
BUENOS AIRES – LAC DNS Forum
Friday, November 15, 2013 – 08:00 to 17:00
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Good morning, everybody. If you would like to take your seats, we are about to start this session. Good morning, everyone. I don't know if I would stay standing or if I should sit down. I think I'll stand up.

Good morning, everyone. Thank you for joining us this morning. This is a joint initiative, as you can see. This initiative has been organized by LAC TLD, LACNIC, the ISOC and ICANN offices for Latin America and the Caribbean and [BOC] of course our host, dot-ar, and the public interest registry. Special thanks to LAC TLD, NPOC and the Public Interest Registry because they are the ones that started thinking about this initiative in Durban in South Africa. So special thanks to all of them. No doubt this will be a very special event.

Please allow me to introduce our panelists, or rather than panelists, distinguished guests that will help us open this first Latin American and Caribbean DNS forum. We are with Dr. Stephen Crocker, chairman of the ICANN board and a distinguished Internet pioneer. Next is Gonzalo Navarro, a member of the ICANN board representing the Latin American and Caribbean region, and of course Carolina Aguerre who organized this event and is LAC TLD's general manager. LAC TLD is the association in charge of coordinating the ccTLDs in Latin America and the Caribbean. So, without further ado, I would like to give the floor to Dr.

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.

Stephen Crocker so that he can take care of the opening remarks. Steve, you have the floor please.

STEVE CROCKER:

Thank you very much. It's an absolute pleasure to be here. I have to apologize that my knowledge of Spanish is so little that I won't embarrass you or myself trying to say anything direct. I can count uno, dos, tres, quatro, cinco, seis but that's about it.

This is a very important meeting. I've had the pleasure of attending the opening of the meeting that took place in Durban, a comparable meeting. Now this meeting here.

One of the things that's been very clear from the perspective that we have at ICANN is the importance of regional activities. It's impossible to coordinate or be helpful across the entire globe from a single point or even from the global perspective that we have at ICANN. It's far more important for there to be regional and very local – hyper local, even – events and coordination. That's where the expertise is and that's where the natural affinities are.

So in the process of maturing the entire DNS infrastructure, organizations like LAC TLD and the meeting of members of the community on a regional basis will be, in the end, absolutely essential and far more effective than any attempt to do things from top down. That's, of course, in general keeping with our natural preference for bottoms-up multi-stakeholder operation.

But I don't mean that in a purely political or rhetorical sense. From a very pragmatic sense, one of the things that we learned right from the

beginning when we were building the first network in the late 1960s and early 1970s was an “each one teach one” kind of mentality. So the experience that some of you gain and that you can share with your neighbors is the most important, the most effective, and it also pays off in building relationships. It’s highly pleasurable. A certain number of careers, including my own, were build that way. So I highly recommend it to everyone.

Getting people together here this meeting I expect will be the beginning of a process that continues onward. I can also recommend that communication is more important than organization, that just doing it should take precedence over trying to argue about what the rules ought to be for doing it, and then the rest will take care of itself.

As I say, it’s a real pleasure on my part and very satisfying to see the gathering of people here. Anything that we can do at the ICANN level to be helpful, we’ll be delighted to do. But the very first thing and most important thing that I think we can and should do is simply to cheer and to be very supportive and applauding of the effort that is underway here. Thank you.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Thank you, Steve Crocker. Now I would like to give the floor to Gonzalo Navarro. You have the floor. Go ahead, please.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you Rodrigo. Good morning. It’s really a pleasure and I am very pleased to be back in Argentina. It’s been a long time since my last visit, so personally, I’m very pleased to be here again. I was looking forward

to the meeting in Argentina, because probably this is the shortest flight ever in my ICANN career in the last ten years, but it was the bumpiest flight, if you will. But fortunately, we landed safe and sound.

Steve pointed out that ICANN's internationalization and regionalization have been on the debate table for quite a while. We have been engaged in different discussions, conversation, at several levels and it's really very pleasing – or we're very pleased to see that we are moving along that path. Durban was the starting point, and now this meeting reflects all our endeavors towards increasing our regional presence. But rather than the presence, the debate at regional level in terms of the DNS and the Internet. This is a very interesting initiative. We have worked significantly, and now we are beginning to see the results. This is only the starting point of something I hope will be much more comprehensive.

Those of us that have been engaged in this effort for a while clearly would like to see this room overflowing with people in the following meetings. I see people from the Civil Society, from the Academia, but I would also like to see people from government and I would like to see much more debate and interest in what we are facing as a region and in what we can contribute to the Internet.

My mic was off. I think this is censorship. So how we can contribute to the discussions that concern us all. So once again, I want to thank the host. I want to thank the organizations that worked to organize this event. As you can see, this is a very important event. Personally as a user and as a participant from the region, I want to especially thank you all.

Finally on a point of clarification for the record, I am delighted to represent Latin America, to be your voice in the ICANN board. But I was elected by the NomCom. I am not the representative of Latin America, although I feel very proud to represent you and to speak in Spanish with you all. Thank you.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA:

Thank you, Gonzalo. Thank you for that point of clarification. In fact, we do not have regional representation in the ICANN board, but what we do have is the alignment or some alignment in terms of quotas for the board members and we have – or we need to have – at least one member per region and not more than five per region.

Finally I would like to give the floor to Carolina Aguerre for her opening remarks. As I told you, she is LAC TLD's general manager and she's a very dear friend.

CARLINA AGUERRE:

Thank you, Rodrigo. Thank you, Steve. Thank you, Gonzalo for joining us. We feel honored to have you here. I would like to highlight that we believe in the multi-stakeholder approach, and in that sense, we like to walk the talk. That is, to show that here we are in a multi-stakeholder approach with seven organizations engaged and we want this to be as representative as possible. This is one sector or one part of the DNS in the region and this is only the starting point. We are trying to reflect upon a problem and a topic that, to a large extent, thanks to a process that was triggered of by the ICANN New gTLD Program and also due to

our participation in ICANN's regional strategy for Latin America and the Caribbean.

Thanks to that, we saw that we have an opportunity. We have a platform for dialogue for exchange and a platform to start thinking about the problems that concern and impact upon us in the region. Steve and Gonzalo mentioned this already, but the African DNS Forum held in Durban was very, very interesting. In Latin America, we may have some indicators in terms of access, connectivity and costs that are largely different from those of the African region.

Well, we think that in terms of the DNS we find some similarities that may bring us closer to the problems we share with the African region and with an important difference. The Latin American and Caribbean ccTLDs have played a very different role in our region historically compared to that of Africa, but we believe that the African DNS Forum experience in Durban was indeed very interesting and we want to continue working along a multi-stakeholder path with several organizations to create synergies and to create a platform in which ICANN's regional strategy for Latin America and the Caribbean is very important, as Rodrigo will highlight later on today.

Further, in this ICANN LAC strategy group, we have strongly questioned, what is the DNS in our region? How can we define the DNS? Is it a sector? Is it an industry? What are we talking about when we talk about the DNS? And we have spent long, long hours debating this issue within our region, so I believe that we have to make an extra effort, an additional effort, so as to discuss these topics and put them on the debate table because when we do not mention them clearly, we can

hardly do anything to improve them, so we have to find these objectives, these indicators, if in this space such as this meeting today, we can come up with a future agenda for future ICANN meetings to continue holding these events and meetings. Well, no doubt we will all benefit from that.

I want to thank all the participants. I want to thank you all for being here because of your effort. It's not easy to move around Buenos Aires after a storm. I want to thank the seven organizations here. I want to thank all the other organizations with stakeholders from Latin America and global stakeholders, and of course, special thanks to ICANN for this space that we have been given and for supporting the regional strategy that no doubt will help us all. Thank you very much.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA:

Thank you, Carolina. Please I want a very warm round of applause to Stephen Crocker, Gonzalo Navarro, and Carolina Aguerre for their welcome and opening remarks. Okay. Now we are going to move onto the next item on our agenda for today. We need the new panelists to take their seats please.

SEBASTIAN BELLAGAMBA:

Thank you for being here. I hope you are enjoying our beautiful city. We had agreed with ICANN people from LAC TLD and the weather forecast. We had agreed on nice weather, but apparently there was some e-mail that didn't get right, so there are some issues with DNS.

I wanted to introduce the panel. It would be very good if you have any question, please make this session very interactive. We want to

contribute to this micro-climate of the world of DNS that we have. So Anthony Harris is now going to give us his presentation, and please, if you need anything just let us know.

ANTHONY HARRIS:

Good morning, everybody. We are trying to organize my presentation, which I have prepared so carefully. And to confuse you a little bit, I have half my presentation in Spanish and half in English, and there were other contributors also in my presentation. So it's going to be quite amusing to see if we can figure the technical issue out. So otherwise, I don't know what I'm going to talk about.

I would like to ask somebody else from the panel, if you're not going to use [lights], if you would like to speak. Could you please solve this issue?

ARIEL GRAZIER:

Good morning, everybody. As a member of the City of Buenos Aires, I have suffered the consequences of not receiving that weather e-mail. It usually takes 30 minutes for me to get here. Today it took me an hour and ten. This is just to let you know that you understand what we're talking about. Fortunately, we are all here. We have been told that the rain would have stopped at 7:30 and the storm would cease, so let's keep our fingers crossed.

Welcome and thank you for inviting us. I am here on behalf of CABASE. CABASE is Argentinian Chamber for the Internet. It's the business association which gathers all the Internet players in Argentina which focuses on the development of the Internet.

Within our association today we have over 150 members throughout the country, and we develop different tasks and projects. We try to participate at all the events and anything that promotes the development of the Internet in the region. We are one of the players in the region, which has supported the multi-stakeholder model and has participated from day one in this famous meeting before the white paper which ended up with the establishment of ICANN.

We have appointed basically Tony from our association to represent us in every international event that takes place anywhere in the world to promote the development of the Internet.

As part of our commitment from Argentina in the multi-stakeholder process, today it is not only Tony but several of us who are participating in almost all of the events promoting this model. Specifically, within the activities we perform in Argentina, maybe most of you do not know, but besides being a business association, which is not only a business association because we have government agencies, we have nonprofit organizations which are involved in our organization we also have an important role within the Internet in Argentina since we operate the traffic interchange points in Argentina, which ensures for us Internet functionality and the possibility of expanding traffic.

Today in Argentina we have ten traffic interchange points which are connected to each other throughout our country. For our visitors, we have a quite large country. Not only long distances within Buenos Aires, but we have long distances within our country. So these ten regional interchange points which are connected to the one in Buenos Aires cover most of our country and we are developing to conclude by the

end of June next year, we have to have five more interchange points, which would amount to 15 interchange points which improves connectivity for users in Argentina. This causes a better quality and better prices for Internet.

Within the activities we've developed and we continue to develop for us, the DNS is an important part. CABASE has devised and established as a principle as from the new project, the New gTLDs, which are being developed by ICANN to become a registrar we have initiated the process to become one. We expect we can accomplish that for us in Argentina and with the political and financial problems which any Latin American country has, we have come across some issues which we are trying to solve so as to obtain our objective. It is a challenge truly for us – a financial challenge, a technological challenge, an institutional challenge.

Over this over 150 members, which make up our association, about 120 are Internet service providers. Many of them provide domain selling services. Therefore we understand that facing this process is very important for us to promote all the new domains to develop what we still see in the region. For us, I think access to domains outside of dot-ar with which we are quite familiar where we have very good access, with which have worked for the last 15 years, we understand that this new opportunity is going to generate new movement and all our associates will find new opportunities for development.

However, we need to make sure that this will coincide our fate within the possibilities of a Latin American association with the economy of a country which enables this to develop.

In Tony's presentation, we are going to explain some of the issues that we have encountered throughout our process to access this milestone, but we are convinced that by working with ICANN we will be able to solve this issue so as to fit within this process. This is from CABASE Argentina. What we are trying to do, we continue to be committed to working in the region, as Carolina was saying before. We will try to contribute and to help in all the processes that, for the development of our region, are required. This project is one of them. I'll leave you with Tony now, if he was able to solve the technology issue. Thank you.

ANTHONY HARRIS:

Good morning again. Or good afternoon now. We have all the technical issues solved. I'm going to talk about two topics. First, this new ICANN program. I call it a large expansion for new generic domains. For six years, many of my colleagues in ICANN have called it the mother of all evils, so the program for new TLDs has had a lobby against from intellectual property lawyers, which I have never seen before. So much energy, so much effort, which managed to delay the program for almost six years. Therefore, we may conclude that it is something important because all of the opposition has encountered briefly background. As you know, the Internet began with the legacy domains – dot-com, dot-net, dot-org. The dot-com absorbed domain registrations virtually throughout the Internet world at the beginning because it was the only thing that existed. When we look at a menu, at the end it says all the others, but [inaudible] all the others. Now it's a [inaudible] in the Internet.

Then came the country codes, ccTLDs, which are classified in a UN list. As you all know, they are territorial codes. Usually they are operated by governments, universities, with some exceptions. One of them is sitting next to me, this gentlemen, which is [dot-co] and dot-tv, which is Tuvalu which is used for television. I understand that for the [inaudible] RALO it's an important source of income.

ICANN and changes. Curiously, when CABASE was the first Latin American entity that approached the ICANN process at the days of the white paper, Ariel who is sitting here was the one who went to Washington together with another member of CABASE, Ricardo [inaudible], and brought the news that an entity was going to be created, which later was called ICANN.

From the very beginning, we were around. The first significant thing that ICANN did was establish competition in the selling of domains, as you all know, which gave rise to the division between registries. That is to say, I call them the owners of franchises. And the registrars, which are the reselling chain.

Of course the secondary market emerged. [inaudible] for domains for good names to register. Dot-com especially gave rise to a whole new industry, which is called the domain [inaudible] which find valuable names and resell them.

The first expansions, briefly. In 2000, there was an open round with some extensions, none of which was very successful. There were problems with access because many e-mail platforms were not able to solve extensions of over three digits to [the right of the dot]. And then in 2004, there was a restrictive round where applicants had to justify

that the domain responded to specific and to a specific community. Now the case of [inaudible]. After four years of legal battle, it has been enabled.

Now comes a mega launch, which started in 2012 with 1,930 applicants with the high cost of application, \$185,000 which is something that discouraged some of our participants in our region. We have to consider that once you have got the preapproval from ICANN, you need to open a standby letter of credit and to hold \$140,000 in a bank for eight years. So this is not negligible investment.

In Latin America, there were only 27 applications for new domains. Those were applied where geographic names such as Africa, Berlin. For example, community names, specific interest names, corporate names which are large companies which decide they're not going to be called dot-com, but they are going to be called Google or IBM.

Then general interest names, which are the ones that have normally 12, 13, or 14 such as dot-inc or dot-web. They have normally 12 or 13 applicants going to an auction, usually. And [inaudible] had 108 applications for extensions in non-ASCII alphabets.

To my understanding, I will say that dot-com [inaudible] needs languages and are going to be among the most successful ones. Who do they belong to? Verisign, of course.

Who will benefit with the new domains? Users. They will have more options to choose from. The registries will be able to sell more. The registrars, too. They will have more products to put in their portfolio.

And the domain resellers will have a larger portfolio to offer to their users.

Some highlights in terms of the new TLDs program. The first delegations were already launched. There were four IDNs that were enabled, and seven extensions in ACII alphabet, which were uploaded to the root last week. It is estimated that in 2014 there will be around 1,000 more delegations, 1,000 new domains. And in the first quarter of 2014, we expect the delegation of dot-lat, which I'm mentioning for two reasons. First, because I'm the applicant. I want to advertise myself. And second, because it's a domain that is absolutely Latin American. That is to say the owner of the franchise is [inaudible], which is Latin American Federation of Ecommerce with a venue in Uruguay and the technical operator is NIC Mexico. It's an absolutely LAC project. There's no American or European registry providing the back office service.

So thank you very much. [inaudible] the end of my presentation. I still need to go on. There is no coffee break here, because you're going to be distracted. But if we are lucky – no we were not lucky, because now comes the statistics for Latin America, which was prepared for Oscar Robles. I think it's going to be very interesting to you to show the problems. There is creativity here. I love it. I have to give the credit to the author, Oscar Robles.

In English, it's great. How to kill the early industry of DNS in Latin America, how to give it an end. Let's see what he was inspired by. First, Oscar says that there are 2.4 billion users worldwide of which Latin America has 254 million only, and we have 10.5% of the total Internet users in our region. The pretty girl is not part of the presentation.

To be honest, it's difficult to show off like this. Let's take into account that security goes beyond operations, so it's fine to update your system. Well, I could invest the statistics, but maybe I'll be wrong. I forgot about the Ginger and Fred routine, which is to dance and to do something to entertain the audience. Maybe I have some partner in the panel. Anthony, would you want us to turn off the light so as to save some time, to win some time for you? I'm embarrassed because I'm also stealing the time from my colleagues, but there was a bunch of interesting statistics prepared by Oscar Robles. Maybe they're coming back from somewhere. Let's see.

Meanwhile, what we could say is a summary. I apologize for using humor. We could say that I'm going to give you the conclusion now, so as to save some time. Honestly, the way the business is prepared which stems from the ICANN activity, which is the registry and registrar activities for Latin America, I would say it is quite esoteric and remote because of the access cost for an interested party to become a registry, or as we're trying to do at CABASE, become a registrar.

To become a registrar, a reseller of domains, besides a series of positions which are [inaudible] such as 3,000, 4,000 [inaudible] cost of the annual fee, the access fee or the enter fee, and the percentage of your sales, you need to get civil liability insurance for \$1 million.

Consider what this means for a nonprofit organization. For example, CABASE, which [inaudible] realizes we don't have our own facilities. We do not have land. We do not have equipment. We do not have assets which will enable us to get an insurance from a company. The cost for us is impossible. It's impossible for us to access this type of instrument.

And on the other hand, what a registrar can sell in terms of registries. Working as a registrar, why should we guarantee this large amount? It is much more than the turnover they're going to have in two or three years. We've been discussing this for a long time. We are truly interested in having Latin America participate, get more involved in ICANN.

I can read to you now. I can at least read the statistics. I'm going to go back where I stopped. We have now 13 root servers, which are the upper part of the DNS. This is where they are located, and 353 what we call mirrors. There's one in CABASE. I'm taking a long time, I know. We can go to the next slide. I need to learn some stand-up comedy to fill these gaps.

Registry operators, thinking of Latin America. If we look at the list, we have Brazil in the 10th position, but you can see that domains are [virtually] focused, concentrated in the first four or five, especially in Verisign. The number of registrations in Latin America, including country codes are .8 million and the total number of domains considering all the world and all the existing domains, Latin America has 3.3% which is a little low. In terms of registrars, there are 989 registrars created by ICANN, [19] of which are Latin America. So we have 1.9% of the total registrars.

The number of registrations by registrars as of July, 2013, was 145 million names of which Latin America were registered 170,000. That is to say .16% of total registrations here. We're talking about generic domains registered in Latin America.

How to kill this domain thing, the registries and registrars in Latin America. Changes to the Registrar Accreditation Agreement [inaudible]. This version introduced changes and demands which forced the registrar to make greater cost, greater efforts. Some things that complicated registration even further. I'm not going to read it. It's written. But I'm going to take some time, so if you want to get this information, I can give it to you later.

On the other hand, the same is required for registry and registrar in Latin America as in any other part of the world, considering that the dimension of what somebody in Latin America can read is not the same as what you can do in Europe, the United States, or some parts of Asia.

Finally, as I mentioned before, the entry barrier to become a registrar, which is a civil liability insurance of \$500,000. You saw [inaudible] thank you very much before, so I'm here for any question you may have. I'm sorry for the technology issues. Thank you, Anthony.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you. Your presentation was impeccable despite the technical issues. This is the coordinator speaking. I am now going to give the floor to our friend, Eduardo Santoyo, who will have a very interesting presentation to share with us.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Thank you for this dialogue space. I'm going to be as fast as possible, which is not very easy for me to do because I tend to speak for longer than expected or planned.

First of all, when we initiated this discussion, when we started discussing the organization of this event, even before Durban, even before the African DNS Forum in Durban, we started discussing these initiatives when other organizations – LACNIC and LACTLD – got together.

For instance, we started focusing on increasing dialogue among the different interested parties. Dialogue on how to build greater engagement and discussion and to raise more awareness, especially for us in our capacity as Latin Americans and for our community's awareness of this collective construction, which we call the DNS.

Surely, this is a very important intermediate or progress milestone that we need to celebrate, because we had gathered other friend organizations like ICANN, NPOC, ISOC among others and all of them are now part of this discussion process towards greater maturity and towards an increased capacity to share or to socialize what we call the DNS in our region, as Tony very well noted in his presentation, because some of the factors are really alarming.

On this occasion, we're speaking about socializing what the DNS is, the concept of the DNS. And as Carolina pointed out, we found it difficult to agree on what the DNS is, on defining it. But we, as a country code, said ultimately it doesn't matter if we don't agree on the definition of the DNS. What matters is to be part of the dialogue.

We had something very clear in mind, and we wanted this to be a space not only to speak about the CCs (the country codes) but to speak about other topics or issues, [unlike] what happened in Africa. So we are really

grateful for this participation in our capacity as the country codes and this is what I will be focusing on.

We are a country code community, and it's quite a varied community which mirrors the variances that we have worldwide in terms of country codes. We have large, medium, and small country codes. They also differ in terms of their administration. We have private organizations. We have fully state-run or government- run organizations. We also have organizations from the academia running the country codes. There are also organizations that deliver domains free of charge to the users while there are others that charge a fee and they have a business management model in place.

