Transcription ICANN Buenos Aires Meeting
NPOC I-Engage – Institute Meeting
Thursday 21 November 2013

Note: The following is the output of transcribing from an audio. Although the transcription is largely accurate, in some cases it is incomplete or inaccurate due to inaudible passages or transcription errors. It is posted as an aid to understanding the proceedings at the meeting, but should not be treated as an authoritative record.
On page: http://gnso.icann.org/en/calendar/#nov
The recordings and transcriptions of the calls are posted on the GNSO Master Calendar page

Klaus Stoll: ...and I very proud of him in this is great. Other people from our board are more from the development sector.

Other people are more from the server society. And just to demonstrate the overlap between ICANN and (unintelligible) partnership foundation Alain Berranger who was active until he couldn't do it for health reasons in ICANN very much was the head of the - (Empire Corp) is a board member. Who else do we have on the list?

Who will become hopefully soon an ICANN JPF board member.

So there is quite an overlap. And I think it's a very, very healthy overlap because we need to look at the different aspects of Internet governance.

And we can't any longer separate pure names and numbers from what they're actually doing.

Everything which is done here, which is done in ICANN has a direct impact in development of the crowd.

For example the new gTLD program it might be a game changer for ICANN. But it's also a game changer for the world. And now we talked to them about that a little bit later.

What we decided in was basically to take on the role in trying to look at what we need to do and how we can support the Internet ecosystem through our activities.

And we literally took to heart for example, the questions which (Tarek) (Jamil) did for ICANN For example, how can we - what can we do to integrate the nation state into Internet governance?

And we didn't look at it from reshuffling this organization, tweaking this (thing). But we asked really our members and a lot of other people, including inside the UN system what's - what can we do, what shall we do or what's happening?

And this brings me now to my PowerPoint presentation in which basically there are two elements I want to talk about.

This is our mini IGS. This is not academically high (high crown). This is actually nothing new. But this is actually where the people on the ground in development are with Internet governance, no more, no less. They are so big holes in it, there are so big holes in it you won't believe it. But on the other hand, it works.

So we ask Internet governance is currently not working why? And the answer we got back is that with fundamental challenges is the clash of multi-server entities in cyberspace and government of the many by the few. So these are just headlines. What does that actually mean? Let's have a closer look.

The first one is the clash of multi-server entities in cyberspace. There is - there are literally them. Many server entities but only one cyberspace. So as to demonstrate nation states are looking at cyberspace from the perspective based on their territory.

The private sector looks at it based on innovation investment in infrastructure. And I think there is no better in a positive sense, but an example, for example like Google. And there at the same time is a server society which basically based it's server entity in cyberspace on the common good.

How many times did we hear about cyberspace and the common good of the Internet?

Basically what is needed - and these are just keywords but how they - but they need to be filled. In the context of cyberspace and Internet governance server entity needs to be defined and based on new criteria. We need to find a new definition of server entity for cyberspace.

And this is nothing new. It's just something which comes out.

And when we - when you talk to the different groups, you're coming to a new definition of server entity.

It's based on the ability of stakeholders to have specific expertise relevant to the Internet ecosystem meaning for example, what school it does is a specific expertise. What a human rights organization does is a specific expertise when they are promoting it or using it in cyberspace it is relevant.

To be inclusive and able to take account in Internet and interest of other stakeholders the way we would have to look at other stakeholders is not to be our competition, but actually vital elements for us that allow us to implement our interests.

So for example if a private sector company wants to introduce a new product or service they should know that they have to work together with the states with server sector in one and actually to make it a success because everybody somehow is involved in relevant.

Transparent and accountable, I think that is the absolute bases which a lot of people talk about but as more transparent and accountable. And I wrote in a recent article I wrote account and transparent and accountable to the point of obsessiveness. But we really should think about that.

And then which I find most important point which came out to have the ability to manage the decision and implement the process in a timely and effective way.

We cannot let people exercise their server entity when they cannot -or they cannot exercise a server entity when they actually cannot implement it when the decision-making when all these things, these processes basically (unintelligible) themselves.

So these are the four points which basically have been came out of how to start thinking about defining cyber server entity. They are just some - this slide just came in for another group but I want to point out to the right and left up serves up as was may be some of the mirror - some of the sessions here in our ICANN meetings for some okay.

Can we actually bridge the multi-server entity gap? How - what can we actually do to get this server entities going?

The gap between the different definition and understandings of the server entity in cyberspace can be bridged when all stakeholders recognize and respect each other's server entity is equal. There is no bigger, larger smaller server entity. All server entities in cyberspace are equal.

All stakeholders recognize that their sustainability and development as interdependent as I said before. You can't do anything without taking account the other server entities.

And all stakeholders recognize the need for and actively participation in implement for change awareness building knowledge and processing.

I'm coming to that point very soon in much more detail.

