backwards, and when I mentioned the WTPF in difference to WCIT, I did not say that the results were absolutely fantastic. It was okay. It certainly did not do any harm. But what was noticeable was the atmosphere, and that people really made an effort

to find thoughtful dialogue and to avoid this divisive -- divisiveness we have felt in Dubai.

Having said that, it is obvious that there was much less at stake. The opinions are nonbinding, but nevertheless, they're never innocent either. They can feed into later processes and they will be revisited at the plenipotentiary.

Why was WCIT so divisive? I think a lot had to do with process. Normally in intergovernmental meetings, you don't vote. You try and find the consensus, and voting is divisive.

I heard that many years back, in the context of the United Nations conflicts in trade of development, they said that's the new clear option. We would not survive it if there is a vote.

If you vote, there is always a built-in majority of developing countries, so they could push through what they want. But they don't do that because they know it's divisive, and obviously they want big, important economies to be part of the process.

I think that was the main reason.

The text in the end that was negotiated, I agree, was not that bad. It was carefully negotiated, but there are a few tipping points, but there's no point going into the analysis of what was passed.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: So sorry to interrupt you. If I understand correctly, the main divisive part in the WCIT for you was a question of process, voting or nonvoting.

MARKUS KUMMER: I think it tipped the balance. But it was --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Yeah.

MARKUS KUMMER: -- also we went into Dubai saying there is no voting, and it's not about the Internet, and in the end it was all about the Internet and there was voting. I think that's tipped the balance. But --

[Laughter]

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: That's a (indiscernible) summary.

MARKUS KUMMER: -- as I said, let's not analyze WCIT, but I think also I very much appreciated Olga's thoughtful comments. There are global preoccupations, and we have to take them seriously. Some of them are maybe smaller. One that came up was how to deal with spam. So we now as Internet society, we are launching a project of having workshops in developing regions on basically giving the tools, working with industry on teaching how best to tackle this concern.

And this will feed into the IGF.

As I said in my previous remarks, on spam, a treaty provision doesn't really help that much. Whereas, if you have a hands-on workshop that

shows people best how to deal with it, you get something to take away and to implement.

But there are obviously global preoccupations that go beyond relatively smaller technical details and a lot has to do with the general architecture. And everywhere in international cooperation, there is an intergovernmental process, an intergovernmental organization. If that is trade, you go to World Trade Organization; if it's health, you go to the World Health Organization. There are governments among themselves. In some areas, such as health, they associate the sector --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: There are sometimes other actors.

MARKUS KUMMER: -- but the governments are still the ones who make decisions.

Now, the Internet is fundamentally different. It has developed governance arrangements that are based on the structure of the -- on the update lying structure, which is a distributed structure, so there are many organizations involved. I mean, there is ICANN, of course, but maybe first comes the IETF. That has, when we talk about multistakeholder cooperation, the longest tradition in multistakeholder cooperation where everybody participates as equal. Then there are the Regional Internet Registries, and all of these organizations work together in an informal way. Everyone who wants to, can participate; can participate in standards developing processes, can participate in policy developing processes. And the way the Internet organizations do

that is totally different from the traditional intergovernmental way, and it is only normal that governments find it difficult to fit in.

And the role of governments in multistakeholder processes is an important issue. And we will also take this up at the IGF.

We need to discuss how best to do this.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Talking about the IGF, as you are now the chair of the -- interim chair of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group that organizes this, do you think that there is a desire now by governments to see the IGF be more operational? I use the word with a lot of caution, but to be producing more tangible cooperations? Without getting into the next --

MARKUS KUMMER: I think to begin with, people were very nervous. It's a new animal, so what does this involve?

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: You mean back in 2006 and so on.

MARKUS KUMMER: Yes. So they wanted to restrain it as much as possible but I think this was a change in the mindset. And participants who come to the IGF are also more relaxed. They have seen the value of this forum as a platform for dialogue. And I think there is an openness towards looking towards maybe other forms of outcomes to give something concrete take-away. We have a session on legal frameworks that will include discussion of

spam. I think it should be easy. It might be low-hanging fruit because lots of work has been made on spam, which is not legal but something you can take home in a document. We have to see how we will develop that.

But I sense there is definitely a desire to enhance the IGF, also in line with the working group on improvements of the IGF.

If you allow a last comment.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Please do.

MARKUS KUMMER: Also as the lady from Korea rightly pointed out, we don't have a shared definition on what does it mean, multistakeholder. And looking back at WSIS, and I made the efforts, I counted when it appears first, it appears in WSIS 1 once, multistakeholder, in a very obscure place related to indigenous people.

Then with the Working Group on Internet Governance, then the word appears. And it fed into WSIS 2, and now the IGF I think consolidate the approach, multistakeholder, even in the name of the MAG, which was first an advisory group, and then we added the term multistakeholder. The acronym is well-known now as MAG. And what is characteristic to WGIG and to IGF? The essence what they have in common is they are open, they are inclusive, they are transparent. Everyone who participates has a right to the microphone and everyone participates on

an equal footing. The WTPF that was mentioned, that was not the case there. It was much more open --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: So it's at best a step the direction --

MARKUS KUMMER: It's a step in involving more stakeholders, but it did not have these key characteristics. There were people in the room who were not allowed to speak. But the preparatory process was remarkably open.

And also, WCIT was more open than normally intergovernmental --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: With the --

MARKUS KUMMER: -- conferences are. It may have been the most transparent treaty negotiation ever, as people were allowed in the room --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: That's interesting to say.

MARKUS KUMMER: -- all the negotiations were open. They had transcript.

So we have to recognize that, in very, what you call the multistakeholderism, the triumph of the term multistakeholder.

Everybody now claims to be multistakeholder. Everybody aspires to be multistakeholder. And if it leads to more openness and transparency --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: But is it the homage advice to virtue as we say sometimes?

MARKUS KUMMER: It can also be the devaluation of the term if you use it too often.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Okay. Romulo, do you want to go next?

Okay. Let's go along the line.

ROMULO NEVES: Thank you, Bertrand.

I would like to take advantage of being in Africa to recall an African religion, very popular in Brazil, which is Umbanda, and they have a very sophisticated concept of justice and good and evil.

It's -- They don't have divinities who can be defined previously as good or evil because it depends on the interest of the person.

So why it's sophisticated? Because it considers different interests and different -- and the limitation of the resources.

So if I want an apple and I pray for my divinity and you want the same apple and you pray for your divinity, it doesn't matter, any of -- or at

least one of the divinities will make evil because one of us will be without the apple.