We contribute another important element, and that is that we are all linked to our local Internet communities and we are a channel of communication for the technical community and these crazy people that you see debating the Internet in the ICANN ecosystem, and we are the communication channel between this community and the users in our countries. We are in contact with CABASE in Columbia. We are in contact with our respective Chamber of Commerce for Internet users, and our role is to bring this local community closer to this overall governance environment. We are part of this environment because it is in line with our role within Internet governance.

In the region, we also have our association LACTLD. LACTLD has celebrated – or is celebrating – its 15th anniversary. We're celebrating that tomorrow and you are all invited to that celebration.

In these 15 years, we have matured quite a lot in terms of sharing experiences, generating a capacity building framework with

intercommunity cooperation of our membership and bringing other organizations on board to encourage capacity building within the region. So we regularly hold workshops. We deliver workshops on technical, legal, commercial topics, business topics. And we have already put in place a fellowship system which helps some small registries attend these types of capacity building initiatives without using a lot of their funds. So this is a very good support scenario or framework that we have put in place in order to increase this security and stability framework of the DNS, which is within our remit as country codes.

There is a lot to do, plenty of work ahead, and we are now becoming part of a strategic plan in coordination with ICANN, within ICANN's umbrella if you will, so that this consolidation initiative for the regional organizations will be more organized and will have or will be better supported by all or the entire community.

Also, within the regional framework, thanks to our language – because we have a very important advantage, almost all the countries in Latin America and the Caribbean speak Spanish. We speak the same language. And in the Caribbean, most countries speak English, so it's only two languages. And I'm not speaking about Portuguese. Well, we have French also. It's also an important language, but we don't have that many French speaking countries.

So we have language diversity, but that is not a very significant barrier in our region, so this really helps our integration and that is very important. It has helped our joint efforts to move along in order to

create this cooperation framework with more fluency, or more smoothly.

We still have very new registries. Registries that came up after political separations or divisions in the Caribbean. Some of them depended or were connected with the Kingdom of Holland and it's very hard to imagine registries that are that small. Well, it's hard, but the year is starting up and we need to find sustainability and feasibility mechanisms for them to create their own existence to develop their own Internet node for their respective communities and to integrate them to the entire community.

And we have, as I said, large or big domain or CCs that do not need this support but that do need help to insert in the market and in the political context.

Also, in our capacity as the ccTLD community, we have increasing and more mature awareness of the political sector and the political sector engagement in the governance environment. From that standpoint, registries and LACTLD have been and will continue to generate a larger space for debate on Internet governance. This is done by registries in their respective countries, and we also engage in global initiatives and we also engage in this kind of initiatives with ICANN.

We understand more and more our responsibility to participate in this joint effort. ICANN is nothing but the convergence of all our individual intentions or wills, and it is from that perspective that we have been growing and maturing this political awareness, in order to jointly engage and build this scenario with all the community.

You see, I told you that I always speak longer than expected or than planned. I still have many topics to cover, but I would rather wait for a dialogue or a Q&A session after the presentations and I need to give the floor to our next panelist. That is Andrew. And building on what Tony said, we, the country code community, are seeing the growth of the generic domains, because finally the gTLD registrants do exist here on planet Earth, and surely some of them exist or live in this part of the planet, in the southern cone. And I'm speaking about the registrants. Somebody will register the domains, so these domains in our understanding are part of our microsystem, our natural market. I don't know how many of them, and maybe Andrew can give us a better perspective, but some of them have a prospect and business plan to develop a new market.

So what will take place is that we will all face a market and industry environment far different from the one we have now as from 2014 and onwards. We will see publicity, commercials, radio, TV announcements "register your name under this domain," etc. We see this in North America. Here in these latitudes, we have never seen that on TV, but this is coming and there will be a very wide offer and it's going to be interesting, but we need to get ready because change is around the corner and maybe Andrew can let us know about this in more detail. Thank you very much for your attention.

ANDREW MACK:

This is Andrew Mack. I am the only gringo on the panel. It's a real pleasure to be here today with you. My connection with the region and the ICANNers and this group of ICANNers is a very deep connection. As I

said yesterday, this is my 23rd ICANN meeting. But before that, I have been – or I became – a member of the community. I was a member of the LAC soccer team in Portugal. Not very successful. And the volleyball team in San Juan, that was successful.

Anyway, this is my first time in Buenos Aires. In almost 20 years' time, the city has changed quite a lot, especially in terms of technology. Not very much in terms of traffic. But it's really impressive to see what we have here. It's really an honor.

I will speak about the impact of the new gTLDs, especially their impact on Latin America and how we can participate a little bit more in designing the future and we can participate a little bit more in terms of the impact of the gTLDs on this region.

So have Latin America and the Caribbean passed this new gTLD process? Because there weren't that many applications for several reasons – low outreach or information on the program, lack of funds, the need to resort to legal counsel and consulting services, etc.

I have three observations on the program and how we can make an impact on the region. First of all, with 1000 new gTLDs, they are not all going to be successful. Very few of them will be successful in the long-term. This is my first observation. Then, after many conversations with many of the applicants, it is clear to us that they did not think that much about the impact on Latin America and they did not think that much about how they can get closer to the market in the southern cone.

So that is a challenge, but also an opportunity because we have the capability to make a very important long-term influence on the

development of their participation in this market. So we can give them orientation and gear them towards things that will have an impact upon the regional development and that will improve the participation of certain groups within the continent or not. And that is why we have this possibility of having a very important influence.

There are two types of new gTLDs – the ones that are mainly commercial and the other ones that are more focused on communities, more community focused. The ones that are only marketplaces, how can we influence or exert influence upon those? They have a strategy. We can do some outreach activities, we can engage in conversations with them and we can prove to them that there is a market here in the south.

But I want to focus a little bit more on the community focused ones, especially on the dot-ngo, because we are members of that team. That is a local example of how we can make a very big impact or have a very big influence because that focuses on the NGO community needs in the region, especially on a global scale.

What is dot-ngo? It's a new gTLD specifically oriented to the NGOs. It's a space for genuine NGOs that have to prove their qualifications and it's fully oriented towards what the NGOs need. They need to have capabilities to get together, to meet, to get new members, and also to obtain external funding not only within the region, but also from elsewhere. So this gives the impression or point of view of more organization, more impact.

I believe that this is a very good example of how we can make an impact, because in the case of dot-ngo, we need the community's advice.

So in order to make this work as best as possible, we need input from the community. What type of NGOs, what type of genuine NGOs, are there? What type of genuine NGOs are there in that market? And what are the community needs in several parts of Latin America?

I believe this initiative is interesting because it was built with the community in mind, but it cannot be successful without the community. So we are asking for help. We are asking for input in order to fully understand the needs, but also to have long-term advice regarding how we can work on this initiative. I think this is a perfect example of something that we can do.

At the end of the day, ICANN's world is landing in Latin America. ICANN's world has changed quite a lot, and the significant or integral role of Latin America is far more interesting than before. In the past, there were just a few of us getting together speaking Spanish, but we have more or increased participation in the business community, in the NPOC community. We are far more visible, and I think that this new season with the new gTLDs means that we have to keep along this trend. It's part of this trend and we have to make the most of this trend for the future, because ultimately, the ones that are launching this new gTLD program from the global north, well, if they are not thinking about the region, we have to show our colors proudly and say we are a market, we have interests and we have needs. As I said, I feel [inaudible] to be part of this panel. Dot-ngo and dot-ong

[RODRIGO DE LA PARRA]: Thank you, Andrew. We're going to give time to Marie-Laure who is going to give a different approach from the other panelists. How much time do I have left? We are okay with time? 5-10 minutes. 15-20 minutes, not more.

MARIE-LAURE LEMINEUR: Thank you very much. It is an honor to be here in Buenos Aires with or without the rain. In fact, I live in Costa Rica where the tropical rain is much worse than here, so I cannot complain.

My name is Marie-Laure Lemineur. I represent a group which was created within ICANN. It is called NPOC, which represents the interest of the nonprofit organizations. We are under the umbrella of an organization that is called, in English, [inaudible] which is a group of non-commercial interested parties which defines policies for higher domain names.

Eduardo was mentioning the registries that are recent in the Caribbean. Well, we are an organization which is relatively new within the world if ICANN because we were established in July 2011, so we are only two-and-a-half years old. Do you want me to speak up? Okay. Or closer to the microphone.

I want to talk about the contribution of the civil society to the DNS to the work that ICANN does. Basically, first of all I wanted to touch on why the civil society needs to be there, present in this situation on these topics. People would ask themselves this legitimate question. Where this interest comes?

I think there are three factors, from my point of view. First of all, the global overview. Let us not forget that the Internet and DNS in general is based on a collaborative open and inclusive model. This is the context where we are moving. Number two, when I was at university I used to have an international law professor of human rights who used to say that Scandinavia was the social conscience of the world in terms of human rights, and I would like to make a parallel with ourselves.

It's not that we are the conscience of the world at ICANN, but I'd like to think that we represent social conscience within the world of ICANN as representatives of groups that have not-for-profit ends. We do not have an agenda based on commercial interests. We defend principles, values and rights that we believe in and that our members believe in. This is important.

Some of those principles and rights are evidently principles of good Internet governance, which is transparency, accountability within ICANN of course, because this is our environment. Then which some rights which are very important for us within this context – the right to privacy, data protection – and this is something that is in the agenda of many organizations and it is quite up-to-date. Within ICANN we fight and we pressure so that these rights are recognized.

I would like to say that when I say that we do not have an agenda [inaudible] doing business, it's not that we are saying that the colleagues or the other sectors who are represented within ICANN who do have an agenda dealing with business are not [inaudible]. It's evidently legitimate. We have an inclusive vision, not exclusive. We do not believe that as we have an agenda to [inaudible] certain rights, we

are worth more than the other sectors. Rather, what we believe is that we must work together, and it is [inaudible] balancing of interests. I think this is an idea for us which is key in our vision of how ICANN must work. A balancing of interests in decision-making. It is important.

This leads me to the third reason why I believe the civil society must participate in the DNS in ICANN. We are part of a model which is called multi-stakeholder, in English. In Spanish, it's translation is the multi-interested parties. It sounds a bit strange in Spanish, but you understand the idea.

ICANN practices this model, and we are part of this model, so we believe that we have all the legitimacy to be there. To me, this model in the end is related to a model of weights and counter-weights, balances, for those who have studied law. We all share this power the power [inaudible]. I believe that this is also an important aspect. This multi-stakeholder model within ICANN, we are part of it. We defend it and I want to clarify that as many think, we will think it's not perfect. There are many problems. We are the first to complain within ICANN. When I say complain, I say this in a positive manner.

However, even though this imperfect model is unique in ICANN, there is no other organization that practices it. And besides, it's the best alternative to the multi-lateral model. As representatives of the interest of non-for-profit organizations, we are against a model where only governments – the multi-lateral model where only governments can make decisions and define the rules of the Internet or the DNS.

This feeling or this vision we have is shared by the general public. I was reviewing an ISOC survey done with 10,000 users of the Internet

worldwide in 20 countries, including Brazil, Peru, Argentina. I don't remember which other countries in the region.

One of the results of that survey is that 83% of the respondents think that the public must be associated to the [revisions] that the government make when defining rules related to the Internet. So this is a position that we share and defend.

Now, specifically, what is it that we'll do in our day-to-day? I would like to give you some specific examples of the things we handle in our day-to-day work and the hours we invest at ICANN.

There is a lot of work that we do at the working groups – [inaudible] working groups. ICANN performs a call and people from any community who are interested, they just enter those working groups and they may become more or less active. Some people have a very passive participation because they listen or they read, but they do not contribute much. There are others that are more of a contributor type, and that is the responsibility of each and any one of us and it depends on the time we have and the interest we have individually.

Participating in a group in something that is called WHOIS, which is a database, going back to privacy, since it is one of the priority things for us, I was at this Working Group. We spent a lot of time – months – working. In fact, there are some colleagues from this Working Group who spent time discussing.

And some sub-groups were created. One of them was about privacy and data protection. [Don] was presiding over this subgroup on data protection and privacy. I would like to say congratulations because he

did a great job and we discussed for months and months. Sometimes these discussions were quite heavy and long, because there were people from intellectual property interests, commercial interests and they do not necessarily share our concern about the privacy of registrants, of the individuals.

Some discussions were quite tense and I'm happy to say – and I believe this is what happened – finally we issued a report with recommendations. I believe we were about four representatives from the non-commercial groups and I believe that our presence waived in the type of recommendations that were issued in terms of the fact that ICANN should be more careful in terms of the implications that the decisions made with respect to this database, WHOIS, in terms of privacy. I believe that our participation was important there.

Another specific example is the following. I was some days ago with the IGF in Bali. A well-known activist on the rights of childhood approached me from Europe and he told me about his concern of the management of the dot-kids application. We had an interesting conversation. He shared his concerns with me in terms of how illegitimate it is for a foundation, for a company, to apply for an extension dot-kids, which is a community extension in fact, which are the implications that this may have in terms of contents. He was quite worried.

One of the commitments that I took with him is that we were going to continue talking because he's not very familiar with the way ICANN works, what are the rules of the applicant's guide to apply for extensions, so I took a commitment to explain to him or to give him the

possibility to express his concerns within ICANN, which his concerns are quite legitimate.

A final example of that the work that we are doing from NPOC is that we are aware that the work that is done at ICANN, in fact, although it is quite specific and it's related to the DNS, the rules that are defined in applications for all users of the Internet even though, as users, do not realize what is going on there.

We've reached the conclusion that it is important for us to defend the rights of non-commercial groups within ICANN in terms of issues related to the DNS. Also, we have one foot outside the ICANN. Rather, one foot in the eco-system of Internet governance and we promote other initiatives, which relate to Internet governance. We are promoting a project that's called [i-info]. We do not have a translation for it in Spanish yet. It sounds a bit strange. There's not time to go into details, but the essence of this initiative is that we have united with other NGOs such as Global Knowledge Partnership Foundation [IECD] which is based in The Netherlands, and in essence it's about questioning the sovereignty of the Internet – the traditional concept of sovereignty, territorial sovereignty which is obsolete in the digital world. So we question and we'll work on this topic.

And we propose initiatives to promote local development with the communities with the new extensions which will be launched in the market because we believe that, as the other colleagues mentioned it, this program, this new extensions that will be available soon are going to be an opportunity to make business. This is not a bad word in our mouth to do business. Also, to develop communities locally. We believe

that there a lot of opportunities but there's no time for – [inaudible] here.

I would like to conclude by telling you about the civil society in Latin America. Unfortunately, out of the models we have, very few are from the region. Let us look at this from the positive example. This is an opportunity for us to campaign for recruitment here. Since some announcements have been made, I'm going to make my announcement.

For those of you who are interested, to those of you who you are working with NGOs, if you're really interested in joining us, please go to our webpage NPOC.org or come talk to us and we'll discuss the process.

There's going to be a panel on participation I believe. You may develop this idea for the panel, but I don't think there is some regional specify that causes the Latin American NGOs not to be interested or not interested in joining what we do. It is rather a global phenomenon.

It is hard to find NGOs anywhere who accept to be active with us. I believe that there is a very simple reason. There's lack of knowledge. It is not very clear what we do. It's quite a closed world. ICANNers, Andrew was talking about it from the outside. Two years ago, I didn't know anything about ICANN. I didn't understand what they did, and now I'm here.

It's our responsibility to go out and find them. It's not sit and wait for them to approach us, but we have to discuss it and be proactive explaining what we do because it's important for NGOs to join us. I'm going to say it again. I believe that a multi-stakeholder model to conclude will only be able to continue to exist if we involve more and

more sectors and if we have quality people, active people, who are ready to contribute. This is going to be very important not only in terms of the members that we may acquire, but also in terms of the quality of the contribution. I think the success of the multi-stakeholder model largely depends on having quality contributions. This is what I wanted to tell you. Thank you very much. Thank you, Marie-Laure.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Thank you very much. We have some minutes for questions. Would you like to ask a question to the panel? There is a microphone over there. Please, don't be shy.

CAROLINA AGUERRE: Thank you. This is Carolina Aguerre from LACTLD for registries for the greater good. You all made contributions from your respective positions in terms of the DNS, so to speak. But I would like to know if we can leverage this collective knowledge so that each of you can tell us, what is the DNS for your organizations, what DNS represents and what DNS is and what is this particular relevance? Where can we approach this from in the region? I'm going to be taking notes, of course. I feel I am at school. Okay. Ladies first. This is dangerous.

MARIE-LAURE LEMINEUR: Thank you for the honor. I think we need to look at it from a practical standpoint. At least as NGOs, what are the problems we may have in the day to day work? For us, fraud is a problem for NGOs. The NGOs rely much on when there are disasters, natural disasters for example. Many organizations count on the platforms they have online to collect funds.

There are fraud issues and abuse of privacy in those cases. I am a bit concerned about the community extensions and applications that are going to exist for those cases because this is going to give more visibility to certain groups, to those communities. We are talking about dot-gay for example. The children, dot-kids. We are talking about religious groups that will have more visibility. I hope I'm wrong, but one of my concerns is the following. By having more visibility, there are those community sites. It may be easier for them to be subject to abuse, attack, by certain groups. I don't know.

In terms of dot-gay, we know that are groups that practice a hatred to their sexual orientations. For the case of dot-kids, from the point of the view of a sexual predator, I hope it will not become a huge database for them to track children, find pictures, information about children because evidently those size of a group, information content related to those groups. The same for groups that foster religious hatred. They're going to be able to find these groups more easily when the community sites will exist. This is a concrete concern I have. I hope I'm wrong, but I've discussed this with other people and we share this concern.

Another example would be dot-[ong] or dot-ngo. This is a discussion we've had with people from [inaudible]. By having an open and public platform where thousands – and we hope millions – of NGOs will be listed, governments that are not so democratic and that chase some local organizations which are politically active in their position, governments will find information very easily. This is a concern we have and we are permanently discussing these topics.

I don't know have an answer to your question. Is this what you wanted?
I am going to give you a more [operational] vision as part of the community that administrators Internet trafficking.

ARIEL GRAIZER:

It generates several things. As you saw in the statistic represented before, we don't have a root server. We only have mirrors. This modifies change. It's going to regenerate changes in traffic. This is why we're interested in bringing root servers to the region. Mirrors help us and improve connectivity and they reduce latency. On the other hand, we also see – and Tony is the advocate of this- the operational problems that this is going to bring about in terms of support to users.

Of all those suppliers, we'll have to understand this new world of all this new gTLDs. You need to provide service to users. You need to explain to them. I can see the secretary there [inaudible] Roberto saying yes, agreeing.

Provide service to users. This is a true challenge because we always talk about evangelism as a way to educate our users and the public in general on how to use our infrastructure, our tools. The challenge of 1,000 new gTLDs is going to be a challenge. It's going to a problem, and we'll need to provide a lot of training to all those who are not used to this word, who are not part of this community as we are – the community of ICANNers or the technical communities that we represent. We have to be ready to provide support.

Recently, in Argentina, we initiated a process of change fostered by the Secretary of Communications, [inaudible], for a better quality and

better provision of services. The services we provide as operators require that level of service. This poses a huge problem and a huge challenge ahead which I believe we will be fit to respond to. But we need to understand that it's going to take some time until all the organizations in the region are ready to provide support to users in each and every one of these new challenges that we are being given by the DNS. I don't know,, Carolina if I've answered your question, but based on the statistics that we showed at the beginning, we really have a challenge.

ANDREW MACK:

The question is, what is the DNS in Latin America? Well, in all the entire eco-system of Internet operation in all aspects, we have to focus or start with users but we need capabilities to acquire and use domains so I believe it includes all the infrastructure – not only the root server infrastructure but also the electrical grid and electrical power infrastructure so that these can be operative. The best way to visualize this is to be as broad as possible and comprehensive, that is to include everything and everyone. From the point of view of challenges, as I understood after listening to the first panelists, I agree.

I have five options: training, engagement, the possibility of having an impact or making an impact in the future, and participating in the development of all GLDs. Then protection, investment because this will be absolutely necessary and cooperation – cooperation between the governments, the civil society, and the business community. Without the participation of each of these members, we're not going to achieve what we want for the future.

EDUARDO SANTOYO: Definitely. And we have participated in some conversations that show how difficult and complex the DNS is. But we see that some elements have crept up and they help us come up with a definition.

My interpretation towards a definition of the DNS is that the DNS is a complex system involving physical structures, and that [means] computers, logical systems, electricity, information processing, protocols, standards, mechanisms that will make the information interchange on flow process smoother.

It means the support of social structures that make it functional so that it works in a coordinated fashion. It needs contents. Content is part of the DNS. It needs protection systems, right protection mechanisms, so that access will not infringe upon the rights of the different parties. And it needs social participation systems.

In general, each and every one of these elements are tremendously complex, but all of them together help us define the cloud that we call the DNS. This is my contribution towards getting close to a definition of what I believe the DNS is.

ANTHONY HARRIS: I have two replies. First of all, I have no idea whatsoever, and the second reply is longer but I promise I will not use any slides. To me, the DNS may be interpreted in different ways. There is a sector that is really involved in that and considers the DNS a synonym of real estate, so it's virtual real estate in terms of domains. Then it is identity.

