BUENOS AIRES – Strategy Panel on ICANN's Role in the Internet Governance Ecosystem
Wednesday, November 20, 2013 – 11:45 to 12:45
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

PINDAR WONG: Today is Wednesday, November 20th. This is the Strategic Panel on ICANN's Role in Internet Governance. The time will be from 11:45 until 12:45. This is Pindar Wong from Hong Kong, a Strategic Panel Member. Thank you. I'll be on mute.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Good morning. Can you hear me well? Wolfgang, can you hear me well? Thank you. I believe we have Pindar Wong on the bridge. Pindar, can you hear us well, if you're there?

PINDAR WONG: Yes, I hear you loud and clear Alejandro.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Excellent. This is the Public Consultation Meeting of the Strategy Panel on ICANN's Role in the Internet Governance Ecosystem. My name is Alejandro Pisanty. I have for you greetings from Vint Cerf, the Chair of the Panel, who is unable to be here and take part in the session. Some other Members of the Panel are present and we'll introduce them in a moment.

The purpose of this session is to briefly present the Panel and mostly to gather input from you. We'll give a little bit of structure to that input in a moment, again, as we run through this very brief presentation. The

---

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.

objectives of the Panel are to provide an advisory framework and a forum for strategic planning, to support ICANN's function in the evolving Internet governance ecosystem.

The way we've structured the work of the Panel goes through the following steps, which are to convene the Panel, which of course has already happened, and to convene the community, as you are already here, and I'm very glad for that. I apologise for having my back towards people.

To convene, to confer, to consult, which we'll be doing not only on this occasion, but as you'll see on our work plan in a moment, we'll have a couple of rounds of public consultation as our work evolves. To advise ICANN leadership and then expire and dissolve the Panel. There's no intention of lingering over any period of time.

The way we are working is with a public email list. That's an address everyone can use to send a direct email to the Panel. We have an internal email list. We will have some more focused opportunities for interaction with the community through webinars, hangouts or conference calls.

If possible these will be regional in order to attend to different time zones, so they're practical and not excluding people because of the their inability or willingness to stay up until 4:00 am or start their days at 4:00 am for these interactions. We will have a Wiki for drafting text informally, which will be the back office for the publishing of documents.

Next slide please? The Panel deliverables are a review of ICANN's place in the evolving Internet governance ecosystem. Suggestions of ways to

enhance ICANN's stewardship function over its fields within its mission, within a complex network of interests. To propose guiding principles for evolving and implementing ICANN's transmissional multistakeholder policy making model, and to propose a roadmap for globalizing ICANN's role in the Internet governance ecosystem.

Next slide please. Membership in this Panel, as you may have seen, it's Chaired by Vint Cerf and the Members are Adiel Akplogan, who I think is not able to be in this room right now, Michael Barrett, Hartmut Glaser – if any of you are present here and I have not seen you, please identify yourselves loudly and visibly – Erik Huizer, Hagen Hultzsch, who's here, Janis Karklins, who's not attending, Luis Magalhåes, Debbie Monahan, who's been around for the physical meeting, and myself.

Can I have the next slide please? We also have Alice Munyua, P. J Narayanan, myself, Alejandro Pisanty, Carlton Samuels, who's here, Ismail Serageldin from the Library of Alexandria, and Pindar Wong, who is present on the bridge, as you've already heard. Pindar, if we can just hear you again so people will know your voice when you take part?

PINDAR WONG: Good morning everyone, this is Pindar from Hong Kong.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you Pindar. I hope it's not a very ungodly hour in Hong Kong. Next slide please. Here are the affiliations of the Panel Members. This presentation will be up on the website so that you can look at this in detail. We will move onto the next slide. The timeline on which we are working is quite aggressive. We plan to have the first draft output by

January 15th, which means that some people will be working over the holiday season in December and early January.