Why am I telling you this? Because different interest -- When you have different interests, it doesn't mean exactly or necessarily that one interest is evil and one is good.

Having said that, I would like to use this kind of sophisticated concept of justice to bring the concept of democracy, which is related to multistakeholder, but not the same thing as, of course. But using the Brazilian example, we have a very open and democratic society. So it means that the government is not always the right voice to be heard.

We have a lot of channels, although they are incomplete, channels to hear the civil society.

But within the government, you have difference in position, and you have channels to have this discussion.

So why I'm telling this? Because I would like to use these two concepts to bring the discussion about, one, the role of the government in the multistakeholder system, and our role as leaders of the process.

I'm not talking about government in this moment. I'm talking about the people who are informed about the ecosystem of the Internet governance.

So what is the role of the government within the country? It's to create and to prompt the channels of participation.

What are our role here? Is to prompt this participation. To prompt the channels.

So if one group feels that their participation, its participation is less than the fair or whatever, you need to have chance to hear this.

So this is part of the beauty of the system. This is a very important part of building a healthy and sustainable system.

So if we could make it very synthetic, what would be the role of the government, within the countries it would be create and prompt these channels. And within the environment here it would be to discuss these channels. Are they, first --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: You mean do they --

ROMULO NEVES: -- exist.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: -- international channels?

ROMULO NEVES: No, in this multistakeholder approach here. I'm talking about ICANN --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Yeah, yeah.

ROMULO NEVES: -- but we --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Yeah.

ROMULO NEVES: -- can make it brother. But we need to discuss does it -- does this channel exist for everybody? Does this channel works, the existing channel, does it work?

And, third, are there any -- are there ways to make it more inclusive, more participate -- to have more participants?

So this is I think this is the role serious governments should play in this environment.

I would not like to talk about ITU because I was not part of the delegation in WCIT, I was not part of the delegation in the WTPF, but I have read the reports. But I would like to deal with it in a very general manner.

So recalling the African religion, which is very popular in Brazil, I think the governments should not think that they are the ultimate voice, but so should do the other stakeholders who are dominant in other --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Sorry; can you repeat? Because the script -- They should not think that they are the --

ROMULO NEVES: The ultimate voice. Ultimate --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Ultimate voice. Okay.

ROMULO NEVES: Yes, ultimate voice.

So neither the governments are the ultimate voice, neither are the stakeholder should be the ultimate voice.

Having said that, I'd like to oppose a little bit, a little bit, some phrase that I heard. One, not only governments take decisions. We take decisions always, and sometimes we take decisions without saying that we are taking decisions. So this is serious. We need to be aware of it.

So it's not because we are not government. It's not because we didn't have a vote, or a poll. It's not because we didn't have received the mandate that we don't take decisions. We take decisions a lot of times, almost every day.

Second, it's very hard to hear. They don't know -- they don't understand. So I cannot talk to them, because, as government, in our case, or in form of people in our case, everybody here, we need to open the channels. Because sometimes those who we think they don't understand, they have very important clues to the development of the system.

But we are working just with some limited approach. We think they don't understand, they don't know, so they cannot offer any positive inputs to the system.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: So basically you're sending the same message to business and civil society regarding talking to government representatives that we're sending to governments to talk to the other actors; right?

ROMULO NEVES: More or less. In different approach.
But I have some more things, but let's share the work.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Okay. Let's continue. Anriette.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Bertrand. I think just to start with the WCIT and the reflection on it. You want me to move forward.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Also to look at the future.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Actually, I'll drop that comment and start with the IGF and just reflect on some of Markus's remarks and your question about are governments ready for the outcome -- for the IGF to be more outcome-oriented? I think the question is: Is business and the technical community ready for the IGF to be more outcome-oriented?

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: I see smiles in the audience.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I think, historically, in the IGF there were also some governments and some non-governmental stakeholders who did not want it to be outcome-oriented. And then there were others that did. But I agree with Markus in terms of the shift in readiness. And I think that shift in readiness for me has been more dramatically visible among business and technical community stakeholders than among governments. I think government's probably still fairly divided. I think my fear is that that developing country governments who have been very ambivalent about the IGF and who have wanted it to be something that could be more outcome-oriented might have lost interest. And, therefore, they're not participating. And I think one can see that the GAC has really made significant progress. And ICANN has made progress in getting governmental involvement. And possibly more so than the IGF has.

And I think, you know, we need to analyze that difference. And for those of us that were in the IGF space learned from some of the experiences and successes in ICANN.

And I think what concerns me a lot about the discourse around this is that we use multistakeholderism as a synonym for democratism or multistakeholderization as a synonym for democratization. I think that is just profoundly inaccurate.

What makes a process democratic and inclusive is lots of different things. What makes it a good process -- and I like Romulo's analogy of

just as good and evil depending on interest -- is what the outcomes of that process are. And I think someone mentioned the public interest earlier. Sala, I think. I think that is really where we are now. I think we've popularized multistakeholderism and multistakeholder participation. If we wanted it to become a concept that is associated with democracy and with good governance, we have to really pay attention to the outcomes of our multistakeholder bodies and our multistakeholder processes.

I think, just to reflect a little bit on some of the questions from the floor and to pick up also on what have been said by Markus and by Romulo, I think the role of governments, a lot of this has to do with the role of governments and understanding and perceptions of that role. And, by implication, the role of intergovernmental bodies such as the ITU, which I think is only partially intergovernmental, but it is essentially intergovernmental. And I think that's very challenging. And then also the role of regulation. And do we want the Internet to be regulated? In what way or not at all? And I think our discourse is still very confused. On the one hand, we're very concerned about regulation and civil society. I'm a human rights activist. I'm extremely concerned about censorship and about control and about nationalization of the Internet and segmentation through faltering and surveillance. But, on the other hand, I want human rights to be defended and protected and promoted. And I believe it's my government's responsibility and the responsibility of all governments to defend and promote human rights. And, therefore, I do want to make them -- to give them a mandate to do that. And, including on the Internet and to hold them accountable. I think what makes it all very problematic for us is that I think we fear -- and

there are a lot of assumptions about what more regulation will produce. And, depending on your stake and the interest you hold, whether you will lose or gain. And, therefore, I think, generally, I think for most of us, a light regulation approach seems a safer approach. But I do think -- I think it does boil down to, for me, two things really. Or three things. The one is that the role of governments, how we define it, what is legitimate, and how does that evolve? And how does that remain a constructive role rather than a restrictive role or a limiting role, a role that limits innovation and that limits freedom. And, on the other hand, I think there's the whole -- you know, the whole notion of democratization and how can we get multistakeholderism to evolve in to this adjunct of democratization rather than just something that's defined by having interesting different people in the room and at the table.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: So, basically, not considering that you've achieved multistakeholderism just when people are in the room. I get that.