Because then we have a second problem, the government of many by a few. And we all know what government in cyberspace should be. I mean consensus oriented, accountable, transparent, responsive. It's actually a nice list. But we all know it isn't. It is not fully fulfilling all the criterias of how government in cyberspace should be.

But because the (unintelligible) today is it Internet government it resembles the contrary, where less than 1% of the population are in charge of 99% of the population. And I think that is our basic problem here.

We can't claim to be true representatives in cyberspace and exercise our governments also here in ICANN if we do not ensure that people we are actually govern in one form or another know what's actu- what's going on.

And that doesn't mean that everybody needs to be an Internet ICANN expert. There are different levels and different - and appropriate knowledge for different groups.

But for example I think if people are would know a little bit more about the basics of how the Internet works the Snowdon affair wouldn't have had such an impact.

And I think the - and as they wouldn't have had the possibility to do things they (couldn't) do because they couldn't do it because nobody knew about it.

Simple enough if you don't know you can do it.

And the second thing 99% of the information technology users are uninformed users and consumers. But this is a clash and the reality in cyberspace. And we have to face it.

I don't think that organizations like ICANN can go on with this situation. I mean, I think that other organizations like (CEU) slowly but steadily realizing that they also have to - something to do about it. And they're doing - they are at the beginning of doing that.

So today's information technology affects everybody. And like any democracy, literacy and sustainability of the Internet and its governance is directly proportional to the ability to create general awareness and engagement for the Internet technology users.

I think this is the kind of statement we have to (unintelligible). So if we take all this together, what does the future of Internet depends on? On the ability to create informed cyber to citizens with rights and responsibilities we're not - if we talk about rights and server entities there are also responsibilities clearly attached to them.

The ability to create out ongoing fair and transparent dialogue between the multi-server entities of cyberspace. And in order to make that dialogue go-happening we need a new instrument.

And that's where we came up to in coalition with a number of organizations and a strange mixture because, for example it includes the initiative of the UN. It includes GKPF. It includes NPOC. It includes (unintelligible) tele-sensors. It is eclectic mix but it is in my opinion a healthy mix.

The instrument which can make that happening is - needs to be fully allocated to all Internet ecosystem stakeholders. It can't be something which is the just looking at the business sector or look- only looking at the private sector.

It needs to include all Internet ecosystem stakeholders. It needs to provide a joint workspace which is a practical platform and not just something abstract.

I think the time for - of talking is coming not to an end but needs to be replaced over by implementation and serving as a learning platform for all stakeholders to learn to understand and how to cooperate with each other.

And I think one of the major problems between the stakeholders is that they don't actually understand what the other says or talk. So we need a lot of learning.

The more criteria there needs to be a space for impartial crosscutting research because if you are looking at the research a lot of research which is happening at the moment on cyberspace is actually orientated to a specific group or interest open to all stakeholders and fully transparent and support existing policymaking processes but should strictly not engage in policymaking itself.

I don't think and a lot of people we talked to do think we don't need new policymaking body. We just need bodies which helped the existing policymaking bodies to implement and to become active and respect all expressions of server entity in cyberspace and not be part independent of any.

That means, for example, the support mechanisms we are envisioning should not be funded by, should not be dependent on. It should be a mixture between all different groups and not be for example the UN's platform or the European Union's platform.

It should give a space to all these organizations but not be dependent on our - or responsible to.

And I think that also which often is forgotten that the stakeholders should feel a strong sense of ownership.

I think when you are going into ICANN and into ICANN groups you always have a strong sense of ownership and you should learn that. You should know that we are at home when we are working at places and that we actually are guiding and are not guided.

Okay. That's why we need what we think we the iEngage Institute. The iEngage Institute is simply an instrument to support the Internet ecosystem.

And in order to create this vital necessary instrument for Internet governance the iEngage Institute has been created. This is the reason why we did this.

And the mission is to help to bridge the gap between the multiserver entities in cyberspace. And the vision is to be activity-based platform and all supports all stakeholders in the Internet ecosystem by governing process and institutions.

I think actually we'll stop the PowerPoint presentation here because all you get is a thank you and so on the slides, but which I would like to go now to the point what is the institute actually doing or what I - have you done and what are you going to do?

And once again we unashamedly stole some ideas and some concepts from ICANN. And the point is that we created and we are creating at the moment councils, councils around specific topics like for example gTLDs 4D, for development, gTLDs for jobs, child online protection, I-inform outreach campaign and awareness building for the Internet.

And some of the events we had is one it's at the general assembly in New York. We were involved in one of the events where we basically discussed a lot of these topics.

We just recently participated in at an event between (unintelligible) where a high visibility body of very (eclectic) body from all over the world came together to simply discuss current or most very important topics and came for example and made a lot of input into the presentation that you just saw.

We are planning for the next year at least three events in the United Kingdom about specific topics. We will bring up groups of experts of people who are stakeholders who are having server entities in specific fields like for example, child online abuse and not sit there with them and they are not sitting there just to talk about what should be done but how things should be implemented.