In terms of domains in the DNS, clearly what you're looking for is to have your own identity on the Internet as the applicant of dot-lat. Our intention is to have a generic domain or TLD that will give an opportunity to have an identity to people that identify themselves as members of the Latin American community.

Then we wondered, "Why are we having so many TLDs? Why so many new users?" I believe the answer to this is very simple. Anyone in Buenos Aires visiting our city now may take the underground service, the subway, and see how many people are texting, are using their mobile phones to text. So there is a market, and inevitably we will see an enormous expansion of Internet use on mobile devices.

This is the great expansion – the great boom – in the use of the Internet, in my opinion, and I believe that there will be many more users seeking an identity by means of a domain name on the web, on their Facebook, or etc. Thank you.

ARIEL GRAIZER:

Is there any other question? We're doing great in terms of time. I think what is very [inaudible] also for the domain name system to realize that we need viable business plans and sustainable business plans to keep these things going.

Why did only 26 Latin American applications? Why only 16 or something like that for African? I can understand they're quite rightly. Why should they when it's so much money when they don't know how to get it back? I think we need to develop and promote business plans on levels

of the DNS system in order to make them viable and sustainable. I think that is a very important thing.

One observation of somebody who – please allow me that, even if it’s a little bit general – of somebody who lived 12 years in Latin America and Ecuador. You've got a concept which is called community and family, which is really, really important. That's one of the big advantages of Latin America.

I think, for example, if you use that word [“comunidad”], does it really show the rest of the world how to use it and how to make it do this [inaudible], be proud of it, use it, and make money out of it. That's one of my recommendations. Thank you. [inaudible]. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

I will respond to you in English because I can. First of all, I think you're absolutely right. I think that where we have a market failure is that a number of the new gTLDs and the people who are thinking about the future of the Internet are not thinking about the Global South, and they're not thinking about the Global South and they're not thinking about the Global South in part that it's not part of their business plan. As we were talking over dinner last night, the best analogy that I could come with is that this is the second half of the game.

To some extent, we were absent in the first half but the game is still very much on and it's very much about us. If we can show that the dynamism that already exists in the region and get people in the new gTLD world thinking about this region as a source of good, sustainable business, as a source of good, sustainable business as a source of

sustainable community impact in the case of a dot-ngo, then there's an infinite amount of development and commercial opportunity for the region.

It is incumbent upon us – and this is the challenge and it's a good challenge to have. But it is incumbent upon us to show the outside world that in fact, Latin America is here, is at more dynamic than you've ever realized. The fact that you aren't making Latin America and the Global South a part of your business plan was your error before, but working together we can make it not an error in the future and build up the visibility of Latin America and the investment in Latin America in that way.

EDUARDO SANTOYO:

Thank you. One of the initiatives that supported the creation and the approval of these new domain name applications was [there was] instrument would contribute to democracy in terms of access of Internet access because that enabled us to decentralize the industry that was so centralized at that time. That promise included the development of a lot of capacity building and promotion activities in areas or zones where this industry was not that developed, such as Latin America or Africa.

At the end of the day, these did not happen, and clearly, as we can see, applications once again come from those places where the industry was concentrated or centralized. So we have not seen this decentralization of the industry and we haven't seen the internal maturity of some other regions in terms of the importance or significance of this industry in Latin America, Africa, in several important parts of Asia. We still lack

awareness of this great opportunity that the Internet is in terms of social and economic development so that further resources are justified.

I do not fully agree with Tony Harris when he said that barriers to entry have made it difficult for the region to be more actively engaged in business management units on the Internet. I don't think that a \$500,000 US dollar insurance policy is the barrier to entry. I believe that the barrier to entry is lack of awareness of the opportunities that the Internet brings. When you take the subway, the underground, you see that everybody is using the Internet on their mobile devices. There's a huge opportunity to generate business. This means that at one point in time, you will get that insurance policy. Not because of your infrastructure, but because you need coverage in terms of any incident in the future once you start working with this business model.

There is still a lot of work ahead in terms of awareness raising in the global south in some parts of Asia, also in terms of the importance of management on the Internet for social and economic development. We need to continue decentralizing the industry because the three most important domains in Asia are going to be the translations into Mandarin of dot-com. They are from VeriSign so we will still see the same company handling this. We all have to continue working to change this environment and I welcome meetings such as this discussion forum.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA:

Thank you, and first of all I want to congratulate all the panelists. You have been great. I want to reflect upon a topic. Why do we have so few new gTLD applications? First of all, I want to reflect upon the work that

we need to do and the diagnosis. Figures speak for themselves. We got together in this Latin American and Caribbean strategy group and our main concern is to promote the engagement of several or different stakeholders within our ICANN model and also to facilitate the incorporation of new stakeholder's registries, registrars, etc. And we want to focus on analyzing the causes, the reasons.

In the case of registrars it's a little bit more uncertain because there isn't a clear barrier to entry. The market was already there. The reality is, as Tony was saying, we have only 19 registrars, vis-à-vis, the thousand-odd registrars worldwide. That is my reflection and we are working on this.

On a positive note, I believe that we got used to patting ourselves on the shoulder and saying, "Okay, good, we're making progress." And now we see members of CABASE wearing a different hat on this occasion. CABASE has been engaged or working with ICANN from the very beginning even before ICANN was created. We are very happy to be here, to be back in Buenos Aires after this 15-year period.

Now they can describe or share their experience as a gTLD applicant. They're still in the paperwork or doing the paperwork towards signing their contract and we hope next year their gTLD will be up and running. There are also other new phases in our community. We have a strong feeling of community, a strong sense of community.

Next week, we will be holding sessions to speak about new gTLDs and we will see new applicants in the region. There is still a lot to do. We are still playing the first half of this game and we are getting ready to play in the second half of the game during which, no doubt we will improve. Thank you.

ANDREW MACK:

I was part of the Joint Applicant Support group whose objective was to provide services and funding to applications from the Global South, especially to those coming from groups in need of help. It was a lot of work and a disaster. After working for two years and holding two weekly meetings, or we had, only two applications.

There's an American film called "Field of Dreams" starring Kevin Costner. There's a very famous line, "If you build it, they will come." A very famous line from that film. I think that within the ICANN world, that it's a very small world, we had that attitude. "If we build it, they will come."

Personally, I have learned from that experience in the JAS. I have learned from the new gTLD experience, and yes, we need to build it. But we need to promote it because nobody in the Global South was aware of the existence of the new gTLD program and of the existence of JAS, the Joint Applicant Support group.

We cannot increase engagement in a program nobody is aware of. So we need to communicate among ourselves, we need to communicate with the community but we need communication between ICANN and the community. We need to resort to all this new technology that we have. There is a lot more that we have to do.

We cannot wait for other people to work their magic. Not even in the ICANN world and not even in the new gTLD world. We have to compete and be at the forefront.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't know if there's any other question or comment. There's no more time, but you are the person from NIC Argentina, so we will make an exception.

GUSTAVO JUSTICH: I'll be very brief. The new gTLD program triggers questions and there will be doubts in the future of course. I wanted to share our experience in Argentina. When the opportunity came up to evaluate a new gTLD, we focused on the significance of the cost.

INTERPRETER: Interpreters apologize we are not receiving audio from the floor. We are not receiving audio from the Representative of NIC Argentina. Interpreters apologize. There is an issue with the microphone the speaker is using now. We cannot receive audio from the Representative of NIC Argentina. If the speaker could say a couple of words, please.

GUSTAVO JUSTICH: I was telling you, maybe what we expected or what we thought was going to happen with the new gTLDs is not exactly what we thought or what we expected. The truth is that there are many brands, many companies, that have extended their brand to the Internet with the sole objective of promoting themselves.

But in terms financial or economics, these new gTLDs are not something that's significant. In Argentina, we have thought of many alternatives. For example, the possibility of having a new gTLD per province in our case, for each region to have some form of identification.

INTERPRETER: We apologize. The microphone goes on and off.

GUSTAVO JUSTICH: Besides the cost of the application or the request for the application, they are not sustainable economically speaking. This is a reality. What we need to rethink for the future is what is that we want for new gTLDs? What is it that we are integrating in this use of gTLDs? And what is the need? Opening it up just for the sake of opening it up will only bring about the fact that those who have money will be able to enter, and those who do not have money won't.

This generates conflict at least. It's going to cause this gTLD to be used as an extension of a brand. I don't know if this is what we want or not. Do we want the company to be independent from those of us who are working all the time for the Internet to be a community? If we wanted [the company] to be run on their own, in terms of the Internet, this multi-stakeholder model could be disintegrated in some way.

I believe that we need to find some alternative to cater to the regions which in some way or other are not being taken care of, including new gTLDs in segments of countries or continents where the language was not being included. I think this is very important. It's a way to penetrate in places where they do not share the alphabet, for example. I think there is a need in those cases.

And I think we also need to work extensively on how to foster the Internet in the regions. Maybe it is just a part of the new gTLDs. There

are a lot of things to work on from the ccTLDs still. There's a lot to give from the ccTLDs.

Maybe the next step would be to reevaluate how to work from the ccTLD to the new gTLD so as to work together. Regional integration is very good but integrated inwards is also very good, because otherwise, we do not understand what the needs are of the area we are developing. For those of you who do not know, I am Gustavo Justich, National Director of NIC in Argentina.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you very much, Gustavo. If there are no further questions, I would like to give a round of applause to the panel and we'll invite you to a coffee break. Thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We are free for a coffee break until 11:30.

DAPHNE SABANES PLOU: We are now beginning the second panel of the morning. I am Daphne Sabanes Plou from the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), an NGO is quite involved in the work of Internet governance , both globally and regionally. I would like to introduce our panel comprised by Rodrigo de la Parra from ICANN, Olga Cavalli from GAC Argentina, Sebastián Bellagamba from ISOC, and Fatima Cambronero from LACRALO who is a regional At-Large organization for ALC. We also have Gabriella [Szlak].

Our topic of discussion is the participatory challenge of organizations in global and regional Internet forums. I believe that it is already interesting to talk about this in the morning because we bring the experience of aid global forums and Internet governance. In Latin America, we've had six regional forums.

We have had a great attendance from multiple stakeholders – governments, technical community, a strong presence in the region of civil society organizations. I believe this experience calls us to discuss what it is that we are evaluating, what we are seeing, which may be the future to continue with this work experience. In this manner in which we can get together, NGOs, governments, businesses, and stakeholders in the Internet so as to see what our future brings us. I will now give the floor to Sebastián Bellagamba.

SEBASTIAN BELLAGAMBA:

Thank you, Daphne. Good morning. This is Sebastián Bellagamba, the regional director from Latin American and the Caribbean Internet and Society. I am like [Santoyo]. I may go over my time. I may spend hours and hours speaking.

To give you a framework, when we talk about participation I believe we are talking about the Internet model as we know it. We are talking about multi-stakeholders as it was defined in the previous panel. It is difficult to find translation for multi-stakeholder, this term in English. The translation in Spanish is very lengthy and ugly, so allow me to speak Spanglish to use this term in English, multi-stakeholder for all the interested parties.

This multi-stakeholderism is natural on the Internet because of the conception of the Internet itself and the way the Internet was created. It was created as an open transparent network, which guided this from the beginning.

The first agency which implemented this multi-stakeholderism in terms of the Internet was the IETF, back then the Internet Engineering Task Force , which are those guys who develop the standards and protocols of the Internet. Some of you may know the IP, [inaudible], POP, or HTTP. All those Ps are developed by the IETF in every open transparent participatory manner. In some way, we wish, at least in our sector, the [genesis] of this multi-stakeholder come from the IETF. Not only by the IETF. The IETF is a consequence of the architectural design of the Internet itself. By design, the Internet needs to be governed in this way.

The IETF is so open and transparent that in fact, it doesn't exist in reality. In order to maintain this openness and transparency, they decided that they do not even have a legal personality. In legal terms, they do not exist. However, last week, the meeting number [88] of the IETF took place so apparently they do exist and product of the IETF does exist. The protocols I had just mentioned are, among many others, are run by the IETF.

I want to make the disclaimer here. One of the rules of the Internet Society is to operate as a [inaudible] home for the IETF. The fact that the IETF in legal terms does not exist, they do not have a legal status, is covered by the Internet Society which does have a legal status and we do lend this legal status to the IETF and we conduct the administrative tasks for the IETF.

When IETF met last week in Vancouver, they met at a hotel at which somebody had to sign a contract as IETF doesn't have a legal status. The Internet Society signed a contract. The IETF employees are employees of the Internet Society, so on and so forth.

In terms of governance, this is another term that is not so well translated either because it doesn't exist in Spanish. To separate it from government, [in the] two entries that's more related to central authority governance is related to distributed authority.

While we're talking about this there is nothing as a central authority in the Internet so the government of the Internet does not apply as a term.

In terms of Internet governance, I believe a fundamental landmark is [inaudible] Internet Society which was called by the United Nations [inaudible] Telecommunications Union, which had two phases, 2003 and 2005.

The summit, many of you had attended this summit directly, so I don't need to clarify much but for those of you weren't there although the summit was called for the [inaudible] in general, the discussion after the first phase of the summit focused mainly on this problem of Internet governance, which emerged as one of the great topics to be discussed.

Unfortunately, because I believe it was an opportunity lost to discuss many more things that would have been more interesting in the cosmic frame of that process. But the focus was [mostly] placed here. It's one of the first processes. There are others if we analyze the history of United Nations, but it's one of the first processes in which being a

process called by United Nations, the participation of other players was enabled, which were not governments. The International Telecommunications Unit and the United Nations are intergovernmental organizations. Only the governments participate. In this case, other players were also allowed to intervene – the [inaudible], the private sector, civil society. The technical community of the Internet was also allowed to participate.

This was interesting. The process, to make the story short because I don't have time to tell you all the details – I can go on later – but some of the main products of the World Summit of the Internet Society was related to more the lack of the agreement [inaudible] new forum of these governments which is the IGF, Internet Governance Forum which started in 2006, the year after the last summit of the Internet, the Summit of Society of the Information.

This forum was called for by the United Nations again. For those of you who participated in the Internet's governance forum, it's very interesting. Imagine if this forum would take place at this building. Before the forum begins, the flag of the United Nations is hoisted so the jurisdiction of all the building [inaudible] – is transferred to the United Nations. Countries that are hosts give over the sovereignty, which makes it interesting from the point of view of politics, if you wish. One piece of land changes from one jurisdiction to the other.

I was saying, although it was a forum called for by intergovernmental organizations, it also enabled the participation of all the other players involved in terms of Internet governance. For 80 years we've been going

around the world discussing things in this Internet governance forum, all the players involved.

There are regional processes also. One very interesting is that these Internet governance forums are preceded over by preparatory meetings for the forum, the regional Internet forums. We took a couple of years to become organized, so this year we had the sixth one. Although it was the eighth Internet government forum globally, we've had a sixth regional governance forums in Cordoba here in Argentina. Again, it's an absolutely open process.

I believe that these things that have happened have helped us a lot and have helped all of the players, especially to understand each other. Although the Internet governance forum doesn't have a resolution [inaudible], nothing specific is resolved besides the conclusions of the discussion, no other product result from the Internet Governance Forum. I believe the most significant thing is that all the stakeholders in Internet governance have learned a lot to work with the others.

I believe there's a concrete example of this learning curve in our region, which I wanted to share with you. I have Jose Clastornik over there. I wanted to mention him. There is a process which is coordinated by [inaudible] in Latin America, which involves all of governments in Latin America which is called ALAC.

The ALAC process was created for governments to coordinate with each other, compliance with the millennium development goals which were established by the United Nations also in the field of [ICTs].

In the first meeting of ALAC, I don't remember when it was – 2005, was it, in Rio de Janeiro? It was an intergovernmental process where many players, many non-governmental players, attended to try to participate to this meeting and try to cooperate and contribute our part, and literally those were banged in our face. Literally. Our noses suffered some bumps because of the doors.

I wanted to mark some learning from there. To cut it short, we've progressed to the point that today you're away, represented by Jose Clastornik at the back. He's here in this room. [inaudible] presiding over the ALAC follow-up procedure. Jose is here participating with us and we participate actively. From all the governmental players, we are very welcome to participate in that process.

I wanted to give this example of ALAC to show you our history, our story. We've gone from not being allowed access to some forums to the point where we are welcome and really well-received. In fact, the follow-up mechanism for ALAC formally has observers from the private sector, civil society observers from the technical community.

Daphne, you were there in that role. You still are in that role as part of a civil society, right? We are really thankful for the possibility to participate in those roles. I was telling you, we are really welcome. Our participation is really welcome, which is quite interesting. In terms of the challenges, I believe we have three specific challenges. They are related one to the other.

First, increasing participation. There are many forums that are arising, movements that are arising. For example, there is a meeting that seems to be very important [that] has been called by the government of Brazil

in the next year in terms of security and privacy, especially. Due to the disclosures that were made of these massive interceptions, tapings on the Internet, it seems it's going to be very interesting and we should participate there. But there are many other instances that were created.

For example, there are more and more Internet governance at a national level. There's another one at the Caribbean which I forgot to mention. Besides Latin America and the Caribbean forum there's one that is established Caribbean which has held its eighth meeting this year.

The fact that we have to become more involved as a region leads us to a second challenge, which is the fact that there are more and more meetings. It's very hard, therefore, for us in terms of resources – financial resources, which are very interesting but also in terms of human resources. It's very hard for us to cover the spread of events and meetings. There are meetings all over. There are even organizations such as ISOC which has a global presence. Even for us, it's hard and we have plenty of staff. Even for us, it's hard to follow the processes that are taking place. One thing goes against the other. We need to be more involved and have more coverage, but the multiplicity of events causes us to be unable to attend everywhere.

I was going to mention a third talent which I forgot. It shouldn't be so important, therefore. The third one is also related to financial resources. How can we, as a Latin American community, obtain financial resources to cover these needs? We have the need to participate. A [inaudible] of growing events and financial resources we need, which do not grow as the same pace as the needs. This equation is hard to solve.

To conclude, I would like to talk about some solutions for this. Many organizations offer scholarship programs to participate in these events. Internet Society, ICANN and many other organizations have scholarship programs to attend events. I encourage you to be aware, to pay attention for a moment when these programs are announced.

We have programs for scholarships at the IETF, IGF, Regional IGF Global, and we have more scholarships that I may forget to mention. Please, subscribe to our lists and they will be announced there. This is what I wanted to tell you. A bit of our history, a bit of our challenges, and I'm ready for questions you have later. Thank you very much.

DAPHNE SABANES PLOU:

Thank you, Sebastián. I think it's very important to take into account the consolidation of this dialogue and participation in these forums. We feel that multi-stakeholderism is coming to good fruition. You mentioned some of these benefits, but regionally, we see that ICANN and the region are consolidating with all the sectors. They have interest upon other areas or fields of work. I have attended the Women's Conference in Santo Domingo. It had to do with women on the Information Society and some of the topics that we have been addressing in the LAC plan have been addressed in that conference.

I think it's important for us to keep walking along this path to enlarge participation and influence. Okay. Let me now give the floor to Rodrigo.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA:

Thank you, Daphne. Good morning, everyone, again. I feel very fortunate that we have organized this panel devoted to participation

mechanisms on different levels. As Sebastián was saying, we have a challenge ahead. The challenge is to promote this participation.

ICANN was founded on the multi-stakeholderism principle. That is our founding principle. It has been so for the last 15 years. Although ICANN's technical and operational functions are very relevant, I believe that it is worth highlighting the way in which we decided to perform these functions, and I mean the administration or management of the Internet critical resources globally, by means of a multi-stakeholder model. That is what really counts.

This model works on the assumption that the different multi-stakeholders or stakeholders will participate or will be engaged. If we focus on the different working groups, existing working groups, supporting organizations and advisory committees with ICANN, we will realize that we again face challenges in Latin America and mainly in the Caribbean. We have groups that are very well represented, but we have others that are not that well represented.

In general, we see that we cannot bridge that gap but we see that the working groups are open to anyone willing to participate. If we focus on Argentina, we see that this is one of the very few countries in the region, which at least has one representative in each of the groups within ICANN.

We have an Argentine government representative at the GAC. We have Tony and Gabby representing Argentina at the GNSO, [dot-ar] actively engaged in the ccNSO. In LACRALO, we have Fatima and we have other colleagues that are actively engaged. Practically, in all the interest

groups within ICANN, we see that Argentina is represented. Now the challenge is to deepen that representation in each of these groups.

This is just a snapshot and an initial diagnosis that we performed in a working group with members of all the community. We realized that clearly the participatory challenge in the region goes far beyond that so that the voice of Latin America is heard. We need more participation from Latin American people and people from the Caribbean too.

I want to speak about this strategic plan. We performed our diagnosis and we spotted areas of opportunity, one of which is precisely participation. To some extent, we focused on projects derived from objectives in order to improve this situation. We have five pilot projects. They focus not only on participation, they also focus on strengthening the DNS structure in the region. We have capacity building programs for security and stability. There are several of these projects but one of them focused specifically attracting new people, new stakeholders in our region.

One of them focuses on regional communication. This regional communication project aims at making information more accessible – information produced by ICANN, more accessible to stakeholders in the region. It should be accessible and in a user-friendly language, easy to understand. The complexity within ICANN does not stem only from the variety of languages, but it also stems from understanding the communication dynamics of each of these groups. This is the aim of communications projects.