We know that both in the northern and southern hemisphere it gets a lot harder to convene people for work, but after the 15th of January it gets even harder in some places, easier in others. We plan to have a first draft output here, comments from the community, while we're taking the final output by January 31st. We plan to have a public webinar in mid-January, as soon as we have the draft out.

As is done in many other processes in ICANN, we'll try to have two webinars the same day or on continuous days at different times so as to facilitate participation from different time zones. We have a public comment period on the final document. That public comment period will be directed now to ICANN as an addition to the document we deliver. The timelines set for us was to finish the work on January 31st.

The plan is to basically dissolve the Panel after that data and lead it to ICANN Leadership to absorb and process the comments. Next slide, if there is one? I think we'll go back to the slide that has the four work items. That one. If this is a useful way to conduct the session, I think we'll immediately start to go on listening mode.

We would like to conduct a discussion along sets of separate timeslots, about 15 minutes for each, or ten minutes for each, for these four items. We'll first ask for suggestions on how to do the review of ICANN's place in evolving the Internet governance ecosystem, information or opinion sources that should particularly be taken into account and the Panel should not ignore, and any strong opinions that, given the timeframe for

this consultation, we could follow up with you through correspondence or other means.

I'm very glad I'm welcoming you, particularly warmly, because this is a huge crowd – a very impressive turnout, both in the number and the caliber of the participants. We see lots of experience come together, as well as people well known for their drive and commitment. So it's great to be able to serve you as a channel for the Panel's work.

We'll keep a very open format of participation, but we'll keep times of participation very brief so that there's time enough for everybody who wants to speak to do so. So the floor is open for the community. I have Paul Twomey… Let me just take notes. [Do you have a] [Vernon Schaub? 10:33]. Your name please? Wolf-Ulrich and Vanda Scartezini to begin with and then…

 If I don't see someone behind my head, just do this… Make someone make me see it. Paul Twomey please.

PAUL TWOMEY: This is Paul Twomey, former CEO and former Chair of the GAC. Can I just make three quick observations? There are obviously bigger ones to come back to. I'm trying hard not to be the ghost of Christmas past at this ICANN meeting, but a couple of observations:

First of all, none of those topics are new in the history of the ICANN community, and I hope this Committee does a proper literature review of the community, going back to the founding ISWP process and how much this was actually discussed, and how each of these topics was delineated.

These are not new topics, and this community has a reputed time to find where it wants to be. We shouldn't take those questions as implicitly saying there's supposed to be some expansionary going forward then, which at the moment it reads a little bit that way. That's a first observation.

The second observation: the running of the root zone is itself a global function, and so when we talk about globalizing ICANN's role in the Internet governance ecosystem, I think we need to be a little bit careful about… In an IP protocol it doesn't have geography in the protocol, and some of the functions that are taken are instantly a global function. So we need to distinguish between protocol globalization, if you like, versus what might be more geopolitical.

I think I'll just leave it at those two points, just for the record.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you Wolf. Next is [Vernon Schaub] please.

[VERNON SCHAUB]:   I work for [Corr], which is a participant in the Internet governance debate, or has been for many, many years. The first point is about the word 'ecosystem'. We actually imply openly that this is about people living of Internet governance, making a living like that. Maybe that's just a fact, we have to accept it, that this is a job.

But it also means that we may be in the logic of expansion, just as Paul Twomey said. We try to get a market share in Internet governance.

Should that be the logic? When we hear suggested ways to enhance ICANN's stewardship is that a market share logic? I hope now.

I think we should talk about enhancing the quality of ICANN's stewardship, and that specifically means, very importantly, that ICANN shouldn't try to centralize everything here, in the ICANN meetings. They're already overloaded. ICANN should allow governance to happen where it should be.

We have a very important example right now going on, specifically in the context of community-based TLDs, where we have decisions being made now. It seems in a number of cases that the community's governance is being discarded and speculators are being put in the position of doing governance in communities. That is something we have to take very, very seriously.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you. I don't know if I can briefly tell you that one of the guidelines that we established for ourselves in the first working sessions we had on Monday, was a very, very hard [plan mission? 14:20], so that should… I'm saying this in order for everybody to know that we, in the Panel, are completely convinced that whatever we do and recommend will be against an expansion of ICANN's mission that's already [pre-distressed?]