And I take child online abuse as one of the examples and then I'm going over for gTLD for jobs as a second example.

What's happening at the moment for example, for child online abuse is for me unbelievable scandal. Because it at least in the northern hemisphere, it is estimated that more than 50% of suicides in teenagers are caused either directly or indirectly by cyber bullying or abuse over the Internet.

The UN bodies at the ITU come back to the remit and say look, we legislate, we create the laws to prevent that. And that's where it stops. But what happened to the victims of child online abuse? There needs to be victim support for child online abuse.

So if we for - developed in the institute over the last year and a half some ideas and some practical points of implementations of what we can do not

only to legislate but also to create a victim support. And you'll find the materials here. This is why they are here.

The other point is where I would like to come in one of the workshops or panel or counsel -- whatever you want to call it is about gTLDs and jobs. And I think that is one of the most important topic which - and a topic which is very much overlooked.

If you're looking at the new gTLDs there are so many business and job opportunities and development opportunities that are actually when you look at to them in detail breathtaking.

And some think that the damage has already been done by only 16 I think at gTLD applicants from Africa and how many from Latin America 24, 27? I mean that basically is a scandal in itself.

But that - how can you expect an African businessman or somebody applying for a gTLD if they don't have viable business plans to get their cash back and to make the whole thing work?

And the fact is that these business plans and that these business concepts exist. There is no - nothing which has to be invented.

And they're actually partially implemented what it's all about is to go and to tell people about it and how it is done and how you can build up a business plan and how you can use a gTLD for job creation.

At the Windsor Castle meetings there was one of the tribal kings from Ghana. And he is not interested at all in Internet governance. But what he's interested in is creating jobs for his people.

And suddenly when you talk about the gTLD program and explain how it can actually be used to create jobs for his people suddenly Internet governance

becomes very, very interesting for people who doesn't even know it existed before, just one straightforward example I gave.

So what - Tony is sitting over there. Tony is very much interested in them one of the panels. And I hope will - Tony will help us to organize this. This is - the year is about mobile '14.

And there is how to say that, an app (fab). If you look in the development world about mobile phones I think that everything's apps developed, apps, develop apps young people develop apps -- apps, apps, apps, apps.

I love apps, no problem. What I don't like is when actually apps that don't produce anything but they don't put food on the table or have any actual practical development value on the ground.

And (Tony) for example has some really good ideas. And hopefully we managed to get a group of server entity holders together somewhere in this world next year and talk about how can we actually implement some of the ideas we have so that we have a real impact.

So how are these working groups actually governance on? Unashamedly we will basically adopt the same best practices ICANN is adopting. So there will be a real controls, real reporting and real implementation.

What I hope to get out of this meeting and then I will stop is that you understand a little bit about who and what is an iEngage Institute, that you might consider joining us in one or two of these activities and really help us.

And you can - you have a choice. You can either support the institute as an activity overall. You can become a thought leader or discussion or issue leader and help us to get the processes going. You can - as again, you can call it working groups, or you can as we call it councils.

You can become member in some of these groups. You don't have to be in everything. And you also - most important help us to develop the concept further to make it better.

This is everything I said here is a work in progress. And we - we will learn. And I really, really learn or hope to learn over the next days and weeks more and more.

I learned here. I'm hoping to be able to use others to visit the UN in the next two or three weeks and learn more there and to go from there.

So are there any questions? I talked enough?

(Rudy):   Thank you Klaus. (Rudy) speaking for the transcript. Thank you for this enormous volume of information you have given us.

I know he's passionate about and he almost sleeps with the iEngage Institute in his head all the time.

I would like to come back to the initial principles and go around the table about the participant's vision on server entity.

I think that's the key of our proposal. It's the lack of server entity for the Internet space that we have been touching upon.

And I would like to go around the table and see if there are any visions or other visions on the definition of server entity for the Internet space.

So for those who are interested in engaging in the discussion the floor is open. And I would like to start with that topic first.

Please state your name, when you're speaking.

(Meta Singril):   (Meta Singril) from India.

I'm (unintelligible) board with the services IT (unintelligible) ICT information for the (unintelligible) community.

(Unintelligible) on? Okay. My name is (Meta Singril). I'm from India. I'm engaged with some NGOs there who (unintelligible) couple of things on my mind. First of all, some very basic question. Now this is about iEngage Institute.

Is it now physical space that you have already created? Is it a (unintelligible).

Klaus Stoll: Straightforward answer, we're creating or we have created a physical space in (Nahag) with the Netherlands with IICD.

We are just creating a space in Washington. But these are reporting offices. Their role is not to make any kind of policies. They're just there to support their groups to function.

I am very happy to hear the word India because part of our initiative if you might know is the equality of agricultural initiative in India we're already working with.

And I really would like to take that opportunity to later talk to you to see if we might be able to do some things in that direction together. Because I think there are some overlaps.