Within the encouragement or promotion of participation, we see that this meeting in Buenos Aires is the first meeting in the region and the

second ICANN meeting with a very strong component of topics of interest within the region, prepared by people in the region for people in the region. We have about eight or nine sessions for the Latin American and Caribbean community. So if you register to attend the ICANN meeting, as members of the region, you will receive a special brochure that will recommendation these sessions and that will guide you so that you can attend these specific sessions. This is very important and very relevant for the region.

Now, we have to promote the participation of economic stakeholders or financial stakeholders or financial business stakeholders in the DNS environment. We have thought about activities along those lines.

Gabby leads the Latin American and Caribbean space project with this commercial or business focus. She will be speaking about the scope of this project and the sessions that will be taking place in the context of this ICANN meeting. Let us hope this is the starting point to improve this lack of participation in the region. Gabby, you have the floor.

GABRIELA SZLAK:

Thank you, Rodrigo. I am not officially a member of the panel, but I will take this opportunity to let you know about the events that we have prepared for the region. As Rodrigo said, we have about 40-odd projects in our strategy, but we decided to focus on the first five. I say “we” because Vanda Scartezini and Celia Lerman and myself lead this fifth project that focuses on creating a space so that organizations in Latin America and the Caribbean can participate, especially with a business focus. I remember that yesterday, we held a session as part of the

leadership program. We said that the civil society is within ICANN and the civil society wants to change the world.

We as businesses are only interested in business. I do not think that is true in Latin America, in our region, because we, the business community, promote social and economic development in our region. The objective is to attract more businesses and bring them on board within ICANN and bring them on board in our community so that they can understand the development of the ecosystem and understand the development needed in Latin America.

We want to promote or encourage the participation of the private sector in the region and in the DNS industry and we want to encourage the participation of all the stakeholders in or within ICANN's ecosystem. As Sebastián was saying, there are many events going on. It's very difficult to participate in all of them. We need to focus on resource allocation, so we decided to make a difference.

It is one thing that we're going to do within ICANN meetings and quite another thing for what we will do in terms of other events. We cannot expect everyone to attend ICANN meetings. So in these sessions, we are really focusing on outreach, recruitment, or attraction of new stakeholders so that they can be further communicators of these projects. Buenos Aires is like a kind of experiment for this project.

We want to invite you to attend all our activities. Here we have a list of business related activities. We included these forums because we believe what is taking place here is really important. On Monday, at 10:30 we will be presenting the five projects in our strategy and we will have a specific space devoted to addressing business topics within

ICANN. We will have people from the private sector, the vision of the ccTLDs, the vision of the new gTLDs in the Latin American market and we will have a Q&A session.

On Monday, in the evening, we are holding a cocktail. You are all kindly invited to attend the commercial stakeholder group and the ICANN board will be attending that cocktail, so the idea is for us to integrate and we will be holding or having a breakfast with a Q&A session for the business stakeholder sector in Latin America.

We are not closely related to other projects or participating that much, but we have the LACRALO meeting on Monday evening. We have the IPv6 session and the Security and Stability challenges. The IPv6 session will be held on Monday at 6:30 p.m. Please, pay attention to all the events that are focused on the region because want meetings to be more meaningful to us and we want to leverage these sessions. Thank you very much for this commercial spot on the panel. Thank you.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA:

Thank you, Gabby. Perhaps one more thing I would like to comment on is that we have programs to develop or to encourage participation within ICANN. We have the fellowship program. It has been in place since 2007. This is a very interesting program because it entails not only financial support but also it entails introducing people into the ICANN world but with guidance and orientation.

Right now, there is a pilot project to provide financial support to some of the working groups within ICANN. Within our strategic plan, we are planning something along the same lines. You must know, or surely

know, that we have remote participation not only in this session but in all of the ICANN sessions. We want more participation from the people in our region. We understand that it is difficult to participate when you are the other end of the world, so, we have this remote participation facility or capability.

DAPHNE SABANES PLOU: Thank you, Gabriella. Thank you, Rodrigo. I believe it's very important to have these sessions so that people in our region can participate and thank you very much for sending this brochure in advance. We are now going to listen to Fatima Cambroner. Fatima, go ahead, please. You have the floor.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you, Daphne. Thank you for this invitation. I am very happy to see that other panelists have touched on topics that I will be speaking about. I represent AGEIA DENSI in LACRALO. It's a civil society organization. I want to tell you about my experience participating as a representative of a civil society organization. I will also focus on difficulties in terms of this participation.

I was telling you about some of the definitions of civil society. What is civil society? We will find as many definitions as people will try to define the civil society. You may choose the one you like best.

There is a definition that is included in the presentation. The civil society is defined as the third sector. It is neither the government nor the private sector and I like using this concept, so as to understand where

we, the civil society and organizations, stand and how we can make our input or contribution and participate.

There are different definitions included in the presentation and in the agenda for the summit on the Information Society. We do not have a definition of the civil society but we have references to the civil society and we have a definition of Internet governance, drafted by the Internet Governance Group, which includes the civil society, also the governments and also the private sectors, each of them with their role within Internet governance. That is included in that definition and the role of each of these stakeholders is defined.

I tried to systematize certain points or items in order to facilitate the participation of these organizations – of this civil society's organizations.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

No problem. I will [inaudible] telling you about these topics that I have identified as facilitating participation. One of them is training, which many associations in the civil society have. In this process, many things we have learned. Among them, that the civil society organizations have become trained, have acquired experience in participating in these different spaces. They have become specialized, we find, in the world of Internet governments.

Among the different spaces, we find more and more specialized organizations. Some exclusively dedicated to human rights, others to freedom of expression; others to digital inclusion and even now [inaudible] training technical issues and they participate in these spaces

as in civil society organizations but with some skills in these technical aspects being discussed.

We may counter this to what happens in some governments, some of which do not have the necessary training to participate in this forum, both regional and global, dedicated to the Internet and Internet governance. My perception is that this happens because these officials that work for the government do not have only this task as their only job, but they do many more things within their agenda.

They do not have enough time to be trained and follow these events, which as Sebastián was saying, they are growing in number. It is difficult to follow all of them. We need to make a distinction here. In most of our organizations in the civil society in our region, the work we do is volunteer. We do not have a salary, we do not have working hours. We work in our free time. When we go to those meetings we need to stop doing our jobs.

However, the representatives of the governments continue to receive their salaries while they are participating in those meetings. Olga will tell us if it is true or not.

Another strength that the civil society organizations have is that many of organizations are used to horizontal work based on consensus and dialogue. We facilitate participation because the civil society organizations are the first point of contact with our own communities. This brings about a responsibility. They operate as a two way bridge, listen to their communities needs and try to take them to the different spaces where they participate so as to obtain policies or legislation that benefit this community.

This is a privilege and it is also a responsibility. When we are working in this manner, we need to get the voice of their own communities to be heard and their interests represented.

This is also related to another aspect – the ability that they have to affect their own communities. This is related to dialogue, or it's based on dialogue of the organizations and we counter this with the governments. Not democratic governments, the governments that are not used to listening to their people. They are not are based on dialogue. They do not respect human rights and freedom of expression and freedom of the association.

What occurs internally when you participate in this regional and global forum which are based on consensus, multi-stakeholderism for government representatives it is hard to participate or it is not attractive to participate because the issues that they need to deal with are not being dealt with there. Another thing that has facilitated our participation of associations is that associations have understood that the rights that people have offline, they have it online too. And the rights have to be respected, especially by governments through legislation passed, regulations both internally and externally.

I also think it is important that many of these organizations have understood that some governments do not – [inaudible] that Internet is not the same as telecommunications. One model – I understand that having understood this distinction causes organizations to be able to participate in these spaces with an advantage with respect to some governments, which still do not understand it, where in some countries the governments are still the owners of the infrastructure which

enables them to stop the access to the Internet when they wish, which is what we have seen in some countries, especially non-democratic or authoritarian countries, which plays against the Internet – an Internet that is open, global, democratic, interoperable, and multi-stakeholder focused.

The items that we identified which hinder the participation of organizations, first of all, is funding. Many of these agencies that live on volunteer work do not have the resources to participate and we need external funding to collaborate with us. Sometimes it is not only money, but let us think of the reason IGF Bali, the visas issue. When our governments facilitate these procedures, we can be involved in these processes.

Many representatives of the civil society were not able to attend the IGF in Bali because they did not obtain their visa on time, because the confirmation for the form in Bali took time, so this did not facilitate. So the communication among governments is much easier [then] for the civil society.

This is related to accountability and transparency. Participants are requested when we receive funding from other sectors. As we said before, government officials participate with public funds. We also need them to be accountable. What they do when they participate in this space is the civil society organizations, when they are funded will need to report up to the last penny which [inaudible] participated in were times which I think is perfect because even though it's volunteer work, we need to be accountable. But this accountability should be the same

for government officials. I've never seen a [inaudible] report by government officials in this forum.

There is a perception of lack of legitimacy of civil society organizations to represent the other members of the civil society. These representations that we talk about is not the one that we lawyers are used to as a contract granting representation. [inaudible] based on a sense of belonging. So some it is considered diffused representation because there is no mandate on what to do, but for the reason of participating and belonging to a civil society organization, we may represent the rest of the organizations.

This is also countered with the perception of legitimacy, which representatives of governments have to act [inaudible] for others, somebody who represents a certain government. It is because they do have the capacity to act on behalf of that government. We would not request a power of attorney asking if they are given the proper mandate to speak on behalf of that language. This difference of perception also exists in terms of these stakeholders.

I have just remembered about an example which took place at the LAC IGF in Cordoba. Many of the organizations involved were requested, asked the representatives of the government to stand up and speak and give responses to some of the things that were being asked. Those government representatives maybe were not able to speak for their governments. They were participating because they are able to do so, but they cannot give response on behalf of their governments in terms of [inaudible] which was the topic of [surveillance] back then. These are some of the things that have to be taken into account.

Another of the problems for participation is the access to certain data or information, therefore [surveillance]. We do not want [surveillance] of the organizations, but we want to have some sources of information or training or access to certain diplomatic resources which the civil society organizations do not have, which other organizations have. This hinders the quality of participation.

The last item that hinders participation is lack of possibilities to participate in some spaces that are exclusive for government. As Sebastian was saying, [inaudible] through ALAC, the civil society organizations are allowed to participate but in the capacity as observers, not on an equal standing as the multi-stakeholder model states. These organizations are excluded from some decisions.

Finally I want to tell you briefly what LACRALO is. It's the regional organization for Latin America and the Caribbean which was created in 2006 by a memorandum of understanding between ICANN and LACRALO. It doesn't have a legal status either, but it is authorized to act by this MOU.

In this regional organization, the organizations of the civil society are active. It's one more space for them to participate within ICANN besides the one that Marie-Laure was mentioning for organizations that deal with other aspects.

In LACRALO, we participate as organizations who work in the interest of end users of our region. We currently have 42 organizations that are participating in LACRALO. If I'm not wrong, it is the one that has more organizations which are called ALSes, which are At-Large Structures. At-Large does not have a clear translation into Spanish. It is translated as

“the scope”, “[inaudible] scope”. This was a [residual] space where all the other constituencies did not fit, we could fit them here. It has become stronger and stronger in defending the global users, because ALAC is global.

For ICANN, the [world] is divided into five regions. Each one has a RALO, a regional organization. There are five RALOs, plus ALAC which is Advisory Committee At-Large, which role is to give advice to the ICANN board in terms of the users’ interests. They all together make up the At-Large universe, which has 150 ALSes throughout the world.

I’m going to give my advertisement now. If you are a civil society interested in working for the interest of Internet users in our region, you may join LACRALO. There’s also a webpage to visit. If you have any doubt, I will be delighted to help. A certification process will be established and I may help you in this if you’re interested.

Final points for reflection to conclude. As we see, [inaudible] stakeholders have some difficulties participating and we face challenges in participating. My suggestion is that in some way or other, we may all participate, so let’s do it. Let us train ourselves, inform ourselves, but not just receive some training and [inaudible] wanted. We have communities of people who are skilled. As you know, this happens with the ICANN Fellowship Program where you continue to be in contact if you’ve been part of this program. Let’s participate, participate, and participate because it’s the only way to attain some result – by participating. If we do not participate, others will participate and others will made decisions for us in things that will affect us.

The joint work with all the other stakeholders is something that we continue to strengthen, something that I have added as far as I've heard from the previous panels is that there is no industry of the DNS in the region or that the DNS industry in the region is to be strengthened. This is something good to take into account. If there is an industry of the DNS, there is a government that is regulated in that industry and there is a civil society that is controlling the government which regulates. So all this circle is activated, which in conclusion, benefits us all. So the small businesses in the region become engaged. You're invited to activate this circle. Thank you very much.

DAPHNE SABANES PLOU:

Thank you, Fatima. I think your presentation was very interesting in that you presented the achievements in the region and globally, but you also focused on those topics or those aspects that have not been that successful and those results that we still need to achieve, and seeking consensus and addressing these areas sincerely are the key to get along and achieving these results or outcomes. So thank you very much for your presentation. And now I give the floor to Olga Cavalli from the GAC.

OLGA CAVALLI:

Good morning. Thank you for this invitation. Thank you ICANN, ISOC, LACTLD, NPOC and [BIR] for this invitation. Since I am the very last panelist, this is a very easy role because everybody else has said what I wanted to say.

Since I have been introduced as Olga Cavalli from the GAC, I would like to tell you the part about participation in the Governmental Advisory Committee. The GAC gives advice to the ICANN board. We are mainly formed or integrated by governments. We are not a multi-stakeholder body as the GNSO or as the ccNSO. You know that ccTLDs can be managed by different types of organizations.

We are the GAC, focused mainly on governmental representation and we have other international organizations and the European Union, for example. But within the GAC, we do not have business participation or [inaudible]. This is something positive, so we're all very excited, very happy about participating and attending the meeting.

This is not very frequent. In development countries we have other problems, other priorities in terms of the economy. We have weather phenomena. What happened in The Philippines. Things that are very unfortunate and unforeseen and many of times, they are the priority of the government officials' agendas. And you speak to them about the new registrar accreditation agreement and they look at you completely astonished and say, "What are you talking about?"

Given the recent announcement from Brazil that they will hold a summit next year, well this topic is now – or has – a much higher profile. So those of us working on this topic have a lot more work on our plate and I am very pleased to see that many more government officials are paying more attention to this topic, and it is very good to have Brazil leading the initiative, because I speak Portuguese which I like very much and Brazil is not that far away from this country.

Sebastian spoke about ALAC. On a regional level, we have participation space devoted to Internet governance topics and that's the Internet Governance Working Group in or within the Information Society. This group, ALAC, did not exist several years ago, but Argentina attended the Lisbon meeting of the [EU] and Latin America and presented or submitted this work proposal, which was approved at that point.

Nobody understood why Argentina thought that this Working Group would be important. We believed it was fundamental to have a coordination point in Latin America and the Caribbean, and Argentina proposed a multi-stakeholder group, which was not easy because at the time, these type of groups were coordinated only by governments and government participation only was preferred. We did not bang our heads against a brick wall as Sebastian said, but we wanted a multi-stakeholder group from day one. The group was chaired by Argentina until 2011. Now Brazil is in charge of chairing the group and Argentina is the vice chair of that group. We are going to hold a meeting next Friday at our foreign ministry office.

I also wanted to tell you that the participation of the Latin American region in the GAC is not as strong as we would like it to be, but in Argentina we say if it doesn't kill you, it makes you stronger. So that happened with dot-patagonia and dot-amazon. These were very complex topics that rallied the Latin American community and Argentina obtained support – and we had explicit support from more than 40 countries worldwide not only in the Latin American region.

I remember attending the Beijing meeting and receiving messages from Montevideo, from all the countries in the region. I see Jose waving over

there. He's a friend from Uruguay. They were all concerned about dot-patagonia and their voice was fundamental support, and that did not kill us. It made us stronger. And we have Peru and Paraguay joining the GAC and we are consolidating a very serious task and we are working very well defending or advocating our interests.

If you remember point seven of the Durban communique, the GAC will work together with ICANN to propose certain changes in the new gTLD round so that geographic names will be further protected. And Argentina is working along these lines and drafting some documents with countries in the region and outside the region. I am sure I'm running out of time, because I like speaking. I love speaking.

But now it's time for my own commercial, so it's my turn for the commercial. So apart from all the beautiful things or thoughts and invitations that have been shared by Gabby, Sebastian, Fatima and Rodrigo, I want to invite you to the Women's Breakfast, the DNS breakfast. It is not only for women. Everybody can attend. Our sponsor is the High Technology Training Center. On behalf of the Internet governance, the southern Internet governance school, the next session will take place in Trinidad and Tobago in April and this Women in the DNS breakfast will enable us to tell you about our school, our Internet governance school.

I also want to invite you all to a workshop. I am not only a governmental advisor to the Argentine government. I am also a university professor and I believe that universities have to be more actively engaged in ICANN initiatives, not only in regulatory, technical, or legal topics but also in social topics.

So on Thursday at 11:00 a.m., we will be holding a workshop. It's a one-hour workshop on the academia and ICANN, how to build capacities in the academia and this is all for my part. Thank you very much for your attention.

DAPHNE SABANES PLOU: Thank you, Olga. Thank you for your presentation. It's very good to see that governments are participating and getting involved. I like that concept. If it doesn't kill you, it makes you stronger. So [inaudible] governments, the civil society, the technical community and ICANN itself can be strengthened by this situation.

I don't know if we have time for a question from the floor. Okay, we'll open a brief Q&A if there's any comment or question from the floor.

If there are no further comments or questions, we thank you all for joining us this morning. We will be having lunch in the [Catalinas] Room. That's the name of the room where we will be having lunch. We'll meet you there for lunch at the hotel and we need to reconvene at 2:00 p.m. to continue working with the afternoon sessions. Thank you very much.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: For the purposes of the transcript, this is Friday, November 15, 2:00 PM, La Pampa. This is first Latin American and Caribbean DNS forum afternoon session from 2:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

RUDI VANSNICK: We will try to start in two or three minutes. Good afternoon. It's my pleasure to be the moderator of this panel. It's always a difficult session

after lunch as it is also difficult in the morning to start with the audience and keep them awake, so don't be surprised if I will shout at certain moments if I see that you're getting asleep. But I'm sure that the panel will not allow you to get asleep.

The topic on which we are going to discuss is "Bridging the digital divide." In fact, we are going to try to build some bridges, which could be quite interesting as in Europe we are destroying bridges. To make it clear, the digital divide has in fact nothing to do with developed or developing countries. It has to do with technology that has been moving so quickly that part of the world was not able to follow. And especially when we look to the elder people, they need time to get involved in all these new high techs and they have to adapt themselves, so we have to keep them also in the same line as the youngsters who are born with the technology.

So I would like to present to you the panel of this afternoon. We are missing someone who probably got stuck in Montevideo in Rio due to travels. It's Carlton Samuels. Maybe he will join us later if possible.

But I would like to start with José Clastornik. José is leading the agency responsible for the development and implementation of e-Government and Information Society Policies in Uruguay.

He is a member of several directorate bodies, such as the directorates of the regulatory units of Access to Public Information – a quite important one I imagine – also Electronic Certification and Personal Data, and the commission of policies for Plan Ceibal (One Computer per Child). That's also a very interesting program.

He is also a member of the coordination table of the regional plan eLAC2015 – we heard about eLAC this morning – and the directive committee of the international conference of authorities in Data Protection and Privacy at an international level. So I'm giving the floor to José.

JOSÉ CLASTORNIK:

Hello. I will speak in Spanish just to allow the people who are translating to keep their jobs open. Okay?

Hello, everybody. Just a short story. I've already told it before. I think Olga heard it once. I don't know whether the rest of the audience has heard it before. Uruguay is a very small country. It's a country that starts the name of the country with a U and based on the way it is written, in general it appears between the United States and some other countries beginning with a U. It was the Soviet Union once upon a time, the USSR, and then Venezuela.

In 2003 at Geneva, we were in between the United States and Venezuela, and we were given the initiative of writing a definition of digital divide, talking about this. We together with Venezuela, the representation of the United States, you know how these international conferences are – long tables, sometimes round, sometimes square tables. There was United States, we were in the middle, then Venezuela. We had the definition of digital divide. We showed it to the United States. The United States liked it a lot and asked to present that definition so as to reinforce the message.

When the United States made the proposal, one of the countries that was friends of ours but not friends of the United States rejected the proposal. So we were running around to tell our friends that it was not the United States who had proposed that definition, but the definition has been drafted with Venezuela. So imagine, the name of the country starts with C, but well they told me over there something and they were right. Yeah, it's C-U, C-U, you know.

And they said something – they were right – that the definition was quite centered at the country level. It was okay, but perhaps it should be extended so as to include a regional level. I take this as an example because the digital divide or brecha digital in Spanish has many perspectives. You can see it from a country level, from a regional level. We can see it and discuss it using several paradigms.

Do you all know what is open data? What it means? It's like a paradigm regarding e-government, and governments are producers of information, so it's the best word right now for e-government. So we should be info producer, let's welcome crowdsourcing on making available data in an open source fashion.

So we drafted a paper saying that. Well, it was perhaps not said with these words, but it talked about the digital divide in this sense. When you were given data, you were generating capacity for the civil society, we were dividing the society once again between those able to do some outsourcing with that data and some that were not able. So we were dividing the society once again using something that was supposedly intended to strengthen the same.