Next is Wolf-Ulrich, please.

WOLF-ULRICH KNOBEN: Wolf-Ulrich Knoben, I'm still a Vice-Chair of the gNSO for the next three hours. Just an observation with regards to the scope of this Panel and in

EN

relation to the scope of the other Panel, given this is Internet governance, it's my observation that there may be some overlaps. I would like to ask this Panel to take a look at that and really make clearly the scope, that there is no overlap, interrelation or clashing between those two Panels. That's just an observation. Thank you.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Vanda Scartezini please?

VANDA SCARTEZINI: My name is Vanda Scartezini from the [Network? 15:30]. I'm from Brazil. My point is directed to suggestions that we need to review a community approach – the way we divide the world and the way we structure the RALOs is far from good. We now have an opportunity to think in an ecosystem. We need to rethink how to involve communities by regions, and deeply devote to really engage and redefine the way they work. That is my direct suggestion. Thank you.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Mrs. Cade?

MARILYN CADE: Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade and I think Paul Twomey stole some of the comments that I wanted to make, but I'm going to make them again with more explicit ideas. Yes, I think that not only this Panel, but the other Panels, need to have an understanding of where we came from and why we came from those places.

The other thing I would say is there was a huge amount of work done during the three years of the President Strategy Committee, with the use of internal resources, huge consultation with the community, and external resources. I think there's some value to also understanding what was learnt during that process. The community assessed many things, and yes it's passed, but that doesn't mean that it's not important.

Having said that, I want to go onto that I do think there is a significant amount of overlap in things that are going on, and I'm going to ask the Panel to think with us about the following situation: the Panels overlap with each other. You almost can't avoid the overlap of topics and interest from the community. The same people in the community, and more broadly, need to be participating in each of those Panels, so we've got a real challenge there.

At the same time we also have a separate initiative that's been launched, called One Net, which is also going to look and engage on participation in support of expanding the multistakeholder model. We also have a series of events where discussion about where multistakeholder activities should take place. I'd say to you that it's not only in Internet or technical coordination.

We use the words "the evolving Internet governance ecosystem". Some of you may think you know what that means. I think whether it's inclusive or exclusive in its list, we ought to try to come to commonality on what our definition of those players and spaces are, and then come to commonality in understanding that in some cases ICANN might watch what is going on.

	In other cases ICANN might participate through the community. In other cases ICANN might communicate and participate directly. Thanks.
ALEJANDRO PISANTY:	Thank you. Chuck Gomes please?
CHUCK GOMES:	Thanks Alejandro and thanks to the Panel for all the time you're going to work on this. I appreciate that. I hope it's okay if I back up… I don't need to back up the slides, but in the target dates, in April the slide showed "Board action". I'm curious as to what action is expected on the part of the Board in April?
ALEJANDRO PISANTY:	Thank you. Carlton?
CARLTON SAMUELS:	There's probably a bit of overreaching there, but the idea is that there is going to be a report. This report is intended to be a part of the strategic planning process, so we're going to send it to the President and presumably the President will share it with the Board. This is all going to be brisk for the strategic planning process, Chuck. I hope that answers your question.
CHUCK GOMES:	So what action is expected by the Board there?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Maybe it's this matter of giving them insight into what the thinking is and what the recommendations are from the group, but definitely it's not about voting on anything, or anything of that nature.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: [inaudible 21:03].

HEIDI ULLRICH: Chuck, there has been, on the Monday session that we had with regards to the Strategy Panels, there was also a slide that I think everybody has seen, but I'll just go to the website. It shows the timeline of the Strategy Panels, the output, which will be put out for public consultation, the threads of which will also be used in the context of informing the Strategic Plan.

Obviously it also helps inform the Board and the community overall. So I think you've seen that. Do you want me to send that to you? No? Okay.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Jeff Brueggeman.