(Meta Singril):   Okay. That's so all - then just one. Thank you for the clarification. And I think that was one thing on my mind.

Going further, that you could probably talk about engagement for iEngage in that part of the world?

Klaus Stoll: So a there are two things on my mind. One is, of course of a better engagement for (unintelligible).

Talking about multi-stakeholders including - I think what we should be talking about is not just multi-stakeholders be part of the ICANN process. I think it should be about inclusion.

But as we see it and why I'm saying this word inclusion is more important from development point of view.

A large section of Internet users globally are (unintelligible).

The other part that we also want representation from people who actually are deprived of connectivity, deprived of access okay (unintelligible) forget that there's a large mass of community how they should be relevant what we've done by certain server society (unintelligible).

And going from there I think when it comes to server entity its legacy, now Internet developed right?

So I don't know whether we can be any - define or redefine server entity on your services. As a matter fact that yes, most of the Internet traffic, most of the - and it's - (unintelligible). And that's always been the big question. That's why it should (unintelligible).

So that's the technical legacy that we have. We can't really do over with it, right?

I don't know whether it's are really going to affect us any suitable outcome in terms of challenging the sovereignty of the cyberspace. It is as (unintelligible).

If you look at the businesses they really don't care right? There is money they will go there and they'll make the promise themselves right?

But from a governance point of view, how do we democratize the sovereign aspect of cyberspace? I really I'm starting to think I think the question here is not about server entity, but it is probably about jurisdiction.

But from a practical standpoint what is happening is that when a nation struggles to manage cyberspace or activities in cyberspace by different layers they struggle with their technical legal jurisdiction, but they do not know how to get cooperation from other nation states in terms of legal jurisdiction.

So when we talk about server entity. It is about legal jurisdiction. That's an important piece because (unintelligible) have some kind of international understanding or a harmonization of misunderstanding forward we'll probably not be (unintelligible).

These are some of the initial thoughts I had (unintelligible).

And the other thing is last time I have to take a flight so I'll (unintelligible).

(Rudy): Thank you very much for these very interesting comments. And it shows that iEngage work, you're engaging yourself in the discussion.

I've seen already some other hands up.

By the way, I know this person. He - yes he is in the ASAC community.

(Eric Vosburgh): Here (unintelligible). Sorry.

Okay so my name is (Eric Vosburgh). I'm from the European Commission of the European Union. So I'm one of the governments here and then to the GAC as (unintelligible).

We have worked a little bit together before since we have also similar thoughts on how to reach out to improve Internet governance over the world with a project that we called (Jifo).

We work together with (unintelligible), and also was in Brazil. We have in Japan. And we have African Union on our side to actually reach out and to make Internet a little bit more want to say accessible to not only governments in - around the world, but also I would say around all cyber stakeholders, obviously smaller communities in the world, different NGOs that needs to know more about it.

So we have been working on that and it complements quite a lot with what we think it should do. So that's why we have a connection also with you here in this (matter).

I just wanted to say that I think one of the problems for governments for the time being is that I will be very blunt to you. It's - it is the complete US dominance over everything that happens on the Internet.

And it cannot be that we have a multi-stakeholder way of dealing with things where of course let's say in all the different matters, in all the three that we talk about -- the nation states, the private sector and server society, at least in the two first we're completely dominated by the United States.

And in the connection between the private sector and the nation state which are the United States that connection's very strong which makes that the force, the force of the United States in this concept becomes completely overwhelming.

And that's I think why many others have been starting to offer alternatives.

We don't have - in GAC in the (unintelligible) community we didn't have I-India with us. This is a major problem. We don't have South Africa anymore. And sometimes they're just (leaving) out.

The Chinese sent a very nice and a very nice girl. But she had even difficulties to get through her positions. And she was actually helped by Belgium, which is funny.

But anyway, that's a (process) it should not (unintelligible) for the record. But this is the way it looks like in GAC today.

This is what - and GAC is just one example.

If we don't have a situation where actually with the India and other countries, Brazil, they are starting to look on other (solutions). The other solution is of course ITU.

And that is not our way forward (in the) European Union. Our way for the European Union is to make the multi-stakeholder approach functions for everyone, whether it's nations based, private sectors or server society.

But if I take an example this Internet governance model that we have in the (unintelligible) that has to function for the government of (Guinea) and (Duzell). It has -the private sector that is happening in - the initiatives that are in let's say Sri Lanka, that has to be taken into account.

And also the server society (then let's) take India has to have its voice in this. Otherwise, we are lost.

Otherwise member (unintelligible) in around the world or member countries, sovereign countries are starting to legislate and they are starting to look at other alternatives.

And we - I think, you know, we're in a very crucial point. It's a breaking point right now on this.

The European Union is really trying harder, very, very harder to reach out to make this a process which is open to everyone which everybody can participate.