Jeff? Also maybe trying to look at how you see the perspective of the preparation of the IGF, on the one hand, and the arising of the plenipotentiary. Because these two things have completely different dynamics. And both of them are actually the environment of ICANN as well. So how does it impact and how do you see that?

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN: Yeah. I think of it as we have to be able to walk and chew gum at the same time. We have to both make the multistakeholder process work

while also being very engaged in the other types of governmental proceedings that are going to be happening. And I will reiterate why I think vigilance and activity there is important. But to start with, I think the earlier question that was asked of what can we do here as ICANN participants, I would go back to what Fadi said this morning. I think ICANN really is the cutting edge of multistakeholder as an actual decision-making process. And that means everything that we can do to make that an effective process, whether it's thinking about the right participation role of the GAC and governments in the process, being sensitive to how ICANN decisions are perceived externally, and making sure with things like the ATRT, you know, which, frankly, maybe not a lot of ICANN participants are thinking is something they need to participate in. It's extremely important to make sure that ICANN is viewed as a credible, functioning organization. And it does often become the lightning rod for those who think that the current model is deficient in some way. And so I think for all of us here, to me, it's not just thinking about how things are working for us in the room. But how is this being viewed externally? And how is ICANN being perceived as a functioning organization? So I thought a lot of what we heard this morning were good initiatives. Trying to think about the geographic presence of ICANN, the outreach, as well as the operational internal focus. Those are things that, you know, we have to be able to make work.

One area that I think both ICANN and all of us need to continue to do more of is to address the very legitimate concerns that came up in the WCIT process about economic issues and security issues and things like that. And so, whether it's working on things like the spam project or

doing -- you know, engagement on building Internet exchange points, all of those things, you know, this community that comes to ICANN is the group that operates the Internet. And we can do more to make it work in all parts of the world for all types of users in a way that is going to help build the support and to show that what ICANN is doing and what the multistakeholder is doing works for them. I think of the IGF -- I do think while we can talk about more outcomes, I think the role that the IGF serves that is so important is to be a little bit of an early warning for what issues are coming, a way to capture what strategies are working, and also to talk about the very difficult issues and trying, if not reach consensus, at least start to bridge that. And I think documenting some of what ICANN is actually accomplishing in those areas to me is a very legitimate type of outcome that could be distributed to those who don't get the benefit of being there.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: But there's a challenge here. Because ICANN is part of the ecosystem of the logical layer of the Internet, basically, the addressing, numbering, root server operators, and so on.

So it's separated. And we pay great attention not to be in the application or in the content layer.

If the IGF identifies important issues related to the governance on the Internet like what people do on the Internet, freedom of expression, privacy and so on, once you've identified a topic, where do you bring it? Back into an intergovernmental process? Because it's not going to come back to ICANN. It shouldn't come back to ICANN. So how do you -- where should it go?

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN: Well, it may come back to ICANN. I think there are a lot of existing organizations where, whether it's a technical issue -- if you're talking about some of the policy issues, I think that's where I get to maybe what Anriette was saying is we need to think about new ways of truly multistakeholder collaboration on issues --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Which is actually an excellent segue for the third part.

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN: I would not accept the notion that you take it to an intergovernmental body. I think we need to think about the idea that there needs to be one central place to resolve issues is a misconception that is counter to everything that we experience on a day-to-day basis on the Internet.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Good point.

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN: Maybe the issue is maybe going back to regional IGFs or going back to your individual governments in some cases or individual country. It could be having a multistakeholder process to figure out how to operationalize what you've agreed to.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: So, Basically, having the IGF being the moment where initiatives report but not an activity by the IGF itself.

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN: But, that being said, we have to show there is going to be follow-through on what is being discussed at the IGF. That's a thing that's emerging. But I also want to touch back on, you know, I think the other thing is that, as ICANN participants, we really should be thinking about how we can be as active as we can in these other intergovernmental processes. And I would agree that in many ways the WCIT was perhaps a turning point, not maybe so much for what was happening in the room but the fact that there were hundreds of other stakeholders that felt like they had something at stake in that process. And, ultimately, it wasn't 55-89. It was hundreds of other civil society, technical business, and others who were collaborating, cooperating, and really, I think, put pressure on the process to be more transparent. And I think that is something that we should take as -- you know, you can debate what the outcome was. But I think it was certainly better for having been paid attention to by many more people than just a small number of government delegations in a room together. And that is something that we should take as a lesson going forward is that we should all be engaged and we should all care about what is what's happening in these processes and make our views heard whether we have a vote or not.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Is it -- I'll ask maybe Bill before calling on Jimson -- you mentioned, Jeff, that, basically, the WCIT provided much more visibility to those issues more broadly. Is it always a good thing to be more visible, being more

on the agenda? Or is it making sometimes things more difficult including for ICANN?

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN: Well, you know, I think the other point that a few speakers made, including Mary and Sala, about how people got involved at their own local country level in multistakeholder preparations for the WCIT.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Yeah, the replication of the --

[Talking simultaneously.]

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN: So it wasn't -- it may have been more complicated at the actual conference. But having people get involved early in the process and think about that you have a voice with your own government as the first starting point even before you get to a treaty conference, I think that's a pretty powerful maybe change in thinking for these Internet issues --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: So the local level first.

Bill, how do you see the perspective of this plenipotentiary and IGFs and the two-track processes?

BILL DRAKE: Can I respond to a couple of the questions that were asked.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: You absolutely can.

BILL DRAKE: I think when people stand up and ask questions, they should be responded to. I want to address Olga's point and -- was the gentlemen Pierre? Nothing about WCIT. Just briefly. I know nobody wants to talk about WCIT. Didn't say anything about WCIT. But you did ask a question that I think is relevant. Sometimes people, including a lot of bloggers, look at the text and go what's the big deal? What's the problem? Why was this controversial?