JEFF BRUEGGEMAN: Thank you. Jeff Brueggeman, AT&T. I wanted to pick up on a comment about looking historically at what ICANN has accomplished. I think not only is that a useful thing to do to avoid duplication and to learn from, but I actually think that in and of itself it's a helpful thing for this Panel to document. This reminds me a lot of the discussion of IGF improvements.

We want to always be looking ahead, but there's also a benefit to documenting how much evolution ICANN has already accomplished. This can be a very good resource in the current environment, where ICANN is getting more visibility internationally than maybe it has before, to present that history as a really relevant part of your work.

Of course I also think that looking ahead is really going to be a valuable part of what you're doing as well; to give thoughts on how to position ICANN going forward. Alejandro, I was reminded of our work on the Security Review Team and how we thought that the role of ICANN was a critical foundation for assessing what ICANN should be doing.

It strikes me that looking at that same functional approach of, there's ICANN's core mission, in which we are concerned about mission creep, but there's also an important multistakeholder platform and outreach role that ICANN can play. I think what we're seeing is a lot of pressure and draw for ICANN to be involved in those other areas.

I think as long as we clearly define when it's doing one function versus the other, I think there are good reasons for ICANN to do that, but it will help to avoid any blurring of responsibilities as they are embarking on this broader Internet governance discussion. Thank you.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you Jeff. Becky Burr?

BECKY BURR: The title of this Strategy Group is "ICANN's Role". I think ICANN has roles and I thin kit's useful to be mindful of the differences in those

roles. I would just urge you… I think depending on what ICANN is playing – and it legitimately plays different roles on different issues – there are different rules, different needs, different constraints – all of those things that ought to be associated with it.

So I'm a little bit of a broken record on this notion that we need to clearly contemplate… We need to identify and articulate what role ICANN is playing at any particular moment, and then think about what things go along with that role. I think you guys could do us all a huge service by helping us think more, in a more disciplined fashion, about the different kinds of roles that ICANN legitimately plays.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you very much. Who's next? [Raymond]?

[RAYMOND]:   [inaudible 24:56], former ICANN Director, also Member of the President Strategy Committee. I would like to elaborate more on what Becky said; putting an accent in the growth in legitimacy – how…

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: We need you to get your microphone closer. The sound is not clear enough.

[RAYMOND]:   I was saying that I'd like to elaborate more [inaudible 25:33] putting an accent on the issue of legitimacy, because I think in most of the groups, since ICANN inception, is the growth in legitimacy. That's my point.

EN

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you [Raymond]. Other speakers? Bertrand de La Chapelle?

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Bertrand de La Chapelle, Director on the ICANN Board. If I look at the four lines, if we can go back to the slides? The interesting thing is on the first point I believe that part of the discussions that you will have is the understanding of the expression "Internet governance ecosystem". For a lot of people in this environment, the Internet governance ecosystem has been limited in terms of the landscape to the governance of the Internet, i.e. the RIRs, the IETF, etc., and ICANN.

We are all, collectively, the ones who are in charge of the logical layer of the Internet. For a long time the role of ICANN in this ecosystem was and is still quite clear. What has changed is the understanding in the broader landscape that the Internet governance ecosystem is much larger. Internet governance is much larger. This was initiated by the WSIS. Today we don't have a larger Internet governance ecosystem, because there are no institutions.

So one of the challenges is the place in the evolving Internet governance ecosystem goes on two legs – on the traditional part the role has not changed much and should not change much. On the larger dimension, which is now much more political and so on, should ICANN say, "We are technical, therefore we should completely shy away from this"?

Should there be a role that should not be a mission creep? Is there a particular role because the people who are in the community are also engaged in the other aspects? Focusing on the term "evolving". The

Internet governance ecosystem is evolving, and this is why the role needs to be addressed.