It's an inclusive process we want. And that is very, very important for us. We are on the line with that.

But I can tell you that we are - we're fighting every day to get our voice heard against this complex mass that we have in front of us.

I'm not anti-American. (Unintelligible) United States of America it's the home of the freedom and all - everything that you would like to say. But we cannot have it that way. It cannot continue like this, right? It's something that we all share around.

And I think also when we talk about - when we particularly talk with the server society, the American (server) Society they're very much on our side.

I can tell you I have been here fighting for stupidity. But it's a very sensitive issue. It has to do with the application for (wine and bar).

I've been talking for Napa Valley. I have been supporting Napa Valley in this. You know, they also have an asset which they will - do protect on the Internet (unintelligible).

I'd say let's try to work together. I think this initiative is very good. It is a one of many initiatives.

Of course we need to have a way of actually connecting the different initiatives over the world to see.

(Rudy):   Thank you. (That)'s a very interesting point.

We have a remote participant that has some questions.

And the name seems to be (Soan). The question - and there are several questions.

The first one is the iEngage Institution like a movement towards IG as it seems to be a platform similar to that of IG forums. It is not possibly creating organizations with similar roles.

Klaus Stoll: I think we need to not also - not only a multi-stakeholder approach, but also multi-solutions approach.

I think for example, the iEngage is capable to help to address very specific problems and implementation problem. But it will not be able to do everything at the same time.

I think there will be a process where iEngage will develop a certain expertise on server entity on specific topics while in other areas other organizations - organisms will pop up and (unintelligible) leading role.

I think what we need is not a big coordinating organization. I think what we need is a different spirit of working together. And what for me is important is that we start becoming outcome orientated and implementation orientated and not talk, talk, talk, talk.

And for example - and sorry that I'm coming back to it. I really would like to copy some of the ICANN practices in the Working Group because the Working Group, even if they meet for two years or three years in the end there is a product. And in the end there is an implementation (all that). And hopefully we might get it a little bit down timeline-wise.

But I think on these issues which I just mentioned like gTLDs or jobs or child online reviews, we should concentrate on the outcomes and not on the discussion.

I think it's clear what the problem is and it's clear what is - what possible solutions are. It's a question now how to get it actually done.

It's the same with mobile (unintelligible) and a lot of others.

The only danger and the biggest danger I think for iEngage Institute would be if it itself becomes a policymaking body. That's not its role. And the moment it does that it's basically in Hell's kitchen.

Thank you for the questions and thank you all for your nice remote participation.

(Rudy): Klaus. I see other hands popping up. I will go first from (Bob) then you and (Daniel).

I'm sorry it's (Shannon). Oh, thank you.

(Bob Bruin): Hi. I'm (Bob Bruin) from the United States.

I have a question on sovereignty. You introduced the term for a specific purpose. But I don't see any (depth) of the definition.

For example I have expertise. I have interest in my sovereign body. Or do I have to be a group that's established in some way in the real world?

I mean, how - what's the scope of the definition?

Klaus Stoll: To be absolutely honest I'm not quite getting your question. Can you try to...

(Bob Bruin):   Your definition of sovereignty...

Klaus Stoll: Yes?

(Bob Bruin):   ...you had mentioned bodies that exist as having sovereignty different than your geographical based sovereignty of the nation state.

Klaus Stoll: Yes.

(Bob Bruin):   But in cyberspace as an individual I can do the same thing as a group of any kind.

                    And the nation state is a group. You know, what is the scope of sovereignty? Can I be a sovereign body within the definition you have?

Klaus Stoll: This is in this slide. And I would like to point out again, this is not a comprehensive answer. This is really the result of a consultation process.

                    And the results of the consultation process where these three answers that you - that can be a body or an organization or a government. If you have a specific expertise, if you include the address abilities, if you are transparent, accountable and have the ability for decision-making and implementation that's the basis of your server entity.

(Bob Bruin):   Okay, so as an individual I can be a sovereign. I can have sovereign...

Klaus Stoll: Yes, of course.

(Bob Bruin):   Okay. That would...

Klaus Stoll: I hope so.

(Rudy):   Thank you (Bob) for your question.

                    (Adrian)?

(Adrian Kasar):   Yes, (Adrian Kasar) from Costa Rica.

                    I have a quick question. I was searching for the iEngage Institution online and
                    I couldn't find (unintelligible).

Klaus Stoll: Very good question. It's - when you pick up one of the brochures, you will see
                    that at the back, you have a - find URL. It's quite easy. It's www.I-engage.me.
                    So, you have to engage yourself.

Klaus Stoll: It's not a.org as everybody thinks about automatically types in.

(Rudy):   So next question (Nona)?

(Nona):   This is one from Egypt. I'd like to know how do you plan to include the
                    visibility of iEngage to outreach different stakeholders?

Klaus Stoll: Straightforward answer is - Klaus for the record.

                    Straightforward answer is we're trying to promote as much as we can in the
                    lines of different groups.