And I think the problem is that, if we had certainty that everybody would read and implement the text in the same way, then it wouldn't be so controversial. But the problem is that you went through a process that totally eroded any trust among all the parties and how the others would take things forward where a lot of things were put on the table that were pretty onerous and eventually taken off. But the text that remained was seen in light of the whole process we had gone through. And so, for example, I'm just looking at the text again. When it says something like "international telecommunications numbering resources specified in ITU recommendations should all be used by the assignees for the purposes for which they're assigned" you can go, well, that's got nothing to do with the kinds of names and numbers we deal with. But what if down the line ITUT were to specify something about IP numbers, for example? Then people would go, oh, wait, how are they going to interpret that? How is that going to be used? Or the provisions about security or spam or so on. If you just look at them flat, they look fairly

anodyne. But, if you think about how might somebody who seeks to have a more aggressive control agenda interpret or say they have grounds to interpret this text, it could turn into something else. So people just stopped trusting, I think, that each other would play it the same way. And I think that's a fundamental problem.

To Olga's point, I agree with Anriette. People in civil society -- I've actually said this on this platform before at previous meetings.

People in civil society argued from the beginning, before the beginning of the IGF, that the IGF should be a place that was not just an annual conference but had the ability to hold working groups and be problem solving and even adopt, if there was consensus among all parties, recommendations of those who were involved in a particular process. Doesn't have to be recommendation of the whole IGF, obviously.

And that was -- everybody said that's a terrible idea. It will result in negotiations, and let's not do that.

So okay, fine. We didn't. But then what happens? Developing countries say wait a minute. Where the hell -- sorry. Where do we get to talk about spam? Where do we get to talk about network security issues? And when Jeff says the idea that one place should be -- can be the answer to everything, I certainly agree. I mean, the Indian CIRP proposal. The notion that you'll have one institutional framework that will solve one thing, obviously doesn't work. But it also doesn't work if you're a least developed country. To say that the solution is that an ad hoc meeting was held among 15 countries in Washington on November 3rd and they talked about such and such and that's going to maybe be carried forward in some partial programs of technical assistance, et

cetera, et cetera. Because the way they need to work is more structured, institutionalized, accessible process. I live in Geneva. I'm around the U.N. all the time. I talk to developing country governments. And what they like is a process where it's -- you know, there's predictability. There's a time cycle. There's -- you know, you know when the meetings are going to be held, what the documents are, all that kind of thing. And you can sort of plan your scarce resources and participation accordingly. An ad hoc lateral deals among the like-minded and so on doesn't work as well for them. They would like something more structured. And the problem is now we have no place. We have no place to say here's where we'll go have that conversation with you. And so you get frustration. And, when you get frustration, what's the result? They have to go somewhere. So let's go back to the ITU. Let's have the -- a council working group in the ITU because at least then we have someplace where we can have the kind of conversation we want to have with the counterparts we want to talk to about this. So then we go back into the whole cycle again of, well, they're having a closed process. And we -- so I think we're in a very unproductive kind of cycle here.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: How to get out of this cycle?

BILL DRAKE: I believe that we should allow the IGF to develop a bit more as an umbrella framework for multistakeholder processes, demand driven when there's an issue that needs to be addressed, that you can even do it on an annual cycle. Have one day per year of the conference plus any

other activities devoted to a particular topic like spam where people think there's a pressing issue. Have a working group. Let them issue a report --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Should it be something that's organized? Without getting into too much detail. The difference -- ICANN as the structure that handles decision making, it's unique in terms of the landscape of multistakeholder spaces because standard setting bodies do not have a decision making power in itself.

In the case of ICANN, there are decisions that are being made. There's enforcement of those decisions and so on. In the case of the IGF and all the other issues, there is no process to go until the decision making. And should it be the IGF itself, or should it be parallel efforts that come in to the IGF to report?

BILL DRAKE: I can just say you can either use the IGF, or you can invent something else. And I'd rather use the IGF, which has a deeply embedded multistakeholder character to it already as a starting point.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Just remember they're profoundly different. The ICANN has a narrow, quite defined mandate.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Yeah, absolutely.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: The IGF covers the universe of Internet governance and policy.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Universe.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: I don't think they need to operate in the same way.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Neither did I. But just to highlight the difference. Markus and Romulo.

MARKUS KUMMER: Just a few words on the outcome. Can we discuss what is an outcome? If you want a piece of paper that says something, is that all you want? Or is learning from each other, take away, go home. I was on a panel next to a gentleman from a Pacific Island. He said, "I was in a workshop on IXPs. I went home and set up an IXP." That's also an outcome.

We listened to the lady from Nigeria. The regional IGFs, the national IGF initiatives, this is also an outcome. And they produce actual results. What I heard listening to her, that is absolutely fantastic.

So we have to be a little bit careful when we say outcome. It's not so that --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: It produces results. They're not documented in the way that --

MARKUS KUMMER:

And then the role -- where can they go to discuss spam? Spam was actually discussed at the first IGF. And it didn't appear anymore because it was discussed to the satisfaction of participants. They did not feel any need to revisit it. But we are revisiting it. And the IGF presents itself as a very open platform that brings all the experts together with governance where these issues can indeed be addressed. But I do recognize the frustration of some governments that expected something else. They were not used to the approach and the approach, that format was very much a copy of the Internet institutions approach that is the same old conundrum. That's not what governments expect. We had open seating. That's not the case when you go to the U.N. You have a flag ahead of your desk where it says you are from this country or from that country. But, of course, the function is important. And, as Anriette said, it's totally different from ICANN. ICANN is operational, has a very narrow remit. It's DNS. It's naming. And IGF is everything under the sun related to the Internet.

But maybe we should learn in terms of process. You mentioned the IETF. Yes, the open standards, the adoption is voluntary. Maybe we should also adopt an RFC-type approach in the IGF context that we discuss. And we have the chairman of the IETF here. I asked him how long does it take average? I think it's two or three years for an RFC to be adopted. But the shortest time can be two months. It can go up to 10 years. But it is an incredibly open process.

Anyone can put forward an RFC, but we don't have to guarantee that it get adopted at the end of the process. But this is maybe you could see

the IGF, the policy equivalent to the standards development process of the IETF.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: So policy standards.

MARKUS KUMMER: With volunteer adoption.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Policy standards. Romulo, I wanted to ask also if Jimson is still online and if he wants to -- Romulo --

ROMULO NEVES: Very quick. We can face here some results of the evolution of the discussion, for example. Because in this continent very close to here two years ago I see some scarce. I got so many punches when I talk about getting more stricter outcomes from the IGF, for example.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: You mean in Nairobi.

ROMULO NEVES: Exactly. Nairobi, 2011. Now we're talking openly about more constructed outcomes. It doesn't mean vote or whatever. We're talking about this. This is the evolution. I think it's very healthy to the system.