The second thing is I'm not sure I absolutely understand the second bullet point. If it is, it can be inside ICANN, how the different groups are functioning, but as the Panel is more about the ecosystem in general, the question is, what kind of leadership role should we, or should we not take, in some of the discussions?

Particularly, as we saw in the new gTLD program, there is now attention to bring some content related issues to the new gTLD debate. Where should the line be drawn? That's an important element. Finally, the third bullet point, we're talking about the policy making model but here, what Becky is saying is that ICANN is not only policy making, but it's already amazing that it's a policy making body, not just a standard.

But it's also an execution body. It has the capacity to execute the policy and even to have compliance enforcement. So how this function is evolving is important as well. Also, the third dimension that we see emerging more and more is that there are disputes related to what we are deciding. It can be disputes about compliance, about the Panels that have been established, and there will be other issues.

How is ICANN going to grow the capacity to solve some of the disputes that emerge around Internet governance issues?   Again, without changing the mandate?   But even within our mandate, this is an important element. Finally, on the word "globalizing", if I look at the discussion we had in the strategy planning process session, globalizing and internationalizing are two words that cover two completely different dimensions when we talk about ICANN.

One is the outreach, the hubs, the multilingualism and so on, and the other is, and has been for a long time, a code word for the evolution of the IANA function. So you have to be clear in the fourth bullet on what's being meant by globalizing ICANN's role in the Internet governance ecosystem, whether you address one or the other or both, and how this connects with other types of Panels that we're talking about.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you Bertrand. Klaus Stoll.

KLAUS STOLL: Klaus Stoll, NPOC.   ICANN's function historically has been resolving names and numbers, and I think what I'd like to encourage the Panel on is to be very, very positive and try to think on what way we can resolve, and what methodologies can we offer in the current situation of Internet governance, which is quite simply stuck.   Somebody was moving between different so-called Internet governance bodies.

I can say that the only body that's only thinking about how that could be positively resolved is ICANN. The rest of the bodies are thinking about how they guarantee their rights or how they expand their power. I think one of the roles of ICANN should be to look [audio cuts out 32:08]…

…actually, at Internet governance and at the ecosystem, from the point of view of the other… From example, from the point of view of the governments, from the point of view of the UN, and so on and so on, and say which model could be possible to resolve them. What can we positively offer to say, "Okay, here's a solution. Does that work or not?" Thank you.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Paul?

PAUL TWOMEY: Thank you Alejandro. I want to put forward a couple of counter points to help you. I think one of the things we should be very aware of is – for those of us who went to the World Summit for Information Society Process, is that the WSIS Process imposed on ICANN a certain symbolic value. I can tell you that ICANN did not go looking for that symbolic value.

That might be a little different to the way in which some of this is cast and some of the discussions. So I think it's a really important issue. ICANN defined itself very narrowly and found itself being symbolized, for a couple of reasons I'll come back to. I think we should distinguish that. Secondly, in the whole discussion of Internet ecosystems we should be aware that this is driven a lot by governments.

Governments are mostly concerned about content and there is an enormous ecosystem on content that this community is often fairly ignorant about, frankly. I think we should be careful in this community to say "Internet ecosystem" and then have it defined basically as the transit and protocol layer, when vast amounts of it is about content, and that's a much more sophisticated, often local, issue.

We should also – Bertrand, you must forgive me now – be carefully about this phrase of "governance". In the international system, in nearly everywhere in the international system, what governments do is reflect

EN

their domestic situations into their international systems. We see that all the time.

On some of these issues that are emerging where the phrase "we need somewhere to put things" is said, I would put it to you that that reflects the constitutional frameworks of certain countries, and essentially a post-Napoleonic constitutional frameworks in Central Europe and Latin America, which tend to have a [Cartigen? 35:28] model of delineating powers.

In my own country, in the Anglo Saxon countries, except for the federal constitutions, the local state constitutions are essentially medieval and open. In South East Asia they're very similar, so I'd just make the point that this argument that governments need a place to put things, well, from where I come from they don't need that. Certain parts of the world seem to say that, others don't.