So the point is that it's not what we have historically thought about the digital divide, that is to make telecommunication available or the access available as the basic problem in the digital divide. But the problem is that any new technological paradigm get us back to the digital divide problem because there will always be some people that will take the paradigm immediately at once but some others will not. And that new segment, even though it is not intended to generate a new divide, will generate a new divide.

So the rationale behind that is the rationale that we have to assume every new paradigm we are pursuing implies by itself on how to implement it without generating a new divide, a new gap due to the availability of new technology. Is it clear what I'm saying? I think it's an interesting paradigm. There is an innovation cycle of new technological paradigms. There is a second stage of ownership and then usage and implementation. Until we do not reach that first stage, we have a digital divide, a new digital divide that is created.

That complexity in understanding that not everything is based on technology, that in technology ownership and use has been mentioned in the CMSI from the very beginning. When we saw it and the action plans were created, it was mentioned that it was not regarding to connectivity and use of applications but the vertical use of some things that were already mentioned in the document of Tunisia.

In many countries in order to articulate all the initiatives that involve lots of agencies and lots of private institutions, we have used the e-agenda. eLAC results from the Latin America e-agenda and the Caribbean following what Europe did with their own e-agendas. And so

each of the countries in the region more or less mature has implemented its own digital agenda.

This is the third version of our digital agenda, so it's something quite remarkable. Not many countries have had three digital agendas that are consistent among themselves because in general the countries have one, then they take a leap and there is another one, and there's not much consistency between them. So eLAC has tried and give continuity to the agenda of each country, trying to take politics out of that and understanding that they are government policies that should be maintained over time.

So I will tell you some of the initiatives in the digital agenda of Uruguay so as to somehow close my presentation. There is a project that perhaps many of you know about it so perhaps it's boring to listen to it again, but it's the implementation of One Laptop per Child in Uruguay. There is the [inaudible] project.

In AGESIC, the agency I work at, we made a project, and it's the most [inaudible] charts regarding the digital divide that shows the number of PCs per economic quintile. So it's a chart that grows with five parallel lines, so the number of home PCs, the share of percentage of home PCs grows until all lines get together and there's no difference between the largest and the smaller quintiles and all of them have the same percentage.

So it's quite a graphic to see those five lines that run in parallel and there distorts. The bigger distortion is in the lower quintile. This is because all children received PCs, and of course in the lower quintile it grew the most because it was one laptop per child so the lowest income

households got more PCs. The difference between the higher and the lower quintile is 5% when it used to be 50%, so graphically the access to technology – and I'm saying once again that we have not bridged the digital divide but just we have given a first step – we are three million inhabitants and we handed in one million machines. So we started with children, then with teenagers, and then preschoolers.

But the point of the use, how you make use of that, how you capitalize that use is quite important because the laptops do not only belong to the children but also to their families. Thinking about the digital divide in relation to language, most of the content is in English, so there is a very large program to teach English to all children. It is based on the capacities from a technological perspective. All schools are shifting to fiber optics, are increasing the bandwidth. There is connectivity for children, public, free, at a distance no more than 200 meters away from where they live and towns from 1,000 inhabitants and more.

So in the English distance learning projects, we do not have as many teachers as we need as people from Philippines, for instance, are teaching Uruguayan children to speak English. So this is the logic of ownership in association with not only the access as I said before but to generate capacity and to use it. The use in this case, for instance, the notebooks are used in science and technological labs for basic sciences including instruments that are connected to the laptops for measuring physics parameters or robotics or some other things that have been added.

With respect to capacity building, having the notebooks over there, there is a presence of children at schools that is related to the payment

of the family allowances of the family subsidies to promote the children's educations. At household level, I may mention two things. One is the plan for the universalization of Internet access. So if you have a phone at home, and most households do, will have one gigabyte for free. So everybody will have for free the possibility of having Internet access by just having a phone. And with greater bandwidth, the idea is that fiber optics will cover all of Uruguayan households. Half of them will be covered by next year. We hope to reach 100% in a short time.

And any other disciplines we are working on capacity building usage are two points that are key. I will give you one example so as to conclude my presentation. That, of course, is open to any question you may have. But I will speak about electronic government.

Some four months ago, we passed an executive order, and so everything related to any procedure for government proceedings will appear on the website. So if an agency says that an office will require two certificates for a certain proceeding, the executive order says that nothing different from what the Web page says may be required.

And this is related to the fact that the agency should understand that the Web pages are created for the benefit of the citizens. So if you Google something today, you know that the Bible [is at] Google, so Google give us the truth so we may answer something and it should be true. But this is what we did, and at the same time all the publications of all proceedings and information regarding the proceedings have been changed saying where you should go, what you should file.

So we created a [inaudible]. We had 600 proceedings. We did not know if they were updated or not. We have an observatory saying that there

were 1,100 proceedings. We find 1,300 and we have 1,200 that have been updated and are available, so we are complying with the executive order.

The point is, if you think that the citizens will have the possibility of checking something you have as a state, provide something to those citizens and those citizens should claim that what is said there should be fulfilled. So you may generate some capacity to the citizenry, but then you have to deliver. You need a state to deliver on its promises to give access. If we say that the Web pages will have information, that information should be actually what is going on at the public administration level.

So this is it for the time being. Thank you very much, and then I will answer your questions.

RUDI VANSNICK:

Thank you, José. It was quite interesting, especially the story about your country involved in the use of just one letter. It's quite important to know that. You're not Russian and not USA.

I have noted a few things that are quite interesting, especially for me being European living in a country that was one of the best cabled ones, noticing that you're bringing fiber to the home in Uruguay. We are still trying to do that in Belgium, so you imagine how far behind we are.

And also the program that you have been implementing bringing one million PCs to three million habitants. I can tell you that, to compare it to Europe again and to Belgium, we have only 76% penetration of PCs. So we are far behind even comparing it to what you're doing.

This illustrates that the divide, as I said, has nothing to do with the origin. It has to do in the way how we use technology, how we think about technology. And I'm sure that some of the audience have some questions for you, so I would like to open the floor for some questions because I think if we don't do it now we will lose track of what has been said. I would prefer having a short—

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE:

Thank you. Your presentation has been really interesting. I just wanted to add a point. In my experience, there is also another divide that is the generational digital divide. You talked about the OLPC experience with the Ceibal Plan. In fact, part of my professional career was devoted to that kind of work in Costa Rica in a similar program.

And adults react out of fear and prejudices when we speak about ICTs and the use of technology in the classroom with students. This is an obstacle and a hindrance when you work with them. So this is my experience. But it's not impossible. It's just another aspect that we need to take into account and that makes our work difficult, especially with students.

Children react very fast and easily. They are more open, so they are already digital natives, but the parents are not. So I think that these kinds of programs have been well managed when they incorporate the different supporting agents and not only the children but the parents, the teachers, all of them in the community. All of them should be included in the program when you take this kind of initiative. That is what I wanted to comment on.

JOSÉ CLASTORNIK:

This comment triggers different answers, so I will try to tell you a little bit about this. The OLPC is an idea from Negroponte who is the Media Labs director at the MIT. Negroponte assumed this project as an educational project associated to the fact that the mass distribution of PCs to children would be a bottom-up educational revolution. We were not so sure about that, and what we did was to associate this project at the indicators level with the digital social inclusion projects because we thought that would be one of the consequences.

In practice, we saw that it is impossible to consider educational indicators because there are many elements that lead to an increase or an improvement in educational capabilities and children's education. So there were some difficulties in having these cause/effect indicators in the education field, but anyway a lot of awareness was raised.

And there is something that is quite clear, that this is not a bottom-up project. The value of teachers, professors is still extremely important. When you have teachers who are really enthusiastic about the use of these tools, the class explodes in the use of those tools. But when the professor or the teacher is not, then there is no motivation in the classroom.

Now when we talk about inclusion, now we are launching a campaign addressed at 12-year-olds for the correct use. This is associated to data privacy and protection mainly in the social networks. So we organized a role playing game so they would have to use certain data, certain faces and they would specify who they were going to share the information with. And we had a problem that the teachers knew less than children in

the use of data in social networks. So together with the educational council, we had to adapt these role play exercises to an educational dynamic exercise at school. It was a workshop, actually, not a game. So that led to the identification of this educational problem.

In our case, we worked with some centers under the umbrella of the Ministry of Education and Culture, centers that allow us to give training to parents. Parents were given materials in order to create a space for work with parents. So that is also part of the social inclusion aspect. And then there is another important aspect to consider, and that is the inclusion of the elderly or people of an older age. There is an agency in Uruguay that is trying to come up with some exercises to include in particular the elderly.

RUDI VANSNICK:

Any other questions? If not, we can always come back at the end and have some more thoughts about that.

I would like to go to our next panel member, at my right side, Hernan Galperin. Hernan is an associate professor and director at the Center for Technology and Society in the University of San Andrés in Argentina. He is also a member of the steering committee for DIRSI – I imagine he will explain with us what it is – an ICT policy research consultant for Latin America [as far as I see], and he is also a research fellow at the Annenberg School for Communication at the University of Southern California. The floor is yours.

HERNAN GALPERIN:

Thank you, Rudi. I'm also going to speak in Spanish. Let me begin by asking a question. Let's say that you have to do some work on the digital divide and you meet a person who has a smartphone and has a subscription. He enters credit into his phone. He doesn't have a monthly fee plan. And then he hires just a connectivity plan for one day when he has to travel, Internet for one day, that allows him to surf the social networks and check the e-mail and Gmail with a limit of 100 megabytes of download and information.

So how can we classify that person? Is that person connected or not? I'm asking my colleagues and the audience. On which side of the digital divide is that person located? The easiest answer would be he's partially connected, right? That day, that person is connected. The next day, he is not connected. So I'm sure that some colleagues would also say, "Well, actually, he is not connected to the Internet because he is being offered a closed service where he only has access to a certain number of publications that are actually being administered by the mobile network operator.

And there are many examples like this one. You can think also of a person who doesn't have a smartphone but has a second generation mobile phone and once a week he goes to a certain place and he connects over Skype to talk to his relatives in another country. So is that person connected or not? It is quite difficult to determine on what side of the digital divide that person is.

So these examples help us illustrate that the concept of digital divide was conceived as a binary concept for a long time – you are connected or not. And that had to do with a perspective that perhaps reflected the

situation 10 or 15 years ago when it was more easy to determine who was connected and who was not, who had a computer and were subscribed to a fixed Internet access service at home and those that were not. That helped us get some statistics and measure the digital divide thinking about this situation, connected versus not connected.

I want to raise here that what we have today is not a digital divide per se but actually a distribution of different connectivity levels. So the persons that I described in my examples are at the low end of the distribution of connectivity because they connect once a day or once a week perhaps to a limited service in a situation that perhaps is not the desired one. It is in a public setting that they get connected over the Internet. On the other end of distribution, we have those who have access to fiber optics at home, those that have 100 megabytes for connectivity and for download speed, the downlink.

So this has changed our view of this concept of being connected or not. It has become much more complex because of the development of technology and the market and because of the operators who have segmented the market in smaller segments now. So now thinking about the digital divide means thinking about a much more complex situation.

We have made a lot of progress because now we have fewer people who are completely disconnected. Of course, we still have people who are not connected, but they are fewer now. But what we see now is that we have this kind of distribution of connectivity that we still don't know what format it fits in. So this is a challenge for those of us who do research into this topic. So we need to understand the distribution of connectivity. We need to understand the determining factors of

connectivity, what social profiles are in the different points in the distribution.

And then we also need to look at the implications of distribution thinking about these from the point of view of public policy. Perhaps José could say that some of the tools proposed by AGESIC in Uruguay to take advantage of connectivity are only available as from a certain point in this distribution. Perhaps people cannot have remote English lessons unless they have a certain level of connectivity that will allow them to download information with a certain downlink speed.

So in all these points of distribution, we could think that we have different implications in terms of the benefits and the usefulness that I can get from this form of connectivity. So now the discussion has become much more complex, and I think that we need to move forward in this discussion because it has implications regarding how we understand the diagnosis of the situation of the country and everything that has to be done from the public policy side to see how well or how poorly our citizens are connected.

We can talk about fixed and mobile bandwidth or broadband connections. We can talk about how to consider that kind of access, not from the point of view of the platform itself but from the point of view of how those different types of access are supplemented in different manners, but we still have to make a lot of progress in that regard.

In recent work that we did, we tried to break down the so-called digital divide thinking that, is the digital divide a problem that has to do more with the demand or with the supply? Because for a long time we considered it was a supply related problem, a coverage problem, that

services could not reach all the locations. And so we had to think about public policies and how to create a number of incentives for operators to build networks or towers where they didn't have any.

I worked with a colleague, and we separated the divide into two: one for the demand side and another one for the supply side. So we looked at the different countries and we said, "In these countries, is the problem of the digital divide a problem of service coverage or demand?" Because you have the services available, and people are not hiring or buying those services. We drew the conclusion that today the deficit of the demand is greater than the supply deficit in Latin America. If we had to assess the problems of the digital divide, the digital divide problem has more to do with the demand today and less with the supply. Actually, it is a problem of convergence between the demand and supply.

So we tried to look at the surveys that asked people who have computers at home why they are not buying the broadband service. In Latin America, most of the people say that it is a problem of pricing, and this is different from Europe. In our work, we also compared the situation in Europe with that of Latin America, and we see that there are differences among the countries, but around 50% of people say that it is a problem of price, 25% say that this is a problem of interest – "I'm not interested" – 10-15% of the respondents don't know how to use them, and there are many other answers.

That is in Latin America. In Europe, it is a different situation. Most of the people who do not have a broadband service say, "I'm not interested in that, I don't know how to use it," and then they mention the issue of

price. So when we compare Latin America and Europe and the use of broadband services, we see that this reflects the difference in performance in the different markets.

Broadband service in Europe is three or five times cheaper than in Latin America, depending on how you measure that, without considering the income disparity. In broadband only, depending on how you measure that, you see two to five times reduction in price. So we talk about a problem related to the demand, but actually it has to do with the affordability of the supply. So we developed several recommendations to try to address this problem of broadband service affordability in the region.

Finally, let me make a final comment about the role of government. José talked about what they are doing in Uruguay, and in many Latin American countries, governments are launching initiatives to address the digital divide.

In recent years, we witnessed a significant change in paradigms. For many years governments limited themselves or their role to a regulatory function where they say the problems of the digital divide will be addressed by the market and, if not, they will be addressed by a universal service initiative. But basically this is a problem that will be solved by the market or through a specific program.

And what we have seen at least in the last five years is a change of paradigm where the states have taken a more active role. Uruguay and Costa Rica and other countries have worked actively with the state on operators. Brazil has created new operators. So has Argentina. And there are many other cases in which public and private partnerships

have been established. There is the case of Colombia, Peru, Mexico. And this is interesting because what we see in the first place is that what governments are doing is they are addressing the supply problem from the wholesale standpoint, that is creating high transmission capacity networks and they are not looking at the last mile.

This has a certain logic, and it's a good signal that governments are paying attention to infrastructure problems in letting the service be organized from the private sector or from cooperatives in some cases. But I think it's a very good sign. It's a properly addressed government investment in our region.

Going back to what I've said before, the programs are still focused on supply instead of being focused on demand. So the progress that we have seemed to make of broadband as something more widely spread is in many cases related and taken into a look at the divide in the demand. But when those that are covered and those that are buying the service, we would have to analyze the problem of whether we have that demand for the whole of the capacity that is being developed with these new networks.

And to conclude, I may say many people say, "Well, look what happens with the mobile phone sector, the development of the network was tied to an explosion in demand, so there is a feedback in that loop." It may be true, but in the case of mobile telephony or general telephony, that technology is easier to be considered old by a person. A person that has never used a phone may all of a sudden say, "Well, this is how you may use it." You don't need many skills.

But Internet is quite a different technology. It's a technology of a general purpose, so it does not give you anything on itself. It's the use that you make of the Internet that makes Internet so wonderful. It takes a long learning process, and the skills to make technology effective are spread quite unevenly in our region. So by being on the supply side, this program has to take into account the digital divide in the region. Thank you very much.

RUDI VANSNICK:

Thank you, Hernan. A very, very interesting presentation that illustrates that the digital divide is not so easy to define as we have seen now two different visions on how the digital divide is seen in the country and how it is implemented at one side and what are the consequences of looking at it at a different way. Interesting that the same topics are coming up.

And you started with this example of is someone connected if you are just connected for one day. It's a quite interesting discussion. I don't know if there's anybody in the audience willing to put some questions to Hernan at this point. No one? Yeah?

CARLOS MARTINEZ:

Thank you, Hernan. I think that the risk is to monetize the kilobytes, because if we are going to measure it up to that point I think it will be like a [inaudible] store, so by the weight instead of considering what do we have to make to consider the value inside the content and how do we take into account the infrastructure, the symmetry? How can we say

whether we are promoting local traffic or local content, in comparison with promoting or just consuming contents?

So I think that your consideration is okay, but if we put it too much in the economic side, perhaps we lose sight of some things. And this is key for operators because carriers want to charge by kilobytes by second, and this is really a great risk for the future. This is just a comment. Thank you very much for your presentation. It was excellent, Hernan.

HERNAN GALPERIN:

Thank you, Carlos. Well, we have had this discussion with Carlos lots of times, the issue of monetizing or charging by kilobyte. But to open up the discussion, it is also related to [inaudible] neutrality and to what extent the regulatory body may allow the carriers to segment the market in such a way that each will have a differentiated type of access based on their payment capacity and based on the use they will make of that or the preference they may use of that consumption or use.

I agree with Carlos because if you ask the economists, they will just say in the short term what maximizes the use of the operators and then what consumers do is the monetization of each kilobyte. And so the carriers that segment the market will do it more precisely and charge by the kilobyte.

But from a point of view of a longer term, perhaps the consequence will not be a desirable one. You might say we will have a second class e-citizens, and in fact we are going to have a lot of classes of e-citizens that will be segmented by the interests of the carriers. And so from the point of view of public policy, that's not desirable.

On the other hand, I may say that carriers may not internalize lots of benefits. And José was saying education, government, the improvement in citizenry, all the benefits related to access to the Internet are not internalized by the carriers. So they will say that the segmentation they have made of the population will not be profitable or beneficial to them.

So the answer, I think, is in between letting the carriers segment the citizens in a perfect fashion and also make them give only one type of access. That would not be desirable as well because otherwise there will be a great divide, those who can afford that and those who cannot afford that. So in between there should be some balance, and our challenge is to find that point.

CAROLINA AGUERRE:

I think there are two comments that are related to what Klaus said this morning and some of the notes that were taken in the panel in the morning about the problems in the region. One of the speakers said that in the new gTLD program when we see how many years ICANN has been [inaudible] and we may see how low has been the participation of the region in the process during ICANN's life. And then you were saying that we have a vision of having an agenda and the governments are promoting a connectivity agenda related to basic infrastructure. This is okay but there is still a gap in the capacity of the society, of the market, of being able to absorb all that is being generated and to create some kind of a bridge so that this may reach people as a whole.

This is a comment that I took from something mentioned this morning and Klaus perhaps will talk about this in the presentation. But it's a

divide of the participation related to how to capture some participation. So I think that this may be mentioned by this panel again, and it called my attention. And there will be some participants from Brazil in this forum, and they are disguising the neutrality network in Brazil, and this is strongly related to what is going on in the region.

CARLOS MARTINEZ:

I work for LACNIC, but I have a comment as an ordinary citizen and a concerned citizen in the Internet. The point of market segmentation, not by kilobyte per second because it's not done in that fashion by the monthly consumption basis, I'm not concerned about that type of segmentation because it has some engineering background.

But the segmentation that quite concerns, I think there is no technical background for that, is the [inaudible] segmentation in some mobile devices. Particularly when I sell a cellphone, [I call it] Internet or broadband when you can only have access to social networks and three or more sites.

I think this is terrible, and I think that it's more damaging in the long term than the other segmentation because there is [econometrics] behind that. More consumption will generate more costs, etc.

But curiously, the segmentation through social media is a segmentation that, in fact, I'm letting people have access to some of the sites that have more traffic, so it's kind of running against the economic end of generating costs. So it's a segmentation by itself, and I'm concerned about that in the long term.

AGUSTIN SACRAMENTO: I'm Augustin Sacramento from development of NIC Argentina. I would like to stress the person that is connected to the Internet for one day only. Before that one day connection that person to get to Gmail, Facebook, or whatever should have been connected somehow, otherwise initially there's no point checking your e-mail if you did not have an e-mail account. So there is a prior connection.

So the idiosyncrasy in which you were born, particularly in my case. I'm a young person. I grew up with Internet and all that. So the level of connectivity is really very large. So you're at dinner and connected with Twitter, Facebook, checking the notifications, and it generates a kind of connection that is actually very high level. It's related to the education or what you want to convey.

Where do you stress segmentation? In that case, I'm not interested whether I have 100 megabytes per second or if I have to connect myself for a few seconds to check my [reader]. There's more and more need to being connected all day long, and I think these discussions are really interesting because it's something that we transfer to users. We are saying to users, "You may get more and more connected, download at a faster speed, and it really calls my attention from that perspective, from the perspective of education. What do you transmit as TLD or Internet suppliers to users?"