Just to complement my second intervention, when we talk about participation and the frustration about the governments, we need to know that there are limitations to participations not only in the intergovernmental fields, but also here. There are limitations on understanding. Everybody can participate in this meeting. Not at all. In knowledge, in resources, not everybody can participate in this field.

MARKUS KUMMER:

But isn't that the case in any topic? I mean, if I want to go and participate in ITU meeting, I may have absolutely no understanding of what they're talking about. Right?

ROMULO NEVES:

You may not know there are those kinds of arena to participate. Knowledge is the first thing that you need to participate. Not knowledge on the technical thing, but even the existence, the mere existence of that kind of arena. So there are limitations.

So what I am telling when I raise this question is that we cannot oppose -- just oppose that some places we have limitations of participation and some places we don't have. Everywhere we have limitations. Then what would be our roles again? Internally, the government should -- and it's why democracy is important. I don't think it's the same thing as multistakeholderism. But democracy allows the government to open channels to dialogue. For example, the Brazilian Internet committee is the result of a decree. So the government open to the society, that's -- now it's institutionalized. Nobody thinks about to take this space from the society. But it was a governmental decision.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: That being said, there's still a distinction where the participation -- irrespective of the limitation in terms of knowledge and so on, there are situations where you can register on an individual basis and other situations where you can't, right? So isn't it a little bit artificial to place the restrictions on the same footing. If it is an intergovernmental organization, you cannot participate?

ROMULO NEVES: It's why democracy is important. It's why democracy is important. Because when you say that a democratic elected government is participating of any meeting, you assume, or should assume, that government represents some people. And they have the opportunity to discuss insight. It's not true. I'm not -- I'm not in the -- in Mars. I know it's not true. But it's why democracy is so important for the concept of multistakeholderism. So I'm quite sure that it's not the same thing.

So and finally, just to say two things, this -- this role is also to create actively channels of participation, not only they exist. They exist. But it's not only because they exist in general, that governments and we, ICANN and informed people, should just wait for the registration of people or individuals. No, we need to be active in this creation.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: That's the effort.

ROMULO NEVES: And finally, failure and success, recalling the Brazilian religion, is so relative because failure and success depends on who is speaking about failure and success.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Does Jimson want to make a comment at that stage? Are you still online, Jimson?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, I'm very much online.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Wonderful. Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah. I want to again congratulate ICANN and everyone for the very great contribution. There is this African proverb, you know, from the Yoruba-speaking people that says that a tree cannot make a forest. A tree cannot make a forest. You know, the Internet ecosystem is really a forest and you cannot just have just one organization say or one sector say governance. So it involves everybody. So that underscores the idea of the multistakeholder approach.

In Africa, some of us in business, I run an ICT integration company and I used to be the President of the Information Technology Association of Nigeria, some of us from about ten countries came together in business and we need to have one voice across the African region when it comes to the ICT business. So we formed the Africa ICT alliance a little over a

year ago. And we've been involved, highly engaged with ICANN through the B.C. and recently we had an outreach in Lagos reaching out to more businesses so that our voices can be better heard in the forest. And also ICANN was involved and locally NiRA, that is Nigerian Internet Registration Association was evolved, and we are the President, Mary that just spoke not too long ago. So this also called enhanced cooperation, that is all pillars involved in the ecosystem working together and unshaken, cooperating together. And, you know, this also saying even in the -- in the theme of IGF for this year, talking about building bridges, enhancing multistakeholder cooperation for growth and sustainable development, and we are not talking about outcomes. So these are the natural evolution of where we should really be. And I'm happy that I have the privilege to be involved in this in the sense that as African we can have some take-aways, some substantive issues that we have been in cooperation between government, business, the civil society, and the academia. And also, I will say that the current working group on enhanced cooperation, the CSTD working group on enhanced cooperation, that started meeting started on a very good footing. I don't know if Mr. Peter Major is there. He's doing a very good job. The first meeting where we have some good outcome. We really need to broaden the horizon. How do people see enhanced cooperation? How do we work together? We know we are in an ecosystem that is a forest. Everybody needs to be involved. It's a media world that needs to be glued together and shaped together. So a set of questionnaires have been published, so it's now important for every stakeholder to put in their own point of view. We must arrive at our destination. There's a destination for the community, global community, and as business we're interested in that destination.

Everybody must speak up. Everybody must be involved. And that is why, once again, I want to really congratulate Baher and ICANN for this opportunity for me to remotely connect with you and can hear one another. So we need to give more people the opportunity to be able to be involved.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Jimson.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: We continue like this as a living organism, surely we will mature and get to the expected destination. Thank you very much.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Jimson, your -- you said -- you mentioned the working group on enhanced cooperation. Just as a background element, the term "enhanced cooperation" without getting into too much detail, is a work that has come from the World Summit On Information Society and is a typical example of an expression embedded in an official document that is interpreted in very, very different ways by different categories of actors. Without getting into detail, after many, many years where the term was extremely confrontational in the end there was a decision by the Commission On Science and Technology for Development, which is a structure attached to UNCTAD to -- or service to UNCTAD, basically by UNCTAD to create a working group on enhanced cooperation precisely to define what people put behind this word and how it can be translated into practice. Jimson, when did the group start its work and where are they and is there a possibility for actors to participate in this?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Yes. Thank you, Bertrand. Yes, we had a meeting, I think May of 30, 31st, two days. We intend to meet again November 6-8. Then maybe twice again next year. As we see the days unfold.

Well, the -- I think the lesson of WCIT and the progress of the other meetings that have taken place have been quite helpful in that there was an atmosphere of listening to one another, of cooperation. Even those are not member of the working group will agree that we should -- observers should also be part of it, and we can also hear their view, once the chair recognizes them, and then it's also subject to ECOSOC rule, in a way, so that there's some control with regard to the space available, room for the meeting. Because also it's not -- it is not funded. So that's another -- that's a challenge there. But basically, it is open, all views are respected, and truly questionnaires -- I don't know if the questionnaire can be provided for all participants so they can also air their view. I think it's one of those concrete ways of moving forward, you know, collectively, towards understanding. Because I have my view of enhanced cooperation. Last year, last May at the open consultation that CSTD organized, in my view, even though there was the background definition or understanding of EC, I believe it is simply building trust and confidence on Policy Development and implementation. And coordination of our approaches, a solution to many of the challenges that have been expressed in the online world. One of the issues of spam or content issue, everything on the Internet, we need to build the trust, you know, cooperate, get people more to understand the issue because a major problem is that, as I said from my experience at WCIT is that many people do not understand even the