So we should just be a little careful about buying this idea, and I'm pushing back a bit on that. The final point I'd make to the Committee, which I know the Committee knows, is to keep an eye on – and this is generally to all the Panels – the long play.   There are some governments in the world who are playing a long play, and this issue is simply another pawn in the big game.

We should not be naïve about that. We should not put ourselves looking pure, and thinking we're doing the right thing, and inadvertently play ourselves at a weak position.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you. Roberto Gaetano. I want to welcome Debbie Monahan, our Member who's now here.

ROBERTO GAETANO: Well, the first point has been touched on by Paul. That was that I would like to reinforce the aspect that should be intrinsic in defining a strategy that is the long-term view. The second point is a consequence of this. By taking the long-term view, by seeing that there is a slow transition in a situation in which, if I see the points over there, ICANN is going to enhance its stewardship in implementing the policy making model.

I think that sooner or later we need to face the problem that we're going to have in terms of the separation between the policy making and the increasingly big role that ICANN will have in the Internet community, and the functions that ICANN still has in terms of executing some of the consequences of the policy.

At one point in time we will be facing the problem that ICANN will make two things – define the rules and then be a player according to these rules. I think if we take the long-term view, I think that we should start thinking about this pretty early in the game, in the moment that we are going towards, and increasing the role of ICANN in the world of politics.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you Roberto. Very briefly, to the wording "enhance ICANN's stewardship function", it came up as enhancing this function in contrast to other trends, particularly to some of the operational and disputes field, if not dispute resolution and the commercial interests of business roles and so forth. As we start defining things for the Panel, recovering

and not leaving the stewardship function is one of these keys that we see as guidelines going forward.

In that sense it does not mean an expansion of mission, it's rather being much more concentrated on the attitudes and function of being a steward for the resources that are ICANN's responsibility. That again doesn't mean… The word "stewardship" can also mean not [comment? 40:12] stewardship, or "patronage", to use a word from another language. Yes Roberto?

ROBERTO GAETANO: Just a really quick thing – you are perfectly right, but I think that we have to take into account the perception that the rest of the world will have on this.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Carlton?

CARLTON SAMUELS: Thank you. So we're talking about stewardship and we're talking about taking the long-term view. We have to look over the horizon. Here is something I want to put forward. If we look at where the growth for the next billion entrants into the Internet is going to be, it's in the south and it's in Asia.

If we look at correlating that with the governments and governance structures in those areas, this is where we have the greatest tension and this is where we have the greatest need for governments – as you say, multilateralism, another word – to have a place on the ship. That was

one of the things that came up, that this is a long-term vision. There are lots of elbows out there, but what they're looking for is an expansion of roles and they want a place on the shelf.

Given those facts, wherever the growth is going to come from, and the natural inclination for those areas of growth to want to have more influence in the ecosystem, how does this group see this Panel interacting with those facts?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Becky Burr?

BECKY BURR: I just want to follow up on something Paul said, that I'm actually confused by, so I want to ask you to clarify it. I want to ask a follow up question on the comment Paul made about being clear about the Internet governance ecosystem and defining that, and the content world. Were you suggesting that that's not part of the ecosystem? I'm worried that if we define away things that think they're part of the ecosystem, we're going to be in trouble.

PAUL TWOMEY: No, I'm saying it's absolutely part of the ecosystem. Just to come from the last point, a lot of the issues – I come from the South too, so I don't use that term – come from the developing parts or the emerging economies, the parts of the world you talked about. Sorry, that was supposed to be a joke for my fellow Argentinians but it didn't work.

A lot of the issues they're concerned about are a lot about content. They must have a real interest in the system, so I'm not scouting the point you're making as well, I think that's right, but they're very concerned about content, and it's in the ecosystem, but ICANN should be very careful not to say that it's somehow or other the symbolic center of that discussion.

BECKY BURR: I agree.