RUDI VANSNICK: No further questions. We will go to our third panel member, Klaus Stoll. Klaus is Executive Director of the Global Knowledge Partnership Foundation. Through his travels and work in South and North America, Africa, and Asia, he is one of the global experts in the strategic uses of

communications technologies for international development issues. He is reflecting in his role as a founder, advisor, and developer of numerous organizations. I would like to give the floor to Klaus to explain us a bit more and give a vision on the other point of this afternoon all about the TLDs and all the misery in the DNS, as we heard this morning. It's [inaudible]. That's what I retained from the morning. Klaus, the floor is yours.

KLAUS STOLL:

Thank you, Rudi, and sorry I'm speaking in English. It's a little bit more comfortable for me. And I'm sorry I'm changing. It looks like I'm changing completely as a topic because I'm going to talk not about technology. I'm going to talk about the brecha digital (digital divide) in Internet governance. I mean, it becomes clear to us now that something is wrong in Internet governance. I mean, we're going to Brazil. We're going to the IGF. We have the visas. We are going to the visas. Somebody complains here. There's a crisis there. Blah, blah, blah, blah, blah. Frankly, my dears and friends, I've had enough of this, and when I'm getting frustrated and as other people also get frustrated.

So the point is quite simply instead of patching up one problem after another, I had the privilege to belong to an organization – and to several organizations – which just simply said, "Let's go a little bit deeper. Let's think about what's really wrong down there on the bottom instead of patching it up." And we are coming out of a process of about two years thinking it over, what's actually going on. And seriously, it started with 250 pages of articles and things and ideas, and it came down to you basically can do it in an elevator, speak in 20 seconds.

What we came up with is very simple, that what's basically wrong with Internet governance is that you know the sovereignty. Sovereignty. I'm German; I can't pronounce it. Please, forgive me. So if I say "sovereignty," I mean that other thing – also for the translators. So the point is very simple. Look, when the Internet started, there was no problem at all because not so many people were affected, not so many things were going on, not so many data was happening. Today, everybody is affected. Everybody, everywhere, even if you're not connected. You are affected, and you are a stakeholder. Even if you never heard about the Internet, you are a stakeholder.

And then we have a situation where the Internet affects everything and we are using governance models which are basically going back pre-Roman sovereignty. We are using, for example, in the GAC or in the United Nations, is using a concept of sovereignty which is based on territorial states. That's great for if you have territorial states, but it doesn't make any sense in Internet governance.

If you are a service provider, or if you're something like Google. Let's take Google just to swear a little bit. If you use Google, do you think Google has no sovereignty and has no influence and has no stake in the Internet and they have nothing to do? If you are a registry/registrar, you have a stake in it and you have a certain sovereignty in the implementation and things you are doing. If you are a private user, you have a case of sovereignty.

What we need to do and what I'm trying to say is very simple. We need to redefine sovereignty on the Internet again and different. And what we were coming up with is you have to start defining sovereignty on the

Internet basically on your expertise and what you really have to contribute – be it entertainment, be it law issues, be it governance issues and the ability to implement it. If you are starting to think about this kind of relationship between the different stakeholders based on this kind of sovereignty, suddenly things start making sense.

So next step is – and I really apologize. Some people will leave the room. I’m talking about multi-stakeholderism. I’m talking about the “M” word. Multi-stakeholderism as we are exercising it here in ICANN worked. It’s one of the best things which ever happened. I just used that example 20 minutes ago or half an hour ago. Just imagine the Internet would have been run by a government or by a company. I mean, how many out times, how many outages of service would we have all the time.

Multi-stakeholderism as it was practiced and is practiced by ICANN is the best thing since the invention of sliced bread, but multi-stakeholderism, like the Internet, must develop and we need to create a new multi-stakeholderism which basically not includes only “I am representing civil society; I am representing a government; I am representing a company.”

What we have to do is to create a multi-stakeholderism which is actually based on joint implementation and joint sovereignty, which quite simply means if you are, for example, a registry, a registry nowadays is so dependent on governments, on all these kind of elements. It’s not just setting up some computers anymore. So what it’s all about is when you are implementing, when you are running your registry, in the implementation of this sovereignty you need to be and have a way to consult with all the other stakeholders, all the other sovereignties.

And I know this sounds all a little bit abstract, but I think when you really think it down and we've got some materials which explain it ten times better than I just did, you will see that actually a "very simple" solution. The question will be, of course, in the implementation. Now we're coming to the implementation part.

With the implementation part, what we are doing as organizations like, for example, NPOC, Global Knowledge Partnership, and others is quite simply we created a platform. Not an Internet platform. We are just calling it the I-Engage Institute. What the I-Engage Institute does is quite simply we will set up, you can become a member of the institute. You can become a fellow institute and so on and so on.

And what we will do is to set up councils – and we already set up some councils – where we quite simply invite people to come together on specific topics, for example, child online protection, gTLDs and jobs, and things like that. And not to come together in another talk shop, in another council which just talks, but the people we are getting together are the ones who are actually implementing that.

If you are in the UN and want to implement jobs in UN-HABITAT and so on, this is your place to go. If you want to talk – the other example which I like to do is, for example, with child online protection. Why is it so important? Sorry that I'm coming to a very nasty topic. The ITU and the member states of the UN are trying to legislate their way out of a problem by saying, "We forbid child abuse on the Internet," and with that one the problem is solved.

The reality today is that the majority of suicides in the United States are basically caused by Internet bullying, and we have to do something, for

example, to create victim support. You can't legislate yourself out. You also have to implement the things which basically help the victims of these things. I hope that gives you a very simple, straightforward example of what's going on there.

Okay, allow me a very quick sales pitch. By the way, I've shortened my presentation because somebody came in, and I know we all spoke a little bit longer, so I'm trying to compensate here. If you're interested on these ideas of multi-stakeholderism and sovereignties, I've got some material here. The good printed material comes Monday because, of course, we are in Latin America. You order something for Thursday, it's coming on Monday. Fine. No problem.

Also, next Thursday – oh, God, now I need my glasses – next Thursday in room [inaudible] between 9:30 and 11:00, you can enjoy the full presentations, the full spiel, everything and get the full information about it. So anybody who is interested in what I just said, come to me after this presentation and I can give you the material. Sorry again. I know that presentation was a little bit unclear. I just tried to accommodate number four. Thank you.

RUDI VANSNICK:

Thank you, Klaus. So we built three bridges. We need a fourth one to go around, otherwise we will stay somewhere in nowhere. We have our fourth panel member, a friend of mine for several years already. We have been together in the At-Large Advisory community since 2007 if I'm not wrong, Carlton Samuels. He is an international consultant in the areas of technology and business strategy, ICT policy development, business process re-engineering, and ICTs in education. He is formerly

the chief information officer and university director of IT at the University of the West Indies. So, Carlton, I'm counting on you to bring the fourth bridge so we can go in circles and come back to the beginning. Thank you. The floor is yours.

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Thank you, Rudi. Good afternoon, everyone. My apologies for getting here late, but we had a little transportation problem coming in. At any rate, I'm here. Rudi has asked me to finish the bridge. The only problem is I don't much know about the superstructure that preceded me. At any rate, I'm looking at the topic, and it seems to me that there are a couple of things I can say from the Caribbean perspective.

The Internet – almost all Caribbean governments through CARICOM and some of our other multilateral arrangements have declared the Internet a development platform. It's very important for us. It stems from the fact that as we try to segue into the information society and the information economy or the knowledge economy as you might call it, we suffer from underdevelopment because the things that we hitherto have depended on in terms of economic activity is largely gone. The primary agricultural products and so on – sugar, bananas, and those kinds of things – they're gone, even the semi-industrial ones such as bauxite are on the way out. Perhaps the only one that's around and making some significant impact is oil and, of course, we have tourism.

The Internet as a development platform presents a couple of challenges for all of us with respect to the digital divide, which is a social construct that we know well because not only internally we have a divide in terms of the haves and the have-nots, the cities and towns plus the rural

areas, we also have a divide internationally. So, for example, the Internet penetration is high in some countries – the Bahamas, Barbados, Antigua. It's middling in Jamaica, and it's poor in places like Haiti and Guyana and so on. So the construct of the digital divide is there at two layers.

There's also a divide in terms of the involvement in the governance aspect of the Internet. The fact is we started the Internet governance forum – the Caribbean Internet Governance Forum is ten years old – in 2003. And I was there at the inauguration as a director. And it was initiated by a member, a senior manager from the utilities regulator. And the issue for them at the time was now that we have the Internet and we were contemplating going to a single regulator – so we have three different types of regulators. We have regulators that look at the hard utilities – water, power. We have regulators that look at telecommunications. And then we have a regulator that breaks out into spectrum, so we have a different wireless spectrum that is a regulator.

And so the challenge was what were we going to do in terms of a single regulatory framework as we looked at the telecommunications space. And the Internet then was seen as perhaps the single most – it organizes everybody around everything. So therefore, the regulator thought that we should begin to look at the Internet and look at the governance issues surrounding the Internet, and that's how we started the Caribbean Internet Governance Forum.

The fact is we have come a little ways since then because by 2006 we were kind of invited into the ICANN environment for names and numbers policy development. And it started fairly simply. There was a

youngster named Jacob Malthouse who came around and was looking for people who had some kind of interest in governance issues and some experience in telecommunications, and it ended up several of us were called from across the Caribbean and we began to involve ourselves in the ICANN agenda.

We are concerned because we try to build capacity to participate, and we are moving in some areas. For example, in Trinidad we have development of the government heavily involved in the GAC. We've always had some involvement in the ccNSO the ccTLDs, primarily .tt and .ag and to some extent .gm. And we have seen some growth in the governance structures surrounding name and numbers. We still have a ways to go.

The At-Large has always been heavily involved. Some of us from myself in Jamaica and Jacqueline Morris and Dev Anand Teelucksingh and Cintra Sooknanan and those people, James Corbin and others from Guyana, Lance Hinds. We got together and organized ourselves in At-Large, and we have a fairly vibrant At-Large involvement. The challenge now is to extend the involvement across the region and to build capacity to participate meaningfully in the IG space, the names and numbers policy development space.

I want to go a little bit to the issue of multi-stakeholderism. I think we're almost unanimous in the Caribbean that multi-stakeholder approach to Internet governance is the optimal framework. I think we are unanimous in that. We are struggling to increase meaningful participation, but we are also concerned that multi-stakeholderism does not – we don't get too comfortable with the fact that we are

participating because the quality of interest that we think should be the hallmark of this multi-stakeholderism and engagement is not there.

You might say we are hampered by capacity to participate at every layer of the policy development initiative. That might be true. What we are concerned about is that some stakeholders – we should not be restful by adopting and accepting the idea that some stakeholders are more equal than others. That is a concern that we have. We have this concern because we are small island developing states mostly, and it's easy for us to be marginalized.

We are concerned because we have heard proposals for a new multi-stakeholder initiative in names and numbers policy development which seems to put us even further on the periphery. We are going to resist that. We believe that, small as we are, we have a right to be at the table. We have a right to be heard. We have a right to participate as full and equal partners in the policy development process. Some ideas of the new multi-stakeholderism for policy development in the names and numbers space is no more to us than enhanced multilateralism. We are not going to support that.

In our corner of the world, we share common challenges with regard to the Internet. It is true with others all over the world, and we want to make common cause to address those challenges.

I will give you one example. Last month, we had a national cyber security and forensic conference in Jamaica, and for the first time the private sector was engaged. The banks sponsored the conference, and the reason they were so engaged at the time was because they had suffered from some phishing problems. It happened in the Cayman

Islands. It happened to some extent in Jamaica and the Turks and Caicos Islands. And so the bankers became alarmed, and here's what they said to me.

They said when the issue came up with cyber security and we mentioned what ICANN's role was in Internet governance space, they challenged that assessment by saying if websites and IP numbers enable criminality, the governance model that addresses name and numbers policy must engage to pushback against criminality on the Internet. And so I told them a couple of the initiatives that we are engaged in; for example, trying to make a better registration data services model, looking at building capacity to develop support for emergency response teams and the like.

We told them of the role that the RIRs were making in the IP management and what they were doing there. But out of all the discussion, it was very clear that the banks – one small but vitally important sector in our environment – is now of the view that ICANN needs to do more, and they know of ICANN on the radar. I have told them that there are constituencies inside ICANN that they can participate, and I hope to see some more of that. But that's just one issue.

The other issue for us, of course, is that if we think the Internet is a development platform, then it's a numbers game. And so we want more persons with the ability to access the Internet than not, so access issues are important in our space. And access issues are many and varied. It's about infrastructure, but it's also about cost to access and so on.

And of course again, they are wondering what can be done even from the names and numbers perspective to move the access issues forward to increase access for our people and so on. I say this to say that while we have a sense in the names and numbers policy framework of what it is we are about, the popular perception simply does not align with what we think we are.

And so maybe that's a messaging problem that we can overcome by having better messaging and communications and greater and more deep engagement in the region. But certainly from a policy development perspective if ICANN is going to be seen as relevant in our space, then certainly they have to be seen to be engaged in addressing those top-of-mind issues for people. I think I'll stop there. Thanks so much.

RUDI VANSNICK:

Thank you, Carlton. So we covered the four bridges. I'm just looking at the audience. Is there anybody willing to put some questions to the panel at this point? Andrew? I know that you're all willing to go for a coffee. Me too, but let's try to finish this one.

ANDREW [MACK]:

Okay, and since the question is for Carlton, I will go ahead and make it in English so that will be a little easier. So we talked a lot about Latin America for most of the morning and to this point, and now you're bringing in the conversation about the Caribbean. And so one of the big questions for me is, how is it different? How should the approach be different to the Caribbean, and how can we make that dovetail with or

coordinate with the approach that should be taken and that is being taken in other parts of the region?

CARLTON SAMUELS:

Thanks, Andrew. It's a good question. There are common issues that beset us in Latin America and the Caribbean. There are the access issues for one that we know that there are cost issues. And it centers around the structure of the market and the provider space, how many providers we have in the space and so on.

I don't think that every single initiative that we could develop is going to fix everybody, but I do believe that there are common issues surrounding access that can be commonly addressed. The Internet penetration, working with governments to develop a regulatory and policy framework that enables increased access is one thing that is commonly required across the region. We call that capacity building.

The issue, for example, of the regulatory framework and developing a regulatory framework that allows more flexibility in the regulation and the space, that is something that I know for example is a big thing in Guyana and in Suriname. It's a big thing in Haiti and Jamaica and so on. So there are a couple of low-hanging fruits that we can have in terms of capacity building and in terms of looking at the access issues and helping governments to frame some responses to those access issues in common. And there are others that might require tweaking here and there depending on the objective.

For most of the Caribbean we are small island states at the lower end of the developing ladder. We have small populations. I mean, a country

with everything – the parliament and prime minister and everything – there are 60,000 people, Saint Kitts and Nevis, compared to, say, Brazil. But they have certain things that you have to do for them the same that you'll have to do for Brazil in terms of the approach. So I hope you understand that there are a couple of issues that are common and there are some responses that could be common across the region. There are others that require finer gradations for responding.

RUDI VANSNICK:

Any other questions? If not, then I would like to conclude this session. I have noted that digital divide has some aspects to discuss further on. And based on what the panel members have been presenting to us, one of the elements that I have noted is infrastructure. It's clear that's an issue that will need more attention as will also connectivity and bandwidth costs, which is definitely also an issue. The third one was the Internet governance where we all know that after the IGF in Bali there are quite a lot of discussions that are not finished and are, in fact, asking for more participation and capacity building, what was in fact mentioned by Carlton. So I would like to thank the panel and give them another round of applause. And now you're allowed to have coffee.

OSCAR ROBLES:

Can we please sit down so as to start with the next panel? Well, let's start. Please, take your seats. We are going to continue with our meeting. This is the last panel of the day and of the forum. And we're going to talk about "Cyber security from a policy perspective." But let me just talk briefly that we're going to use a different perspective rather than policy. We are going to talk about the political implications of the

cyber security. I already mentioned this to the panelists, so they are already aware of this slight change. I took it from the Spanish version, which is actually with the meaning that I am trying to explain here.

And today, we have three panelists. They are the experts in this topic. And we'll try to talk about this other perspective rather than the technological or the social or the cultural implication of the cyber security, we're going to talk about these things, how all these cyber security issues could impact the political views or the political perspective.

So please let's start with the panelists. I will give them five minutes to introduce themselves and make an opening statement. After that, I've prepared some questions to start this dialogue. After those two or three questions, I will ask you to prepare your own questions and send them to me or rise to ask them directly to these panelists.

So let me use the always polite alphabetic order to start this discussion with Don Blumenthal, then Carlos Martinez, and then Gonzalo Romero. Please, Don, introduce yourself and your opening statement, please. Thank you.

DON BLUMENTHAL:

Okay. Well, I have been – I was in Buenos Aires about six months ago for anti-phishing working group meetings. And knowing that I'd be back for Buenos Aires I asked Paul Diaz from Public Interest Registry if I should go ahead and take Spanish lessons, and he said yes and I have been. But I'm not as fluent or maybe fearless as Andrew Mack, so I'm going to stick with English.

That's actually where I met Gonzalo Romero. We've become friends since then because he was one of the panelists on a session I moderated on anti-botnet remediation cooperative efforts. So in some respects, I think there's some overlap because a lot of the issues surrounding, well, for effective botnet remediation you need collaboration, you need cooperation, both within countries and across borders. And very often, political, legal, policy, whatever, even technical issues can get in the way, or maybe I should say more politely present challenges. So it was interesting to see that when I started to work on this.

Defining cyber security is a challenge, but I think as Oscar suggested in his outline to us – oh, introduction. I've got the title of Senior Policy Advisor to the Public Interest Registry. I focus mainly on security, privacy, DNS abuse issues. That comes a little bit naturally from my background. I'm an attorney, but I also used to run networks and things like that. I was in law enforcement, so I've got kind of a cross-section of expertise for this area. In addition, I do ICANN-related work. The Public Interest Registries interest directly, but I'm also on ICANN's SSAC group. So up to fully engaged, shall we say, in some of the technical issues.

In any event, defining cyber security is difficult. First, I think if you asked anybody in the street and kept doing it for about 300 years, you'd get different definitions, if they even knew what it was to begin with. And I'm not sure there is a good single definition. I generally approach it from three different directions. The most obvious is attack, defending against attack, whether it's DDoS, hacking, burrowing your way into systems. There's just the attack vector that's the most obvious.

Another element of cyber security is more the cybercrime element. That can be malware, botnets, but I think in the sense of security as a question of raising concerns about the security and stability of the Internet, of the DNS, you've got to go broader than that. You've got to include questions such as fraud, which aren't actually attacks on networks but they make people worry about using the Internet to conduct their business.

And the third element of cyber security is probably where the political issues get heaviest. Whether it's law enforcement or government agency or government policy, when access to content is controlled for whatever reason, that's fundamentally a political issue. So you can come at it from three, like I said, those three areas. Those are hideously broad, but the whole process of looking at this question is a process of narrowing down.

Now this is a program on DNS. Some of the things I just mentioned are DNS-related issues. If you're talking about the attacks, they don't have to be DNS. It could be straight IP. There's some DNS-related there. If you're talking about phishing malware, there's likely to be DNS involvement. If you're talking about fraud, there almost certainly will be because people are driving you to websites to do bad things. But when it comes down to it, I don't think you can separate DNS versus non-DNS. It's the Internet, and to the average user out there, that's what matters. That distinction really isn't critical.

To foreshadow, I think, some of the later questions that we're going to be addressing where this definition of cyber security and these issues under cyber security will play out is the extent to which they raise

political issues. And again I think directly straight up front it's going to be in the content control issue, and how deeply you want to get into that may vary according to who is involved.

But when we're talking about attacks, addressing attacks, addressing botnets, malware, whatever, there are very significant political issues that do involve the intergovernmental cooperation, that involve private-public partnership, all the things that are necessary to have the cooperation to address these issues effectively.

I'll open it up. I don't know if this falls under our purview, but I'll raise it in case somebody wants to comment later. Obviously, the most common recurrent political element going on these days is some of the things involving broader Internet governance. I'm just not sure whether that comes under our small topic here. Thanks.

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you, Don. Carlos?

CARLOS MARTINEZ: Good afternoon, everyone. Thank you, Oscar, for your introduction. I would like to thank the audience for staying here to listen to us. I was telling Don and Oscar that something strange happened to me. This is my first ICANN event. I wore a tie, and usually I don't. And I see that most of the audience are not wearing a tie, so I'm the minority so this puts me in a very strange situation. So I'm not used to being this [inaudible]. Yes, perhaps you can do something about that.

I must confess that I was thinking carefully which would be my open statement, and it was quite difficult for me. And I think that I'm going to repeat some of the things that Don has already said. It was very difficult for me to separate the notion of security from DNS. And I think that DNS is just another component in a series of basic Internet infrastructure elements. And those who abuse the Internet, the attackers, those that commit fraud, usually do this much better than us as organizations. They see the Internet as a whole. They do that better than we do it, and they take advantage of the vulnerabilities that stem from the interaction between the different parties that are moving in the Internet.

I come from LACNIC. Many of you know me. But let me make a few comments in order to set a framework for what I'm going to talk about. In LACNIC by the end of the year we did a strategic planning analysis exercise, and we tried to find out which should be LACNIC's mission. And one of the natural findings was that we believe that, in fact, LACNIC – and I'm going to quote from the mission statement – “the constant strengthening of a stable, open, secure, and ever-growing Internet.” Secure and stable, I would like to focus on these two concepts.