architecture, the underlying working of the Internet and why we need to reach out and cooperate. So by and large, the working group on enhanced cooperation can bring about a new definition, so to speak, but there's no doubt we're in the forest and everybody has to be at work.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you very much. I see Marilyn. I wanted to open the floor for some questions and then come back to the panel on this notion of enhanced cooperation. Are there other comments? Marilyn, go ahead.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade, and I am one of the five business participants along with Jimson. There are other people here, I see Baher and a few others from the technical community. Governments, IGOs are members. So some of us who are on the working group are here in the community. What I wanted to just reinforce was the importance of looking at the questionnaire yourself or your group or your community and understanding although there are many questions there, don't feel intimidated by that. And if you can only answer two or three of the questions, do that. But I, for instance, just want to note that unless a lot of you fill out the questionnaire and send in information, I will have nothing to do all the month of August, and I'm looking forward to reading hundreds of pages of comments and helping to synthesize them. So that's a challenge.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Where's the questionnaire available?

MARILYN CADE: May I turn to the chair and ask him to give the location.

PETER MAJOR: Thank you, Marilyn. I'm Peter Major. I would like to Jimson especially for his kind words. Now, the questionnaire is on the UNCTAD Web site, it's unctad.org/cstd. And you have it online and you have it in pdf format as well. So we hope to have only online submissions. But I intend to have the pdf also for reference because the questions are relatively complicated so probably you need some written paper to be able to consult.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: So in case you don't have enough consultations in the ICANN environment, you know you can do more outside in the U.N. environment now.

PETER MAJOR: Thank you.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Sala. And then Peter.

SALANIETA TAMANIKAIWAIMARO: Thank you very much. Salanieta Tamanikaiwaimaro for the transcripts. I really like the discussions that have been going on so far. Particularly something that Jeff mentioned. Because the reality is -- and

it's good we're having discussions about Internet governance external to ICANN. But I think on the same token there needs to be a take-away deliverable from this particular session, and so my comment is in relation to what ICANN can do. And I think there's general consensus that ICANN remains on the cutting edge of multistakeholderism in the experiment of multistakeholderism. And as such there is a sense of stewardship and a sense of great responsibility of ensuring that it becomes a pattern for what multistakeholderism is. And so to that note I would like to point to just one example of something that ICANN can begin to look into. For instance, if we look at -- and by the way, when I'm making these comments, it's not a criticism but it's for pragmatic discussion. So if we look at, for instance, Form 990 which is available on the ICANN Web site, it mentions that there are 26 volunteers and we know in the opening statement our ICANN CEO had mentioned that we have had thousands of volunteers. So little things like that. And also, for instance, like a geographical breakdown of how ICANN spends its monies also on that form, for instance 47,000 in Russia, versus 7 million in African, 1.19 in Lebanon and that sort of thing. So I'm not wingeing by the way, but if we're to talk about governance and if we're to develop a model where we become the pattern, it's very critical that we ensure that our systems are structured in such a way that we are beyond reproach, if that sort of makes sense. Where things like equity, things like parity, the things -- so when we talk about global public interest as referred to within the Affirmation of Commitment that ICANN is obliged to adhere to that we translate that into tangible processes. And I think to very large extent the board and the executive management, ICANN staff and ICANN community as a whole, is -- seems

to be moving in that trajectory. There seems to be greater movement towards -- to facilitating that. So with that I thank you, Bertrand.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you, Sala. Peter.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thank you, Bertrand. Peter Dengate Thrush, a long-time supporter of ICANN's multistakeholder role. I wanted to start off, Bertrand, by thanking you and the panel for the session I heard -- and I've heard it before -- that the new gTLD program is sucking the oxygen out of ICANN, and I think it's absolutely essential that not happen and that sessions like this that focus on the IGF and the multistakeholder model and ICANN's role and that we need to look around and maintain the importance of that. So thank you for putting this on.

I wanted to speak as someone who's attended the majority of IGF's and spoken at many other regional IGF's as far apart as Russia and new Caledonia and is a supporter of the model, and I wanted to pick up on a couple of the panel comments. First of all to confirm with Anriette that like you many of us are absolutely passionate about the issues of freedom of expression. But the other thing we're also keen to make sure is that they not come to ICANN and cause the mission creep. The essential maintaining that role in relation to the critical Internet resources has to be the primary focus. And the problem we faced in the early days is because we were visible, because we were accessible, and because we were dealing with Internet-related issues, these things

started coming onto the ICANN plate. So many of us supported very strongly the formation of an IGF where those issues could go.

So let's then pick up sort of Jeff's -- some of Jeff's comments and Bill's comments. You know, we either use the IGF or we make a new one. And Jeff's sort of practical comments, if I can contribute -- the suggestion is the IGF has to be the place where those issues go. But perhaps what we don't do is support it well enough and not actually becoming an implementation body. Because one of the other things that ICANN has always stood very strongly for in this space is respecting other institutions and the roles they fulfill and respecting the fact that they have their own histories and their own Constitutions and their own strengths. What we don't do is help the IGF take an issue and feed it into those institutions properly enough to take a technical issue. If it rises the IGF is the exec -- is a great forum for the global multistakeholder community to bring an issue. It can be a law enforcement issue like child pornography or spam. The IGF cannot solve that problem, but it can be the place where the multistakeholder debate brings the ideas together, comes to several solutions. When there is some finality, the IGF role should be to feed that into law enforcement or feed it into the IETF. The it's about educating people and outreach on the Internet we've got a fabulous ISOC society that has the mission of educating people, so why aren't we feeding stuff into ISOC. So what we need to do, I suggest, is strength the IGF and its processes, not to become an implementation body but to take a fully-formed policy concept and help it go into the place where implementation can occur and stay with it. Don't just hand it through the door. Keep the multistakeholder power and the -- go with it and

help them do the implementation processes. And that way we will strengthen ICANN and keep it on its mission, we'll grow the IGF as the forum for the global community to come and talk about these issues, and we'll also respect those institutions which are really good at solving these problems but we will be helping them because we will be bringing a multistakeholder solution to the problem. Thank you.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you, Peter. Siva, and then we'll --

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: I'm Sivasubramanian Muthusamy from India. That's more of a question for a philosophical response from Bertrand. Can the IGF be an ongoing conference or a sort of an institution -- as an institution with a physical campus either in a neutral territory or in a revolving territory. This is for the -- for around the activity for policymaking. Is it -- would it work?