CARLTON SAMUELS: That is a stewardship issue, you see. This is exactly what I was talking about. We understand that the most support they're talking about is about content, and we understand ICANN's role with the content. So in terms of stewardship, I was asking the question of what then do you see as the possible role for ICANN or possible position for ICANN within this specific corner of the space?

PAUL TWOMEY: I think we should be careful of the word "stewardship". I don't think ICANN puts itself up to be the steward of freedom of expression, or the steward of protection of children or the steward of… These are all important, but I don't think ICANN's in that space. I think a commitment to a globally growing, scaling infrastructure that works as one, something… On the protocol roles, I completely agree, but yes, content is inside, but we should be very careful not to say we've got any role in that, I think.

EN

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Hagen Hultzsch?

HAGEN HULTZSCH: I'm very pleased to listen to all these arguments for the last few minutes. I agree with Paul and some others that the word "stewardship" is risky, even though what we've accomplished in ICANN over the years may be an example for others arenas of this scope, especially the multistakeholder achievements, and also the bottom-up structure of ICANN, which is behind some…

For example, item #1: what is the governance ecosystem? We may use our good experiences, I think, to convey a harmonized Internet into the globe, into the different cultures, into the different government structures, into the different states, and that's why it's so important to think about what the best strategy is to further evolve that into a world that may even be enhanced, changed, modified or become more effective with all these digitized structures that we've experienced throughout the last two or three [inaudible 46:26], which have changed us.

So I like the words; even the word "stewardship", even though I believe it's risky. That's why the Strategy Committee is to carefully use these words in order to develop some good mechanisms, which they will then present to the Board of ICANN for further action, whatever "action" in this case means. So basically I'm pleased to see what all of us have said. We try, as a Committee, to combine it into a very readable structure of words.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you Hagen. Very briefly, on behalf of the Panel, when we talked about stewardship and decided that this should be there, and it's also part of the Mandate that we've got, it's stewardship over ICANN's responsibility. We're not aiming to propose that ICANN acquire any stewardship function outside what it already has, which is global location of IP addresses, central global coordination of domain names, and IETF protocol parameters.

Anything else will have to come from the input that we get from the community, but we are not talking about that, and we do look at how to keep that stewardship function working, and concentrated on it, in this much more complex network of interests that the Internet has now. Next speakers, I have Marilyn Cade, Wolfgang Kleinwächter and [Leon Santamore 48:08].

We have seven minutes left of this session, so [the first time? 48:14] we'll also have Bertrand de La Chapelle and the closing remarks. That will close the list.

MARILYN CADE: I want to go back to what I said earlier and see if I can be clearer. What I said that we needed to do was really look hard at who's on the list, so to speak, of organizations that we think are in the Internet governance ecosystem. Maybe I'll give a couple of examples. I think that in fact when it comes down to addressing the uses and misuses of unique identifiers, ICANN probably does have a responsibility and a role.

EN

So that's not focusing on content, but it is focusing on how what we do have stewardship over can be used and misused. At the same time, I'd say that we have to reflect the recognition – and let me use IDNs as an example – and the collaboration between ICANN and UNESCO. So when you look at that first bullet and go through this examination – but I'll also support what I think Paul said; that content, both the morays, the standards and the laws, is heavily localized.

The concerns that governments usually bring have to do both with access to content and knowledge for these citizens, but also concerns about these citizens being harmed in some way. So I go back to we've got to think about who's in the ecosystem, how do we define the ecosystem, and then what is the different roles that we might play?

WOLFGANG KLEINWÅCHTER: I think it's important, what Hagen said, that ICANN is first of all an example, [inaudible 50:17] or something like that. When ICANN started 15 years ago it was an experiment on how to manage a global resource in a new way but now transparent, open and inclusive. I see ICANN first of all for the Internet governance ecosystem and the political ecosystem, which has [around? 50:35] ecosystem, as a source of inspiration.

It's a possible alternative on how to manage global issues in this new way to achieve more sustainable results. So it's indeed a source of inspiration. While ICANN looks beyond its own fences and into the Internet governance ecosystem and the political system, which [inaudible 51:03] Internet governance ecosystem, I think the priority for ICANN is to bring its own house in order and to give a good example; to be a good source of inspiration.