                    There will be new people joining us. As I said at the end you have a choice.
                    You can become a member. You can raise a topic. You can actually start an
                    iEngage Institute (unintelligible) East or whatever you want to do. It's up to
                    you how you want to use that instrument and platform.

                    I think as longer the - as long as we are able - as more we are able to actually
                    produce ourselves we should grow on our merits, not on our promotional
                    materials.

(Rudy):   Thank you Klaus.

(Nona):   Can...

(Rudy):   Sorry. Yes, (Nona)?

(Nona):   (Nona). I just have one comment. It's good - I don't believe in the power of one. But we do - I think more effort should be in (unintelligible) because some stakeholders don't know that we are part of the process.

                 So we need to be informed that we are part of the process and there are tools that we can use. So (unintelligible) from the (unintelligible) because stakeholders are not involved. There is a same (unintelligible) kind of (unintelligible) between government and between the stakeholders and governments are still a reluctance to let the other stakeholders in the process.

                 So we - they need to be informed that they are part of the (unintelligible) need to be informed that their tools for them to be engaged in the process.

(Rudy):   If I may respond quickly to that question. And I think that (Sam) will give you much more details.

                 I would say I refer to the title of the organization of the structure we are putting iEngage - you're engaging yourself already to try to bring it up in your environment which means you're going - and you're enabled to put on stakeholders that you think are important.

                 And that's what is important. That is the difference between all the other initiatives where they're using the higher hats and the high towers to be involved where we are looking for everybody to be allowed to bring to the table topics and solutions for the questions we have.

(Sam) you have the floor.

(Sam Afranco): Lead-in to what I wanted to say. (Sam Afranco), Canada and some other places.

Two terms were used before, inclusion and sovereignty. Sovereignty exists within a domain. And the point that was brought up earlier is those domains can be very small.

And for inclusion I work and I've been working for a long time with groups in ICT for development from the bottom up, in which we basically start from say AKA (Sim)'s notion of a theory injustice which says that if you want sovereignty to be working in a democratic way, you have to have knowledgeable discourse on the part of those who are within that sovereignty, and individuals within that sovereignty, the communities within that sovereignty, the groups within that sovereignty.

And so where I'm starting from the people that I'm working with they're all concerned with saying okay the Internet is out there. The stakeholders are out there. There may be a farmer in Egypt worried about water. There may be (unintelligible) in Bangladesh.

How as they come to understand what all this means to them? And what sovereignty are they concerned with?

They're not concerned with whether .kids or .culture tend to be approved or not approved by ICANN.

They're concerned about what's happening on their cell phone and whether they have access to a cell phone, what's happening to the prices of their imports and their outputs, what are the opportunities.

So this engaging and empowering the stakeholders initially in their own context, ICANN is one way of doing and saying let's reach out to them. Let's start where they are and let them begin to say this is what I'm worried about.

This is what I don't understand. And they may not even understand what they don't understand to begin with. Starts there and it may start with a stick on the ground or a piece of paper nailed to a tree. That's okay. That's the place it starts.

And this - so the inclusion, the notion of sovereignty, the notions of engagement, there is a bottoms up way of doing this. It's not easy. But there is a way doing this.

(Rudy):   Thank you (Sam). Another question? Please state your name when you need to speak.

(Natalie): I'm (Natalie) from Jamaica. What would you be doing differently from...

(Rudy):   Very good question. Klaus?

Klaus Stoll: ICANN?

(Natalie): Yes.

Klaus Stoll: So ICANN engage? I think ICANN has a very, very specific role and function. And ICANN is extremely good in doing the functions of Internet governance with over - and a development ability of the DNS and everything.

But there are - what we - what I said at the beginning there are some topics where everything that ICANN does is influencing other areas in development.

For example the new gTLD program is having such an impact in the development world but it is not strictly in the remit of ICANN to deal with that. So other people basically have to take over this role and fill this space.

And the iEngage Institute is just one of many other initiatives and organizations who are trying to do that.

(Rudy): Yes go ahead (unintelligible)?

(Natalie): Just - this is not just talking about engagement ICANN at all because there is people (unintelligible) talking about. There is now two kinds of platforms or two different Web sites...

(Rudy): Yes. Well, we can have a clarification from (David) or from ICANN to express the clear view of engaging in ICANN.

Man: They're complementary. But with the engagement at ICANN.org is to engage people in our ICANN processes, in the policy development process and other activities relating to the domain name system.

That is our specific focus as if you were an organization of the World Bank you'd want to have them come into the World Bank type of thing.

But the point is of this institute is complementary. While we have a rather specific focus for the management of the domain name system this institute and others are looking at what are the other implications for the wider use of the Internet for social and economic development for education, for e-government?

And you look - and they're looking at these things to also have the engagement of people how an end user or a user has it to worry about things.