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Well, turning the IGF into a permanent body or institution is a radical suggestion. I'm not qualified to answer, but --

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: One clarification. Unlike the U.N. So I want to be clear.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: So Peter, and we'll close the end.

PETER:

So I would like to make some comments on all the issues which have been said up to now, if you don't mind. I'm going to cut back to the IGF itself as well. But first about WCIT. To me, it was doomed to fail because the preparatory process was pointing to this direction. In spite of that, I don't think it was a failure. As it has been pointed out, it was a very good occasion to encourage people to talk to each other, to bring up the problematic issues.

I want to emphasize one thing. In the preamble we have a sentence about the human rights which is extremely important, and you should know that in CSTD we couldn't manage in a draft resolution -- which is not a treaty, just a draft resolution -- to get something about human rights. So that's for one. It has been also mentioned that there's an article about the rights of people with disabilities. I'm very proud of that. I have been behind that, so let me take the merit for that.

For the WTPF, it's true, the preparatory process started before Dubai, so we have to recognize that too, and maybe Dubai gave it a bigger momentum but the preparatory process was also a successful one and I think the WTPF itself. Now, we have to see that in context. It was said it was a forum with opinions, but we should see that we are going to have the plenipotentiary conference which will rely on these opinions and probably it will shape the further strategy, the further mandate eventually of the ITU. And even though there will be a change in management of the ITU but it will be the member states who are going to decide how it's going to be.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: True.

PETER: And we have already mentioned the CSTD and the working group, so I don't really want to dwell on that. I just hope that there would be real participation, and it has been opened up to all stakeholders and we are going to have streaming and hopefully we are going to have transcripts of the sessions. So it's going to be absolutely open, apart from the physical limitations and the financial resources.

Now, to the IGF, you may know there was a working group on the improvements of the IGF, and there's also a working group within the MAG about the implementation of these recommendations. And I think it's extremely crucial how this working group is going to perform. Because we don't have to forget that we are going to have the General Assembly of the U.N., which is going to decide on these issues as well.

So the WSIS+10 also means that it's the continuation of the IGF at all, or is it going to have a different format? We don't really know what's going to happen.

One thing we do know, if we don't implement the recommendations of the CSTD working group, then we are in trouble because it's a good pretext to some countries saying you couldn't implement it, so what do you want?

So basically that's what I wanted to say.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you. Actually, it's interesting for people to remember that the practice of scribing and Webcasting that is now spreading in many organizations was actually coming from ICANN in the first place, and then has been popularized in a certain way by the IGF, and now is replicating. And the fact that the WCIT was one of the first conferences that was Webcast and allowed people to follow from home was a big improvement.

We have covered a lot of topics, and there's no way we can exhaust this.

We're nearing the end of our session. I will ask maybe each of you, if you want to make one final comment.

My own take in this environment is that the beginning showed that maybe the WCIT was a surprising constraint that encourages people to work together more; and that the second element is that there is a progress in the understanding of having the IGF produce more facilitation for cooperations. Let's use a very neutral word. Not doing things but facilitating.

How do you see the future? And how do you see, in particular, what people who participate in ICANN can do in this environment? And vice versa, how to bring things in ICANN that come from that space.

Who wants to have the first shot? Shall we start with Bill and go along the line?

BILL DRAKE: The first last word.

Well, let me just spin slightly differently.

What I think would be really useful to the enhanced cooperation discussion would be if the different parts of governments all talk to each other, and if those parts of government that are involved at ICANN were to play a little bit more proactive role in documenting what exactly has been done through the GAC mechanism.

When I look back, for example, at the text of the Tunis Agenda, and it calls for relevant international organizations -- i.e., ICANN -- to help prompt the development of globally applicable principles of public policy on the coordination of Internet resources, well, the GAC has principles that they adopted; okay? And the GAC has done a lot of things. They have taken concrete steps. And I would like to see that fed into the process so that we don't continue to have an abstract discussion where people say, well, governments can't get what they want or can't even get heard within ICANN.

It seems to me governments are getting heard within ICANN.

So I'd like those aspects of what goes on around these issues within the ICANN --

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: To be implemented.

BILL DRAKE: -- space to feed back into the U.N. process where often it's different government representatives who spend their time in Geneva, and not at

ICANN meetings, saying, "Oh, nothing is going on at ICANN. We can't be heard."

That would be very helpful.

One other point. I wanted to say for Peter, yes, you had the human rights bit in the preamble, but you also had the right of states recognized in the preamble. The right of states to access.

And of course as we know, this -- in the WCIT agreement. And this helped all of Europe bolt and not agree to the deal.

So they were very edgy about that language.

So it's just worth recognizing it's (indiscernible).

And finally, I would just say enhanced cooperation, more generally, we need to get past the dialogue of the deaf on this point. We spent so much time with people saying enhanced cooperation is going forward. No, it isn't. Because for some it was some new intergovernmental thing, and not a Secretary-General who was supposed to result in a big hoo-ha, and for others it was, no, let's evolve things within existing institutions.

So we need to have a clearly documented discussion and establish what has already been done, and I don't think that's happened yet.

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN:

Thank you.

Well, since I ended on a cautionary note -- or started on a cautionary note, I want to end on a very optimistic note.

I think sometimes it's easy for us to forget how innovative the multistakeholder model is and how successful it's really been over the last eight years, starting from being really an experiment. And while we can criticize it and think of ways to improve it, I think the fact is, as has been said about democracy, it's the worst model except for every other model that's out there.

And so I think it leads to the best decisions. It's shown itself to be flexible, and I think we've seen that in both the IGF and ICANN. They're changing constantly, and we're always self-evaluating how to make the process better.

So while we need to keep that focus and make sure we do that, I also think we shouldn't minimize the accomplishments that both of these institutions have really had.

And more specifically, I think to build on Bill's comments, I think ICANN should file an extremely substantive and thorough filing with the CSTD documenting the range of activities that it's doing. When I look at the CSTD questionnaire, everything from how it's managing its own functions, dealing with other institutions, doing outreach and development work, there's a lot to be said. And I think instead of having the enhanced cooperation be a textual interpretation, let's get facts and information in the record in that proceeding to really show people what's happening.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: And how it works.

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN: ICANN should take this very seriously as something it should undertake.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Nigel, let me finish the panel. Apparently Nigel wants to make a comment on that, but Anriette.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Thank you, Bertrand. Before I start, can I ask Peter Major to clarify whether the CSTD working group on enhanced cooperation survey is open to all or only to WSIS-accredited individuals or entities?