EN

But it has to also invest in environment protection. If the environment is protected – if there comes a storm or a typhoon in this environment, this is bad for the Internet governance ecosystem and it's bad for ICANN. That's why we have to have an investment in this environment protection, and this is the other leg. ICANN is on two legs. The standing leg is our homework; that is the very [limited 51:40] technical mission we have in managing these resources.

But standing on one leg does not mean that you can use the other leg for playing in other spheres. Thank you.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you. [Lyn Santimore 51:51].

[LYN SANTIMORE]:   Thank you. I think we need to find a third leg, Wolfgang, so as to make sure it's as stable as possible. My comments have been overtaken a little bit by a couple of the last speakers, and particularly Marilyn. I was going to point out earlier that I think there were probably as many definitions around the Internet governance ecosystem. What we're trying to talk about here is there is multistakeholder.

So I think Marilyn said it really well with respect to one of the first orders of work, which is to get clear on the Internet governance ecosystem definition that's actually being used in this context.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you [Lyn]. From the Panel we have comments. Pindar Wong?

PINDAR WONG: I just wanted to say thank you. All these comments are very insightful and very helpful. I'll just leave it at that. At the back of my mind, in terms of this discussion, I'd like to have some input on peoples' views as far as law enforcement, but that's perhaps… If we could have some input to the list on that, in terms ICANN's role in law enforcement, that would be very helpful. Thank you.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you Pindar. We are two minutes… You have one.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Just to make a link within what Paul and Hagen were saying, if some of the environment and institutions that deal with content related issues internationally are actually very patchy, there are no international systems. There is just a patchwork of national laws, so this is not a governance ecosystem at the moment.

It's a set of actors and stakeholders, which are the nation states, and they're not necessarily looking for a place to do something, because there's not a single place. But there's clearly a need for mechanisms. Here this is where I'd go with Hagen. The stewardship is not necessarily that ICANN would be expanding, as has been explained in the One Net thing, it's precisely to prevent this pressure from coming on ICANN.

The fact that we could demonstrate that we are able and we have been, as a community, able to solve and do things that were not possible in the traditional, multilateral system, is the best example for replication of

the framework – not expanding the mission of ICANN. So the stewardship is how do those principles for multistakeholder cooperation issue-based networks function, and how can they be replicated.

As a matter of fact there will be – in the coming days and weeks – probably examples of situations where ICANN is allowing actors to solve issues that the governments cannot solve.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you Bertrand. Is there someone left with a pressing need to speak for 30 seconds? Maybe someone I cannot see because they're behind me?

ADAM PEAKE: Very quickly, just an observation on the ICANN home page. On the bottom of the home page there's an Internet governance map. There's also an Internet ICANN ecosystem map. I missed the beginning of this meeting so you may have already referred to them, but is the Panel looking at those? Does it agree with them? Are they finding them useful? What was the process to devise them?

Perhaps it would be helpful for you to review that as you go forward. I have some confusion about what these maps are, but they may be a starting point. That's a silly thing to mention right at the end of the meeting, but there are two maps that exist already and we can perhaps use and share them. Thanks.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you.   Any urgent expressions from the Panel Members in response to what we've heard?   I think I represent well all the Panel Members by thanking everybody for coming up here and expressing very interesting, important, insightful views – as has already been mentioned.

We'll try to keep this interesting for you when we begin drafting, and we'll try to make this as interactive and active a discussion as possible, in order to make sure that the final document really represents the needs, interests and principles that guide this community in its full diversity. Please feel free to communicate to us.

Spread the word if you think there's someone else who should communicate with us, and we'll try to engage with whomever we can. Thanks for attending.   Thanks for making this session really worthwhile for the Panel through your input and debate.   See you soon, online or elsewhere.   Session adjourned.

[END OF TRANSCRIPT]