Security and stability as elements of what? For us, as elements that make the Internet a reliable platform for something. At a certain time in the past, the Internet was just like a toy for us technical people and it was interesting because it was new. But now it is much more than that. The Internet became part of the larger society. Now it is a commerce platform, an education platform, a platform for social interaction. That is why we have the need to have a secure and stable Internet, and this goes beyond the fact of just being a mere technological platform.

As it usually happens, not only in the Internet space but among human beings over time, good things also bring about bad things. So we were talking about the use of the Internet as a fraud tool, as a tool for abusing people in different ways, the use of the Internet as a war instrument with cyber warfare now being a very fashionable term. So this is the dark side of the Internet, so to speak.

In this connection and now looking at this from a political standpoint, one of the things that sometimes raises concerns when we talk about security is how tempting it is for somebody who is doing politics to use the digital and the virtual elements as a policy enforcement tool. Why? Because it is easy. You can do things not because they are good things but because they can be done.

For instance, looking into the Internet traffic. In other contexts, in other settings, that would be politically unacceptable or even impossible. Nobody would think and no country would accept that the post office would open up the mail or the letters. In fact, in some countries this is a crime. But some countries believe that it is acceptable that some organizations can examine the contents of certain data packages that travel through the Internet. When actually we are just talking about a physical support, the guarantees of rights that should affect different things are equivalent.

Perhaps we cannot talk about data packages because that would be too detailed, but let's talk about reading somebody else's e-mail. That would be acceptable, but it wouldn't be acceptable if that e-mail were inside an envelope. So using the digital network of the technological

possibilities is quite tempting because there is somebody who looks into those packages.

And although somebody may say that I'm trying to infer what happened last year, well, this goes beyond the leaks that we unveiled last year. We are actually learning about this now, but we all suspected that this happened. And this did not happen only in the U.S. This is a wider reality. And once again, I insist it is tempting because it is easy.

So here we have a completely indiscriminated use of those possibilities. I am not naïve, so I understand that in some cases it might be necessary to read a certain e-mail content. But the indiscriminate use of these goes against trust, and by that we also destroy the ability of the Internet to give us benefits as a society.

So to close this open statement, let me refer to cyber security also on the positive side. I don't think that this is a lost battle. I don't think that those who commit abuses on the network will prevail always, but I think that we need to look for collaboration mechanisms to establish interrelations among organizations that can foster the security and stability of the Internet as such. Thank you.

OSCAR ROBLES:

Thank you, Carlos. Gonzalo, I think you're in a bit of a trouble. You have the floor.

GONZALO ROMERO:

Thank you very much, Oscar. Good afternoon, everybody. Thank you very much to all of you who made this possible, made the realization of

this first Latin American and Caribbean DNS forum possible and who gave me the opportunity of almost closing the forum.

Honestly, I would like to share with you what was a very interesting experience, an experience that I had to study so as to be part of this panel. When you are on that side of the technological strategy and you're asked what happens on the political level, you have to study. You have to study so as to know what to say. It was not easy, in fact, and it is important for all of us here.

We are a plural audience, and it's important to understand what cyber security means when we do not know perhaps what it actually is. There is a very good definition from the ITU in Resolution 181, November 2010. I'm not going to read it right now, but it's quite simple. It says any mechanism that will protect users from cyberspace and the assets of any organization. So under that umbrella, we may give certain guidelines so as to understand from a political perspective what cyber security is.

In many cases, people talk about cyber war, and this is really different. Cyber security is not cyber war. Cyber war is something more political, what is called cyber warfare. It's more related to power, to defense. So in the light of that protection, each of us as participants in this cyberspace to protect the community and to protect the assets, we have to take lots of things into account. Carlos and Don have already mentioned some of the most important points, but I would like to bring some more points to the table.

When we talk about stability, security, resiliency, not only with respect to DNS but with respect to the whole of the Internet space, are issues

that are really very important. Each of us has to take them with responsibility. How? Simply by making consumers aware of how to use the tools. I like very much the [inaudible] of Carlton when he talked about capacity building. I think this is one of the most important topics, and this may certainly reduce all the challenges of the emerging technology and all of the circumstances that may make the cyberspace something to be used by evil hands.

Fortunately, there is a task force for security, stability, and resiliency and together with LACNIC, LACTLD, ISOC, and the ccTLDs are working on this issue. In particular, I know there is a project within the ICANN strategic plan – project number three – related to that capacity building. This is a very challenging project in which we are participating and working.

Another point to supplement what has been said by Carlos and Don is the issue of online privacy. This is quite a complex issue. It gains more and more complexity day after day. When we talk about big data, when we talk about managed data, this is leading us to discover ourselves and to open ourselves. So privacy is something that is becoming less frequent. It's not easy to be anonymous. It's like all the intelligence has been done on our data, and this poses some other new challenges in cyber security.

Now we have 1,200 new gTLDs that will add something more to cyber security in terms of phishing and malware. That's not just from the point of view of business but from the point of view trends with respect to abuse and illegal activity regarding domains. So we have to be ready for the new launch of the new gTLDs and new players in the market, new

agents in the economy, and we will have to be careful on how to manage security in that respect.

Finally, so as not to keep on talking a lot, I would like to share with you that the biggest secret regarding cyber security is related to cooperative action. The fact of [being plural] and the fact of exchanging cooperation agreements among several organizations, civil society, governments, the private sector is key to protect the critical infrastructures of the countries to fight against cybercrime and to ensure the security, stability, and resiliency of the DNS and of cyberspace.

To conclude, this is a very interesting topic because we have to analyze it not from the perspective that we are seeing today, that is day after day and as a reaction, but as a concept that is progressive and innovative. It's amazing how technologies like social media and the cloud and the use of mobile devices are problems that organizations are facing nowadays. These are technologies that we have been discussing for ten years, but right now when we talk about big data, when we talk about bring your own cloud and the Internet of things, and then we are not going to talk about big data but in memory computing that will replace the concept of databases to manage information instantly, the cyber paradise, the cyber heavens, digital money. So I cannot think if we are in a problem because we do not know how to manage [guidelines] and policies to manage social media at each of our organizations and bring your own device. I think we should change our model to innovate in terms of cyber security. Thank you very much.

OSCAR ROBLES:

Thank you very much. So now we will continue with the second stage of this panel. I have specific questions for the three of you. I would like to say, first of all, about what you have discussed.

First, the difficulty to speak about this issue as something only related to DNS, that cyber security is only related to DNS. We know that's complicated, Don said that, because at the end of the day, it's very difficult to take DNS out of some problems or to define whether a certain domain is being used or not or whether that domain is being used for a cyber-attack or not. You just mention the Internet. You are not saying DNS or not DNS. But there are many examples where the DNS specifically intervenes in this type of problem, so we are going to discuss about some of them.

Gonzalo also mentioned that this is different to cyber warfare, and I fully agree. This is, I would say, the opposite to it because it is a political situation that has a certain incidence on Internet or the security of the network or the DNS. What we're trying to identify here are certain aspects in the security of the network, of the DNS, of the Internet that if those aspects fail will have a political consequence.

And Gonzalo also mentioned some of these issues, how the new gTLDs will have an influence on political issues. If something fails in the new gTLDs, of course there will be some political implications that will be really serious, particularly if they are related to something that was mentioned by the governments well in advance and was not paid attention.

I don't know if you know, but ICANN has defined a strategic plan for Latin America and the Caribbean, and it established one of the four

areas of work that are political issues. In that field, it talked about the political impact of the lack of what the three panelists have mentioned, the lack of cooperation. What would happen if a ccTLD in the region fails? Will there be any failure in the continuation of the operation of the ccTLD? Because in that case, many businesses will lose communication to their e-mail websites, Web pages, whatever. But apart from the technological consequences, there will be political consequences.

I would like to continue discussing on that field. So let's start the other way around. Gonzalo, would you please tell us if there are any political implications different in the region when compared with the implications that may take place in some other parts of the world?

GONZALO ROMERO:

Oscar, I think that in our region we have our own problems, we have our own situations, our own considerations of facts. And from my perspective, the situation is the same. I really don't think that there is something quite different in terms of cyber security that may make it different from a protection perspective.

As I said before, if we are speaking about cooperation, we have to all cooperate internally at country level but also at regional level and global level. So I don't think really I cannot find any difference in that fundamental concept for us over cooperation or cooperative action. This is something that should be done at the local level, domestic level, regional level, and a global level as well.

OSCAR ROBLES: Carlos takes the floor.

CARLOS MARTINEZ: I agree with Gonzalo. I think there is not much difference when we compare the political implications for Latin America and the Caribbean and the political implications in some other parts of the world. I think that the difference is related to maturity and development stages and perhaps a qualitative difference. I think we're following the same development steps that other regions are taking, but perhaps they took it before.

I think that something related to the DNS, I don't know how it translates into Spanish, but you have domain issues. When a law enforcement agency decides that something is doing something evil – regardless of the definition of evil – and so that domain is appropriated, it might be suspended but it's not the same. It might be. Well, okay, a forced suspension of the domain. Okay. In some of the regions this happens. And we know that this happened. I remember [Rojadirecta.org].

And I have my personal opinion. I think it is a bad idea. This is not an instrument to implement any policy. In some cases, it may be okay, but apart from my personal opinion I think that it does not happen here quite frequently because we are at a different developmental stage. But it will happen sometime in the future. In that case, I think it's related to the knowledge of the technology, for instance, of the courts or the judiciary. And then by the lapsing of time, these things will happen. So it's a difference in the development stage we are in, qualitative differences as I call them.

DON BLUMENTHAL:

Well, I'll just say first that the U.S. government ultimately agreed with Carlos on [Rojadirecta] and dropped the case, so there is hope. It's very distracting to hear yourself come in through the headset. I think we're generally on the same page on this. I don't see anything inherent in the region that would make things different from any other part of the world.

But I do think that it's interesting to note where Latin America has been ahead of some other regions I can point to but also where the stages of development suggest that for good, bad, or indifferent, maybe Latin America is catching up. There was, I think roughly 2003-2004, an intergovernmental initiative on cyber security in Latin America. And that was before the European Union similar document.

I saw Carlos most recently at an OAS program in Washington, D.C., where these issues have been discussed in an open, cooperative sense at government levels, and we don't see that much too often in other areas. Well, no sense getting too specific, but the OAS efforts the compact projects like ones that [USUARIA] has organized, in a lot of ways I see cyber security critical infrastructure analysis and cooperation ahead of the curve here.

On the other hand, the bad guys are getting more active in Latin America from all the studies I've seen. Trend Micro did a very interesting analysis earlier in the year that malware, botnets, things like that, well, they've been accessible – the stuff made in the U.S., the stuff made in Europe – because it's the Internet, of course it is. But now there's homegrown stuff, which raises obvious concerns.

Where there's the advantage down here, as was suggested before, the common language provides some avenues that are a challenge, particularly in Europe. Just some of the roadblocks are lack of understanding, and I'm not talking about law enforcement. In talking to law enforcement, they're generally more than happy to do it. But I'm talking about language differences that have created policy roadblocks, just lack of being on quite the same page on what's being discussed.

So while I don't see any inherent differences in cyber security issues in Latin America, I do see some very practical things that both are to the advantage of the community down here but also are going to present some increasing challenges over the next few years as the landscape – again, maybe a bad term – but the landscape catches up to the rest of the malware community.

OSCAR ROBLES:

Yes. Certainly we are facing a global environment in terms of security threats, and it doesn't make any difference to be in one part or a different part of the planet. What may be different is the level of consequences in the different places. The reaction in Mexico will not be the same as in Haiti or in Argentina or in Brazil in the face of a security issue with the DNS.

But let me ask two questions that are related, and I'm going to ask the panelists to address both questions in the way that you think is best. First, which could be the worst scenario where you may have a security DNS problem and the political implications? So what kind of situation could we envisage in that regard? And secondly, what should we do in order to avoid those scenarios? You have already talked about

cooperation, but perhaps drilling down into this, what can be done in the region and who should do something to avoid that kind of potential scenario? So we'll start with Don again.

DON BLUMENTHAL:

The middle next time. I think the worst possible – well, there are two bad scenarios. I think something was suggested before is the failure of a cc. I don't know how common it is in the region for companies or individuals to be using both a cc and a gTLD, but certainly in the U.S. or Canada, they don't have the level of penetration I think than is the case in a lot of other places. But a failure of a cc potentially brings down Internet access if the penetration is very high.

The second thing, and cooperation, I'm not sure what cooperative efforts would address that short of commercial agreements for failovers. But this is getting into business; it's not dealing with politics. Those two aren't exclusive, but in this case.

The second thing worst case scenario, again, is not covered by, I think, cooperation and it's the absolute opposite of cooperation. It's a country in Latin America putting up a Great Wall of name your country. It might be said that that's a stretch of cyber security, but certainly in the sense of the stability of the Internet, I think it is an issue. But using my first definition, in some nations' view that is a cyber-security issue. They're securing themselves from bad ideas, from bad content, from whatever you want to put it.

So those are number one and two worst scenarios I can think of. Number two, unfortunately, I don't see how cooperation is even in the cards.

CARLOS MARTINEZ:

I think that once again we are going to agree on certain aspects. We all agree that the DNS is one of the mainstays of the Internet and its operation. One is the end-to-end delivery of packages. If that pillar is negatively affected, then there are a number of cascading consequences that will affect us all.

One of the examples quoted by Don is very clear. What would happen in the case of a failure of a ccTLD? You know that we are in a situation in which e-government services all over the region are a priority now. So all e-government services tend to be inside a ccTLD. So if there is a failure of ccTLDs, then that will have immediate political consequences because it would produce or bring about the failure of all the e-government services.

So this could be used as an argument to say that the manager of that ccTLD is doing a bad job. That would be the typical Latin American scenario perhaps. We are Latin Americans, you know. And somebody could also say that this is an attack from a neighboring country, so this would be the other example that Don mentioned. So I have to protect myself from my neighboring country because this will have a bad effect on my image and on other aspects.

So all these have to do with the balkanization fear of the Internet, the subdivision of the Internet into small local networks. In my opinion, that

could be one of the worst case scenarios that we could find in the Internet because the Internet would stop having the purpose that it has today and it would stop being so valuable.

Once we had a free or very cheap Uruguayan Internet, and everybody said, “No. We don’t want that kind of an Internet. The Internet as a sum is greater than the sum of all its parts.” So I think that there lies the value of the Internet.

There are some important lessons to learn here. Although some of the things that I may say go beyond the topic of this panel, I will run the risk of saying them. I was told that the European parallel organization to LACNIC also has a secondary service. They suffered a DDoS attack this morning and several of their services failed, but they survived because of the way in which their DNS structure is established.

I think that cooperation here is key. When we build infrastructure, this infrastructure by nature should be stable and secure. In the construction, we should make sure that this is safe, secure, and stable. This is what I was talking about with engineers. When we build something, this has to be secure and stable just because of its own construction. So if we have to look for technical solutions to address security and stability, that means that we haven’t constructed that in a secure and stable manner.

So then we would have to leave the silos in our own countries and start talking to others to see how we can pull together our efforts to contribute to a more secure and more stable Internet. If I had to define this into one single statement, I think that we need to avoid the political consequences. How can we do that? By avoiding problems turning into

political issues. How can we do that? By trying to build things in the best way possible and trying oftentimes to leave aside the jealousy that sometimes exists between or among the regions because that is almost a silly thing to do considering the overall picture.

We have a lot to support one another, and perhaps the self-criticism for the region would be that the problems that we face are not technological problems. In some cases, they are not even money related. It has to do with problems of interaction among ourselves. So we should avoid problems becoming political problems. How can we avoid political consequences? By making sure that the problems do not become political. Obviously, this is not possible in 100% of the cases. Gonzalo?

GONZALO ROMERO:

It is difficult. The worst case scenario. My God. I am the IT security director of a global domain. A global that is .co, that it has 246 countries in the world. And I'm here sitting with you and I'm not paranoid. But I have a responsibility to fulfill. We are a private company that has a concession agreement from a ministry from one country, and we have a dual responsibility – a responsibility at a country level and a responsibility at the global level, at the world level. The worst case scenario? I can't picture that.

Participating inside the country raising awareness of cyber security has been a big challenge for our organization for the last three years. Three years later, before a national holiday, the banking system, the ministries, the [five] certificates that we have, the TLD, and several stakeholders sit around a crisis table at the headquarters of the national

police of our country in order to put together a joint action plan as a preparative effort to work proactively to address any situation that may affect the security, stability, and resilience of our institutions in our country mainly.

Let me bring up this example here because it is an example of cooperation, and I believe that this is an example that should be followed by all countries in our region as well as in other parts of the world. It is the only way in which we can raise awareness and really show that through joint efforts we can achieve things that can protect all these assets that are not only for our benefit but also in the interests of our children. Thank you.

OSCAR ROBLES:

Thank you, Gonzalo, thank you, Carlos, and thank you, Don. Now I would like to open the floor to questions from the audience for the panelists.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Hi, this is [inaudible] from ICANN. This is a question just for the panel. What experience have any of you had or what have you seen as far as the embrace of multi-stakeholderism by the cyber security community? This is touching on dovetailing on what we talked this morning what the subject seemed to be, and I would just like to hear your opinions. Is it being embraced? Is it something they're pushing away and saying, "No. We would rather operate in silos?" You know, law enforcement, defense, etc. That's my question. Thanks.

DON BLUMENTHAL: [inaudible] put it. I can't imagine seeing an Ann Arbor police department detective using the word multi-stakeholder, but it works. And I focus on that because of the conference that I attended a few weeks ago, the Michigan Cyber Security Summit. And I think that's what it comes down to.

I don't think you would hear the term used, but the fact of the matter is certainly in the private security community – except for company lawyers, and I am one, but except where company lawyers get in the way – the security professionals are falling all over themselves trying to cooperate, trying to share knowledge, trying to share techniques, whether it's defending against attack or it's swapping samples of malware trying to figure out how to work against it.

I think if you checked with law enforcement agencies at the operational level, law enforcement agents – no, I shouldn't say that – I know you would find a real interest in cooperation.

Law enforcement since the San Francisco meeting has gathered at ICANN to try to compare notes. Now we're talking multi-stakeholder in a horizontal sense there, but looking at U.S. laws – leave it there because that's what I know best – you're even seeing a little bit of vertical trickle up.

The FTC where I worked reaching out to the private sector to come up with best practices type approaches, government can't share information to private sector but they can work to facilitate the exchange of ideas and there are government agencies I know of that are doing that. So it's a really valid concept once I stepped back and applied the term in a way I really hadn't thought of before.

CARLOS MARTINEZ:

I have an experience that supplements Don's experience in a funny way. I did hear the term multi-stakeholder model in the police and defense setting. And that concept of multi-stakeholder was that the other government agencies had been invited, so of course it was a multi-stakeholder meeting because you had more than one stakeholder. [Rick] was there too, so he heard about that. That was really funny for me. I was a little bit ashamed to laugh out loud, you know.

But in turn, I would like to say something. [Rick] and I were present there on behalf of LACNIC, so there was already some recognition that you have more than one valid interlocutor or spokesperson in security matters. And we can compare this against what happens in the public sector among politicians when they talk about security.

If you listen to the public discourse, there is an intention to nationalize problems and say, "[ICANN] really solve the security problem." But we know that this is not true. All of us know that it is not true, but sometimes politically that sounds well or can have a positive political effect for the person saying that.

But if we go down into law enforcement and defense levels, I think that there is some positive development there. There is increasing awareness that the problems cannot be addressed in silos, that they require to be addressed through collaboration in order to be mitigated in a reasonable manner or in a way that can lead to a better or a more secure future.

I think that there is light at the end of the tunnel, and we start seeing that interaction among the different law enforcement groups and the courts and the civil society. In LACNIC we are a civil society as well as ICANN, and in the private sector you start seeing this recognition of the need to apply the multi-stakeholder model in order to deal with security issues.

OSCAR ROBLES: Gonzalo, would you like to comment on that?

GONZALO ROMERO: No. I fully agree with what my colleagues have just said, and I join what Don and Carlos have said about this.

OSCAR ROBLES: Go ahead.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I think that Don's comment is really valid, and it is applied among agencies but perhaps they don't use the term. They don't talk about multi-stakeholder model. I was reading a press release from the European Center on Cybercrime, and they have issued a communique talking about successful cooperation during three days in a seminar that they had on child sexual exploitation. That is one of the crimes that you see on the Internet through illegal content. And they say that this was a successful activity because they brought together experts from the academic world, from NGOs, the private sector, and the European Commission, and the different European specialized agencies dealing

with cyber security. So when I read this, I feel that it is true that they are really adopting this multi-stakeholder model. So this is just an example. I was just reading that. Thank you.

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you very much. Any other questions?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I'm trained as an economist, so this comes from an economic perspective as well. What constitutes a crime, as we've discovered in the financial sector, can be quite elastic. So when you're talking about cybercrime and so forth, one of the things that I'm watching is the growth of the multilateral agreements like the transpacific partnership and some that Canada is dealing with in Europe. And it looks as though a significant chunk of Internet governance is going to be subsumed under those agreements.

Is anybody paying attention to that? Because once they're signed off as national agreements, they supersede national policy and there's a whole Pandora's Box there that a number of people are worried about. Do you have any comments on that area?

OSCAR ROBLES: Anybody? Any of you willing to talk about that, the agreements with the TPP? And, please, if you may close the curtain. We are vampires in here.

[laughter]

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That was epic, really.