And so this is I think a very good complement to what other efforts are being done by ICANN Internet Society and other Internet organizations to promote the better awareness and education of Internet users as well as to have them and got - be aware and be involve at every level or whatever level they need to be involved with. So that's the kind of basic distinction if you will.

(Rudy): Thank you very much for that clarification. So I have one new participant that brings up another question, a very interesting one.

It's (Surmigan) and he is referring to the (Duploy) Foundation that we probably all know. And he wants to know if there is a partnership with (Duploy) maybe that working with (Duploy) could be a second approach. So Klaus what is your statement?

Klaus Stoll: First of all I would like to say I would love to, and I've got one of the highest respect, professional respect for the (Duploy) Foundation. They have a specific expertise which would work very well inside the iEngage.

I tried to engage - engage with (Duploy) during the (unintelligible) at Geneva. It didn't work quite well but I really hope that we can build a bridge as soon as possible.

And as I said that's a perfect example. (Duploy) has a certain server entity in that Internet governance and that - and it's great -- very great. Come one, everybody who knows what (Duploy) about does and did knows they have for example, the ability to explain things to people in a way that actually the non-expert understands what's going on.

So sometimes for example in ICANN meetings, we are sitting when somebody speaks (gobbly-gook) you're just thinking where is (Duploy)?

Now if that's the answer I mean we would love to seriously. And I hope that we get that going.

(Rudy): Thank you Klaus. I think that that will help (Surmigan) understand where we are and what the engagement could be.

I see (Sam) also putting his hand up. (Sam) the floor?

(Sam): (Natalie) this is - I've been contacted today by a group that represents indigenous societies around the world - they will be very interested in this (unintelligible).

What happens if I apply to ICANN for the global domain name .maroon? Maroons in Jamaica don't even know about .maroons - if the maroons in Jamaica have gone through a kind of grassroots introduction to whatever the Internet means to them and then this comes up they're alert, they're ready. They're saying, wait a minute, wait a minute.

Education and (unintelligible) different notions, layered notions of sovereignty that we're talking about here - complementary but a very different - we've got our space in the

Klaus Stoll: I just also would like -- Klaus for the record, I just would like to add one more comment because it seems to be about the interpreter relationship between ICANN and iEngage.

There is no Inter-relationship between ICANN and iEngage. But the role of the iEngage Institute is there to be chosen by organizations like ICANN or the ITU or whoever if states see fit and they see and evaluate it to engage to that platform to help with certain things.

As I said, ICANN cannot deal with gTLD (unintelligible). But it can use the iEngage Institute to help others and participate in that discussion and to bring in the specific expertise. The iEngage Institute is there to serve, not to govern.

And that's very important. That comes back to the point of not being - not doing any kind of policymaking in any layer.

(Rudy):   Thank you Klaus. I see Tony you have the floor.

Tony Harris: Yes, sir. My name is Tony Harris and I'm here as part of a JKBF on the one hand. And I work here in South America with the Argentine Internet Association and also the Latin American Federation - applicants - had to step out of the room for a few minutes - off track with exactly what you're discussing.

But generally speaking on Klaus' - what Klaus has presented it ties pretty much into something which I've been discussing with him for some time which is the - what I call the new - the coming explosion of the Internet on mobiles.

Take a trip on a subway here in Argentina and it's got a - one - just in one coach you've got 300 people and 180 are texting.

So basically to my mind, there's no doubt where access is going. It's going to the handheld device.

And on the one hand as Klaus mentioned there is a question of Internet development and social development which could extremely be leveraged through mobile phones.

Just as an example, all the mobile phone manufacturers and service companies have clubs of developers.

I've sat in this hotel in one of the presentations from BlackBerry a couple years ago. They had 600 young programmers sitting in the room. They were

giving - they were telling them about new development tools. And all these people were working on apps.

And you have this in every country multiplied by how many manufacturers you have for cell phones, the big ones and by the carriers.

But these people are working on - they want to have a hit. They want to have an app that will make them a lot of money. But where is this going? Where is this coordinated towards social development? That's on the one hand, there is that.

On the other hand, that I think the primary tool for outreach for the iEngage Institute would obviously be the cell phone because that's the way you can get this message of bringing in so many unheard voices. You can get to them quickly on cell phones more than on a Web site or a very expensive marketing and media program.

You know, have to have an app on every cell phone which says iEngage or whatever it is, so people have somewhere to go if they want some information.

And they may - it may even prompt them to seek information. That's just my 2 cents at the time. Thank you.

(Rudy): Thank you very much Tony. And indeed, when you go to Africa the mobiles are the tool of communication because most of the time landlines doesn't exist. So they need to use mobile communication to get in touch with each other.

And there are several projects that are running over there. For instance, I know in the (unintelligible) world that they're using a specific application to allow farmers to present their products and know the prices of the products. And they are doing a real big business with that just by using the mobile.

I've seen (Martin) also putting his hand up. And I think that yes, (Martin) go ahead. You have the floor.