I believe there's been some negotiation around that. An update would be helpful.

PETER MAJOR: Thank you for the question. I'm not really certain that I'm grateful for the question.

[Laughter]

PETER MAJOR: Yes, there are negotiations still going on. My intention is to open it up, but we have, as I said, very limited resources.

The working group itself is, according to U.N. resolution, should be on voluntary funding. And based on the resources we have up to now, there's a strong opposition from the secretariat, which is quite understandable.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Okay. Thank you, Peter. I think it's important not to create the expectation that people might be able to respond to that when, in fact, they might not be.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Yeah. And, sorry, just one illustration that this is typically the kind of situation where the devil is in the details.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: That's right, that's right.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: And there might be a word that changes the openness or not, unfortunately.

ANRIETTE ESTERHUYSEN: Just to make my closing remarks. I agree with Jeff when he said that to centralize decision-making is not the best way of doing it. I don't think that will give us more inclusion or better results.

And I agree also with him and with Peter on the role of the IGF. And as Peter Major has said, the working group on IGF improvements as a report has made these recommendations.

I think the challenges that the IGF can only play that role -- and I think it's an end-to-end role. It can be a role in brainstorming policy regulation beforehand, and then troubleshooting them afterwards. But it needs resources to do that. It needs the structure and the capacity. And it also needs participation.

And I think that is why it is relevant to get governments into the IGF, because if they're not part of that soft power process, it loses a lot of its richness and of its usefulness.

And I think with regard to where we're going with enhanced cooperation, I think two things. I think good Internet governance begins at home, in the same way that good governance begins at home. And I think good governance is part of good Internet governance. And I think, therefore, what happens at the international level really is important.

We heard from Nigeria. We've heard from Brazil. I don't think this is the only layer because the Internet is global, but I think having those inclusive processes at national level is extremely important. And it's also something we can do and achieve.

I think on a -- at a broader level in terms of how enhanced cooperation, I think we are moving forward. I'm possibly not as optimistic as Jeff.

I think my fear is that that is the impact of power. And in a way I think it is like a dance floor. And we increasingly see the powerful players who have had some tension in their relationships, inviting one another to go onto that floor.

We have ICANN and the ITU. We have Fadi and Hamadoun, you know, waltzing along, and it's very encouraging and inspiring. We have the GAC, which is now quite an important player -- in fact, some people fell too powerful a player in ICANN also on the dance floor. But what about those that are standing along the walls? The wallflowers? The ones that are not important or beautiful enough or rich enough to be invited? And I think that is my concern.

You know, how do we make sure that this -- the balance of power, of interest is such that new exclusions are not emerging and old power dynamics not just being reinforced in this process.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you, Anriette.

Romulo.

ROMULO NEVES: Thank you, Bertrand. Very quick.

I don't know where are we going with this relationship, ITU, ICANN, CSTD, et cetera, but I think I would have a suggestion, personal suggestion on how we should go.

I think using Fadi's word, instead of -- I've heard vigilant here, but I would like to hear open, since his opening speech, because I think this is the key.

I don't know if it's possible, I'm optimistic, a little bit less than Peter but mostly I'm optimistic, and I believe that being open, we can reach some common ground.

But I need to say that I understand and Brazil understands that it's a huge challenge, but I think we need to do this effort.

The tension will be there, as always, but I think if we can give at least some steps in this path, I think the level of tension will be a little bit lower in the next years.

And as a matter of fact, I need to say as well that we can feel some change even in ICANN. I have been out for one year, and one year afterwards I can feel it. I can feel that there were some good -- I can't say exactly what, but the environment, I think it's a little bit more open.

And I'm quite sure that some evolution in the other arenas will produce almost the same effects. I hope so.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you.

Markus.

MARKUS KUMMER:

Yes. I'll be short, as we risk losing people because of the time.

I'll pick on what previous speakers said. Enhanced cooperation, it is happening, as Romulo said. Organizations are changing. And I think they have changed for the better in the past year since WSIS 1.

All the Internet institutions are open and inclusive. Anyone who wants to participate can participate, but it is not enough. We indeed to do more to increase the participation of developing countries, of all stakeholders from developing countries. And if the process on enhanced cooperation can help us in doing that, all the better.

And the IGF I think has a key role in this regard. I think Peter Dengate Thrush said it very nicely. It's what we always said. It's not here to replace any organization but they can shape decisions that are taken elsewhere. And that is important.

But as Anriette said, it is a very fragile process, and it is very weak financially, and it really needs better funding, and that's also appeal to the ICANN community -- to ICANN as an organization but also to the participants to consider contributing to the funding of a very fragile but important institution.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Extremely important.

Thank you.

Jimson do you want to say one concluding word if you are still online?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, thank you very much, Bertrand.

What I would like to emphasize, I (indiscernible) spoken, is that (indiscernible) the approach, the multistakeholder approach for Internet governance is a living organism that will need time to grow and mature. And as we see the evolution and all the players, stakeholders and stakeholders, get involved in playing our parts, I am very optimistic that the process will mature down the line. But just as Markus said, the need for funding, to get critical voices to be involved, from developing countries, from least-developed countries, because this process costs money.

And finally, I want to also underscore what a UNDESA official said at one of our meeting; that a multistakeholder approach is one of the best things that they have ever witnessed. (Inaudible) could hear from

people they never could before, to hear the perspective of business, the perspective of civil society, academia, technical community.

So I think it's a good thing for the ecosystem, and it should be sustained by everyone.

Thank you once again.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you. Thank you very much.

Thank you to all of you for your patience.

Nigel, you want to make an announcement?

NIGEL HICKSON: No, first of all, thank you, Bertrand and thank you to the panel.

Just three quick points. One on the enhanced cooperation work that we're all undertaking. We will be putting a report in. We're working with the ISOC and the RIRs and various other business organizations to put in a report detailing the type of enhanced cooperation that has taken place in the Internet community.

The other point is in the run-up to the WSIS review that has been discussed in the plenipotentiary, there are regional events which the ITU and others are holding and it's worth looking in your regions where those regional events are happening. We're taking part in some of those for ICANN, and we'll probably have a session, a bit more detailed session, particularly on the WTDC and the WSIS+10 at the Buenos Aires meeting.

So thank you very much.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you. Enjoy the evening. Thank you very much for your patience. I hope it was providing information that you wanted.

Thank you very much for the panelists and for Jimson who was remotely participating.

Good evening to you all.

[Applause]

[END OF AUDIO]