[DON BLUMENTHAL]: I think we should just really, with that, call the conference off. Go home. Really the only thing I wanted to say is I wish the panel had been tomorrow because on my reading list is the lead copy of the TPP that's sitting on WikiLeaks. I don't know if you've seen that. I've heard those concerns raised, but for the most part people have run from them.

There are a lot of issues in multilateral contracts that have maybe unintended consequences, whether it's the TPP, the European Union-U.S. safe harbor program has had some unintended – well, I'll stop using the term – the EU safe harbor program has had some effects on some of the discussions concerning cybercrime, data loss, privacy that have gotten in the way of really addressing the issues properly. So it's certainly there, but when I do read this document I'll maybe look at it in a little different light from the initial concerns I was going to look at.

OSCAR ROBLES: Anybody else?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: My only comment about the TPP and some other initiatives are two. I think that these are initiatives if seen from an economic perspective are positive and are related to the development of the world, but some other times they are used as vehicles to include some things in there that really do not belong there, in some cases the criminalization of absurd things.

So I don't know. If you download a film, it may be morally questionable, but if it is criminal, my mother would be in jail. So I think that it goes well beyond reasonableness. It may be okay or not. You may educate, speak about copyright, etc. But to criminalize that and to use a free trade agreement as a vehicle to include that, I think this is something really very negative.

I would like to make a comment about that question. We are following the TPP. We are doing a follow up of it. We have had access to its text through our ministry of economy in Mexico. And it is an example of what Carlos said, how we let something become political and so we are facing the consequences of that.

The problem of disputes in domain names became a political issue for some reason, and the countries that are negotiating that particularly the U.S. with the rest of the Pacific basin countries included a chapter related to ccTLDs and they are saying that it's a dispute resolution mechanism. The countries in there will have that, but they also mention something that was mentioned by Carlos right now.

They are criminalizing the domain registration, but not just abusive registration but somebody wanted the domain over somebody else and lost it through it a process. And so this treaty calls for remedies or for consequences after the dispute is settled. And then we are criminalizing the practice of registering a domain name in an illegitimate factor, an unlawful factor. This might be a consequence of what we are saying.

So when we let this become a political issue, at the same time around the same table there are negotiators negotiating. Even though those negotiators are economists and may have lots of experience in

negotiating but do not have much interaction with the economic agents they are trying to regulate. And this, of course, will have negative consequences.

OSCAR ROBLES: I don't know if there is any other question.

WIM DEGEZELLE: For a bit of information and have a question. I'm Wim Degezzelle I'm working for CENTR, which is the European ccTLD organization, so it's basically the sister organization of LACTLD in Europe. In Europe at this moment, there is discussion going on at the European commission of [inaudible] level on a new proposal for legislation to enhance the security or to go to a higher level of network and information security.

We reacted, and I think as a ccTLD organization, on that proposal with saying first of all that we really welcome and that's really good that within Europe on the European level they are thinking on ways how to make the different sectors cooperate, work together, exchange information. And we, of course, say first of all that they have to look at the ccTLDs because there is already a good cooperation. The ccTLDs, other DNS sectors already inform each other, have a good cooperation, exchange information.

But the second part, and that's I think also very relevant for this discussion, is we talk about trust and we say what we see in the cc community is there is a good exchange of information. People talk to each other if something is happening because they trust each other, because they know the people they are talking to, they know if I have a

problem. If I have an issue and I inform my colleagues, it will say they will help me. They will not leak this information. They will not use it for other purposes.

And therefore our message to the European legislature is that you have to pay attention if you want to come up with ways to make the sector cooperate because you cannot instill trust. It's not because you say, "Okay, people – legislators, governments, DNS ccTLD registries – you have to sit together once a year or you have to be on our list or whatever." It's not because you say that that it will work because that trust is not there.

And that's, I think, my question I would ask. What do you think is the most relevant to create more than just that platform for cooperation but to create that platform where people from the different stakeholders talk to each other but trust each other just enough that it will be effective and that they will help each other?

OSCAR ROBLES:

Thank you. Any response to Wim's comment?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Something in general terms. I fully agree that trust is not something that you may sell, buy, or create by law. Trust is so intangible that when you lose it, you cannot regain it. So I think that some of the things that happened in the last year are and have been quite adverse. This is just this thought. It's like a self-help book, but my mother used to tell me to make me feel miserable like mothers usually do, that trust is like a

paper that you try to squeeze it and then try to make it flat again. It will never happen.

OSCAR ROBLES: Okay. Thank you very much.

DON BLUMENTHAL: This one works a lot better than the other one. I think that the best way to kind of instill the trust is what we're doing here face-to-face. And I know this will be a shock to everybody here, but the value of ICANN conventions or APWG programs or [MAAWG] or I could just keep going down the list is not in the formal sessions. It's putting e-mail addresses and whatever else to a person, and it's going back and forth and getting a sense of that person and then taking it out from there.

The content is important, but that can be done other ways. It's the personal contact that builds the trust. I'm on an anti-spam list, and the fact that I can look at the message that's coming through, picture a person, suddenly somehow what they're asking me to do or asking me to maybe go to Public Interest Registry management and do has a much stronger chance of success.

OSCAR ROBLES: Thank you very much. Gonzalo, would you like to make some comments?

GONZALO ROMERO:

I fully agree with what you have said. Trust is part of the spirit included in a conversation with somebody. You start discussing a certain topic, and when you show the objective and you have your goals clear in that respect – in this case the protection of communities, the protection of assets – you should be sure that by the mere fact of exchanging business cards you have had a very good impact. And that trust will then translate into an agreement of cooperation, and you will not need to go to that agreement to find the clauses but just dial the cellphone number and he or she will be there with you. This is translated into trust.

But as Don said, this is done on a personal contact basis, by actively participating in this type of meeting. Exchanging your problems, exchanging your ideas to the interior of your silo, this will never happen. So this is what makes the cyber security process very interesting in how to go out and share your problems with others.

OSCAR ROBLES:

Thank you very much, Gonzalo. Carlos?

CARLOS MARTINEZ:

I would like to supplement what Gonzalo was saying because this is actually true. It's very difficult to build trust if you do not know each other, and it's very easy to misinterpret the other's intention if you haven't met before face-to-face. So it happened to me shortly ago. A person that certainly we have discussed a lot over the Internet, but when I met that person I realized that he was a very good person. So when we talk about policy making and decision making, this is key because we have to know each other.

OSCAR ROBLES:

Okay. So I think we are reaching the end of this panel. Oh. Any other questions? No? Okay. So this is the end of this panel, and we will continue seeing some more examples of the scenarios of the situations where some technological issues in theory have an increasing influence on the economic agenda and the political agenda as the panelists here are saying. And it also shows us how to address all these issues.

They said, for instance, to prevent this from becoming a political issue, these problems should not become political problems before they explode. That if this is political, then to cooperate, cooperate, and cooperate. So please give a big round of applause to these three panelists.

[applause]

UNIDENTIFIED MALE:

Thank you very much. Since you are here, we are going to close all this. We're going to wrap up and we have like a brainstorming here so as to know how to move ahead. I think Gabi has a presentation. And please do not leave the room because we are going to take a family picture afterwards. Please, do not leave the room. Keep up with your energy and attention a bit more. We are going to make a summary for the day.

So the plan is to use the other microphone, but I think that we can do it here because it is better for the interpreters. So Gabi has been taking note. We have compared notes among colleagues here, and we have prepared a summary of the main ideas, of the highlights of today's sessions. So we are going to split this session into two parts. First, we

are going to show you the summary, and then we will ask for your feedback and we would like to have a small discussion to determine how we can continue with this work. So are you ready?

[GABRIELA SZLAK]:

So let's start with a brief summary. What we saw that came up in different panels is the level of relationship between the DNS and the Internet. Although here we call this the DNS forum, in our group we had the discussion there are certain topics that have to do with a small Internet governance forum, but we don't want it to be like that. We want to talk more specifically about DNS-related issues.

So there are no clear-cut borders or boundaries here, and we have seen the different stakeholders in the ecosystem are reacting in different manners. But the Internet infrastructure doesn't recognize all these different boundaries, so we cannot just stay there.

In the last panel, this was mentioned. This distinction between DNS and the Internet is not so critical for dealing with the most relevant political implications. It is a complex ecosystem where we have different structures and different social engineering processes, including the coordination factor that will be mentioned later on too.

Among the major challenges for the DNS at present is the advent of the New gTLDs poses new challenges from the point of view of technical criticality and security and resilience. But also we see challenges in the way of making sure that the new contents and the new forms of exposure that these groups will have with the new gTLDs will be managed and the new business models that the regional could or

should use in this launching phase because we know that in the medium or short term we will see the launching of new gTLDs, so we will be exposed to them, or there may be more sectors interested in developing sustainable business proposals.

[GABRIELA SZLAK]:

Now that the picture has been taken, can we move on to the next slide? One of the most important findings from this forum is that there are difficulties for participation in the region with all the stakeholders in Latin America. So we tried to summarize what is happening in the different sectors. Of course, this is a work in progress. This is not a complete list in the private sector.

We see that there is lack of information, lack of awareness. There are many opportunities are being wasted now, and also that there are some problems related to the access costs. We discussed whether this is an issue of cost or not, and this is an interesting discussion. But anyway, the issue of cost crops up.

As regards governments, there is lack of understanding of the relevance of the Internet governance. We also talked about other needs and priorities for governments. At a given point, somebody said that this is a different time because some governments are awakening and certain things have happened that led them to think that perhaps everything that has to do with Internet governance is interesting and this might be politically important for all of us.

And in the civil society, we see the need for capacity building, training, information, resources – financial and other types of resources – and everything that has to do with awareness raising and outreach.

And we also talked about the number of forums that exist, how difficult it is to keep up with all the forums and to attend all of them. So all the topics are cross-sectional, they cut across different [functions], so how can we participate in all of them? Shall I continue? Okay. So I will continue doing the talking.

Among the opportunities, we saw some interesting opportunities because all challenges bring about new opportunities. So we talked about the new gTLDs and how can we take advantage of the business opportunities. Somebody said perhaps we lost the first round with the applications, but we still have some second opportunities. So the game is just starting, so for Latin America we have a lot of opportunities.

Although there are 27 applications, when we present the new gTLDs in different e-commerce events, yes, we always say there are 27 or 24 applications from the region. But there are many names in Spanish that are aiming at our market and they have not necessarily been applied for by companies or community groups from the region, but those names aim at our market.

And we also have words in English that aim at our market. We cannot say that .marketing is not something that is not intended for us or for our market because we don't use the Spanish translation for that. We don't say mercadeo. We also use the word in English – marketing. So I think that there are plenty of opportunities that crop up and that with the launching of the new gTLDs.

Then we saw also that some changes in Internet governance are leading some stakeholders and some partners in the government and in the civil society to become aware of the relevance of these issues, and this is creating a reaction in different [partners].

We also see some leadership of regional organizations that are already involved. This event is a clear example of that involvement. Some organizations are taking the lead, so this may push others to join in. And we also have opportunities to work in a collaborative and synergistic manner among the regional partners that are already trained and engaged. How we can build trust, how we can continue working together.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: [Carol, Sofia].

[GABRIELA SZLAK]: As to the digital divide, related issues because we believe that here we are dealing with a topic that might be more typical of an Internet governance forum. We are in the region that has this problem, but this problem is not only regional as Rudi said earlier. It is a much more complex issue. It is not a binary issue. It is not a problem of having or not access or having a good quality of broadband service or a poor quality.

So it is extremely important to understand all these aspects in order to understand other issues related to this low perception ability that the regional stakeholders have with regard to understanding these opportunities in the market that came up with the new gTLD program.

It is not that there is a problem with supply. Our local demand, the capacity that we have in the region to perceive that as an opportunity for participating or as a business opportunity or a development opportunity is still low. It's still lagging behind. The aspects related to government management should not only focus on the deployment of the infrastructure and the cables but also on other capacities such as the necessary social engineering to understand all these problems.

Some other concepts were raised that are not so traditional in the discussion of the digital divide. The gaps that we have when it comes to thinking about Internet governance with some other aspects like sovereignty or the way in which we are getting involved in those processes that are a little bit anachronistic for this phenomenon and how we can come up with new skills and new strategies to revisit this from a different perspective.

And then we have this important distinction that within regions or within countries you have significant difference among partners that speak to a digital divide and also a divide in terms of participation and engagement.

Regarding cyber security policies, there are many consequences. The security of the Internet is affected by several factors. The panelists talked about the launching of new gTLDs, the cyber warfare that is increasingly frequent. And these are new ways of having confrontations among the different nation states. The cloud, how to work with the cloud, how to take advantage of the new opportunities or deal with the challenges of the big data.

The keyword in this panel is cooperation. We are talking about cyber security, so there needs to be a resolution or a document to continue working. We need cooperation, reinforced cooperation. In Geneva there is a multi-stakeholder working group that is discussing the participation and cooperation of all the sectors dealing with cyber security, and that is the only way of getting to a certain level of acceptable commitment and engagement to address these issues.

Latin America has the same perception about cyber security and the regional impact that other regions have. It is just a matter of recognizing who the partners are, who the stakeholders are and a matter of getting involved.

And the problematic scenarios are lack of international cooperation. In this regard, the ICANN strategy for the region contemplates different points to work with the different mechanisms for emergency and crisis response. This is an initiative that we expect to have more information on to tell you about that. The ccTLD failures that are the key factors in the region and the consequences of projects for segmenting national spaces on the Internet or the balkanization of the Internet.

In this last slide, we have some proposals. But this is just to open up the debate, to spark up the discussion so that you can all give your views on this. So a proposal is to raise awareness and reach out to relevant regional partners that might not be involved in our work to create meaningful participation and have all the sectors represented. So this should be a cross-sectional participation.

We also need to become leaders in the decisions that are being made now and in the future in relation to the Internet and all the aspects that

affect us and learn to work with other regional stakeholders to preserve a global, open, democratic, secure, and interoperable Internet.

So this is some food for thought. So now Rodrigo is going to help us moderate the next part of this session, which should be the next steps and the objectives that we want to pursue.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA:

Thank you very much, Gabriela. And thank you very much for this very good summary that you have made. You captured here everything that was said, so congratulations and thank you.

So let's do this interactive. As it's said by the very name of it, this is the very first Latin American and Caribbean DNS forum. So I hope there will be a second and many more to come, but it would be good to hear from you what you said it was okay in this forum, what would you do different, in which area, which subject. And perhaps I'm going to provoke you with the co-organizers so these co-organizers may something in that respect and then the rest of you.

So, for instance, Sebastián Bellagamba, please, take the mic. Even though he is at the back not willing to speak, he will speak. So what do you think was good? What do you think you would do different?

SEBASTIÁN BELLAGAMBA:

Well, thank you very much for passing me the ball. So get ready for the rest of you present here. I think that we should keep on working on these initiatives. This was a very productive day, and from this forum there's a logistic issue. Perhaps the date is too early to say that to be at

the very beginning of an ICANN event. Because it's at the very beginning, we should improve the weather. Because there was a meteorological problem, many planes did not land. So there was a failure on ICANN's side in that respect.

But now speaking seriously, I think we should keep on discussing the contents and be focused on DNS. I think there are lots of things to be discussed in this respect, and we should try and fine tune the agenda. This is a process that, of course, happens over time. And so I think that when you have this type of events at each region and at every ICANN meeting, it will lead us to evolve and to make some progress in the agenda. So I think it is okay. There are things for improvement, room for improvement, but we're in the right path.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA:

Thank you very much, Sebastián. Perhaps Carlos on behalf of LACNIC? What worked okay? What can we improve?

CARLOS MARTINEZ:

What was okay? Well, of course, first I think we should do something about the curtains in this room. This is the very first step.

One of the things that worked well is that there is quite a diverse representation here. People come in from different geographies but from different institutions as well, and that worked well. I think that from my personal perspective when I was invited to this, I did not realize that it was something to have a continuity over time. So now that I see that intention, I value it much more. I appreciate it. So this is the first step in a row to come. So this is part of process. This is not a

milestone in itself. It should be part of a process. We should then spread the word out. I think that people from different origins should keep on coming here. And I agree that we need an agenda that should be more focused, but this is natural in the first stage like this one. You touch lots of subjects, and then I know that one of the outcomes of the process is to identify the issues where the cyber security meets DNS, politics meets DNS, development policy meets DNS, etc.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Thank you very much, Carlos, for your comments. And then we'll ask [Carol] or Eduardo whether they would like to talk about LACTLD. The same questions.

[EDUARDO SANTOYO]: Thank you very much. I think that one of the things we gain here is to put [the efforts] interest of many organizations working here to prepare the agenda, to prepare the space, to prepare the logistics, lunch, but also the participation of all of you so as to discuss together issues that have the flavor of the region, issues directly related to DNS.

So I think this is a second milestone in this attempt. The first milestone was the one that we prepared with LACNIC in Beijing. It was at [Medellin], Colombia. So we devoted some time to speak together about Internet governance. That was the result of some conversations at regional level. So it was to find the spaces for discussion.

We've seen that there's much more richness and much more people should be part of this conversation. So we should do some follow up. Of course, there is an agenda. We may meet with a specific subject to be

discussed. It's not just to meet for general subjects about DNS. It might be one every year or every two years, but to have at least one related to this subject a year so as to think over as a region and for the region with people coming in from outside the region, of course, to help us think about the different subjects, the different topics.

A very good proposal I think then would be to raise the accountability of the region so that year after year, whether ICANN may meet in the region or not, there would be forum of multi-stakeholders so as to discuss DNS issues. And to be more specific, to have some general topics like this first forum or to have more specific ones. I really feel very glad I have been part of this discussion process and been here with you today listening to the discussion.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Thank you very much, Eduardo. Very good proposal. And now we have NPOC. I don't know if any other person wants to take the floor.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: From my personal perspective, I think that it's fascinating to be able to compare the processes by region and by continent over time. This will give us very good input to keep on working and to compare the challenges and the solutions reached.

I would like to thank on behalf of NPOC the other organizers. It has been a very good process, and particularly LACTLD and Sofia and Carolina because they became the executive unit and they took into account the thousand details that make us suffer day after day, everything related to

logistics and all that. And you have done a very good job, so thank you very much. A round of applause for them.

[applause]

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: This is it. These are the things that we should keep on doing the same. So if you dare take the challenge again. And our hosts, [NIC AR]

[GABRIELA SZLAK]: Well, thank you very much for having helped and contributed to coming to a place where it rains and curtains fell apart. We are quite new in all this. We have been in the operation for a short while, and to generate spaces for conversation where all of us can share and exchange experience and gain experience makes us think that there's actually a lot to be done, a lot to be improved.

And the participation of the new gTLDs that we've seen the whole day long will open the door for [inaudible] stability and DNS management from a technical perspective and from a political and technical perspective as well. We'll get enriched and give us a view, a perspective that is less summarized into a problem but more open to consider what is happening to the northern region, to the southern region. If this happens to Europe, we may take advantage of their experience. And so as Eduardo says, please get together as many times as necessary and talk about this.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Thank you very much, Gabriela. And finally, last but not least as it is said in English, from the PIR, Paul, [Don].

[PAUL DIAZ]: [inaudible] from Public Interest Registry. I won't say much because it has already been covered. I guess I would note that my immediate impression was today's session was akin to what we experienced as the organizing committee for this event. It should be obvious to everybody that there is a tremendous amount of capacity, brain power, will, passion for all of these issues in the region and that you have the context and connection to reach out to others beyond the region for additional expertise and whatnot, but you really can do so very much yourselves.

So it's really important to keep the momentum going. And again, much as we experienced ourselves as the organizing committee, we started strong in Durban. Then we kind of had a bit of a hiatus. And then we picked it up quickly at the end, and something very, very positive came out of it. Consistency, commitment is going to be key.

So as you said, hopefully this is the first of many or other opportunities, other forums wherever they may exist. If you can send delegates who come back and report to the broader community, ICANN, ISOC, they provide natural opportunities like that to continue to engage, to build the confidences, the trust factors amongst yourselves as regional participants and amongst the broader community or comunidad as we said at the beginning.

That's such a key term, and it doesn't quite translate in English. The word in Spanish is more meaningful, and I would hope that we can continue to build and that will become something we look back on this and say, "Solid start, and it's just going to get better from here."

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: I have no other person in the list, but the floor is open so as to speak about the future of this process. Fatima?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thank you very much, Rodrigo. First of all, I would like to say that I have nothing to say that [inaudible]. I have all things to thank for. And based on what you've said about the future, I would like the idea of having a mailing list among all of us here, institutions and people willing to join this mailing list would also be accepted so as to continue discussing all this. And as Sebastián has said, from the community we may start generating the DNS aspects in which we are more interested in to be discussed, to go deeper, to be included in future fora.

I like the idea of meeting once a year. If we wait for ICANN's meeting in the region, I think it's far away one from the other. So there are some topics that should be further discussed by all stakeholders here.

And as Carolina has said, we should take into account that this is not an IGF or LAC IGF. We should not consider that from that perspective. We are just analyzing what affects us from a DNS perspective and not as we are used to discussing because the IGF is a discussion forum. But thank you very much. That's it.

RODRIGO DE LA PARRA: Thank you very much, Fatima. So it seems that it's very good for the event for the activity to have logic of its own. And as Paul is saying [may meet] the initiatives of some other organizations, but as well there has been a very good reception to discuss about [cuts off]

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]