(Martin): Okay thank you, (Martin) (unintelligible). It's clear a lot is changing and we need to have good inputs on those changes that are at hand. And it's also clear there's many initiatives.

And I think will what came very well out in the discussion for instance yesterday morning that we realize that this is a world with maybe interests that there needs to be a place for that.

That we also realize there will not be one solution and there will not be one Internet in terms of very tight definition. There will be an Internet that is supporting people around the world we hope.

And in that I am happy to see this initiative as well and really to be as effective as possible, I think there's two things.

One is continue to keep track of the landscape and see what's been done by others, and done well in the (I system) in whatever way.

But the other thing is for those topics you feel that they are yours to pick up. I see cyber (serenity) is on your top. I know you spent the next (unintelligible) talking about it too and (he) knows a little bit about it.

And that's good. But then make per subject very clear what you're doing for who.

What I've been missing in other initiatives is like who is doing this for whom and what is exactly the end? So keep that sharp.

And I can see many - I like the paper's you've been writing because what you've done is you've picked topics that are on the minds of every people.

And rather than spending a lot of time who is going to talk about this and what needs to happen to make progress about this you're focusing on bringing a little bit of confidence, a little bit of...

(Rudy): Thank you, (Martin). And indeed it is our goal to try to be added value to what is going on, not being the idea but helping to structure the whole thing that's going on by little pieces also.

And when you said you have the person next to you that has some knowledge I would say it's an expert.

So (Adrian) the floor is yours?

(Adrian Kasar): I'm very interested in this initiative. What's the procedure for example were to (unintelligible)? And do you provide institutional support or (unintelligible).

(Rudy): So I have already an answer for your question. We have been really stepping up things to allow you to participate. We are not just asking to engage yourself, we're trying to deliver you. You can find also the documentation that we are providing.

And I would say if you're really interested look into the topics that we have put on the table. The - so (many) councils we want to start up.

And if you're interested in one of them please join and start it. It's not us alone. It's all of us. That's the net. It's not just a few around the table. We need all the people, even the not connected have to engage to help us to understand why they're not connected. And for many regions that still is the biggest issue to solve.

And so we will provide you the membership, the fellow registration forms that you can fill in so that you can become a member of this structure.

I'm looking around the table. Are there any other comments? Klaus you want...

Klaus Stoll: Just very quickly to answer. It's a repeat of before. If you are an institution or something like that, you (unintelligible). If you're an individual you have a choice. You can say I'm joining a specific topic and I want to be in the council Working Group or what I'm hoping for I'd rather start my own. Yes.

And we're providing as much institutional support as possible that varies from topic to topic.

For example, in certain topics there is funding from the outside available (unintelligible). In other topics you're running around with well (unintelligible) terms and terms and you don't get a (penny). So that is not right because it's - yes. So we would work it out in place in case to case.

I really would encourage everybody the application form is also on the Internet. You fill out either the paper form or you fill out the form online.

But also there is a space for you to comment and to say this is what I would like to see happening.

Man: Just correct (unintelligible) time and travel costs money. Rooms cost money.

If I would to - would be to start a topic what support would I get from the organization in that and how do you make sure you have enough money to keep your activities going?

Klaus Stoll: The point a very straightforward answer. There is still a little bit of (unintelligible). But for example it really depends on the topic. Let me repeat of what I just said.

For example if you are looking at (unintelligible) at the moment at the topic and they're looking for others to help them to implement or to develop programs so the money is readily available.

If you're looking for example at child online protection and victims report you are talking about a topic where quite simply to set up victims support networks it's so expensive, it only can be done on a national basis that you have to say without engaging the national government you won't raise any money. It really depends on where you're at.

And is that - and so one of the first institutional report would be to sit together and look where's the money?

And I think that is also one of the points of the iEngage Institute. We will not go around and, you know, operate anything without a clear business plan.

And that's part of course the transparency. Because I think it's important that the people know where the money comes from, how it's spent and what impact it has.

Because if let's say we end up with one big institutional sponsor and it will influence say - will influence the discussion I'd rather come down with ten, 20, 30 small sponsors which are specific on one topics than say for example (Itech) which doesn't exist sponsors the whole thing.

(Rudy): Thank you Klaus. We have four minutes left. So I don't know if there are any other questions. I have no questions from the remote.

I would then thank you for your participation, also for the remote participation.

And we are looking forward to meet you in the iEngage.me Institute as soon as possible. We will try to provide you some extra tools in the coming weeks.

And we are even thinking about trying to set up as soon as possible some Webinars that will allow you to again engage without having to travel, without having to invest money.

And maybe the next step will be the startup of one of the councils in which we will then provide a more clear structure for organizational aspects such as travel and locations where we could have these meetings.

So thanks again for being here with us. And we are looking forward to meet you again in the iEngage.

Thank you.

May I ask to stop recording now? Thank you.

END