EN

BUENOS AIRES – Internet Governance Public Session
Monday, June 22, 2015 – 18:15 to 19:30
ICANN – Buenos Aires, Argentina

NIGEL HICKSON: Ladies and gentlemen, boys and girls, could we -- Ladies and gentlemen, good afternoon. You're here for the Internet governance public session.

If you think it's something else, you won't be disappointed.

Could I just say one thing? No. All right. Two things.

We have a -- we have a background paper that was linked to the agenda. This is a background paper on various Internet governance issues. I'm going to put it on the table over there by the water. We also have a timeline for the WSIS process, which we're going to be discussing, which Marilyn has put together, and I'll put that over by the water as well. So don't all run and get it at the same time, but if you want a paper copy, these copies are linked on the agenda, so they are virtual. They are digital. But if you want a paper copy, I'll put one over there.

Thank you very much. And Lynn wants her own.

BILL DRAKE: All right. So are we more or less settled?

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.

Good evening, everybody. I would have preferred to say good afternoon, but it's good evening. I'm Bill Drake and I teach at the University of Zurich, and I'm the chair of the Noncommercial Users constituency. This is the Internet governance public session that we do every -- at every meeting where we review larger developments in the Internet governance ecosystem of relevance to ICANN. That is to say, the world beyond ICANN. And we have quite a lot to cover today, and not a lot of time to do it. 75 minutes. So we'll be fairly concise and yet, at the same time, hopefully provide plenty of opportunity for an open and inclusive discussion.

We are going to essentially move in two parts here. There will be a first part that will be concerned with the WSIS+10, that is the World Summit on the Information Society's tenth year anniversary and review, and I will moderate that piece. Then we will have another section on broader range of recent Internet governance happenings in different environments, and that will be chaired by Peter Dengate Thrush, the former chair of the ICANN board sitting next to me here. That will include such items as the NETmundial Initiative and the ITU and the OECD, and various other international acronyms of great interest.

I refer you, if you have not looked, to the very helpful background paper produced by Nigel Hickson of the staff which is linked to the Web page for this session which provides a very concise summary of some of the recent events in these various international fora. So that's very useful for you if you are not following all the details, although as I look out on this audience, I see quite a lot of people who I'm quite

certain do know their WSIS from their WGIG from other things. So I'm happy to say we won't have to go too far into providing background and we can just dive into things, which is wonderful.

But have a look at Nigel's paper, and there's also online, I believe, a timeline for the evolution of the WSIS+10 review process.

We have a series of very good conversation starters. I won't call them panelists because their job here is really just to speak briefly in a way that will stimulate discussion with you all. They include Marilyn Cade from the business constituency, Matthew Shears from NCUC and from the Center for Democracy and Technology, Marilia Maciel from the Center for Technology and Society in Brazil and also NCUC, Wolfgang Kleinwaechter from the Board, who is not here yet, but -- oh, he's on the end. Okay. Wolfgang is here. Bertrand De La Chapelle, formerly of the Board and now the Internet and Jurisdiction Project in Paris. Megan Richards from the European Commission and Jimson Olufuye -- Did I say your name right? Olufuye? Olufuye. Okay -- who is with the business constituency and in Africa.

So, okay. We are familiar, then, that the World Summit on the Information Society was a process that took place between 2002 and 2005 which discussed a wide range of global governance and related issues concerning the global Information Society during the context -- in the context of these meetings. Internet governance became a highly geo-politicized topic and the question of ICANN and its standing in the international ecosystem of Internet governance became a political hot potato of some importance. And we ultimately, at the

Tunis Summit in November of 2005, had inclusion of an intergovernmental agreement, the Tunis Agenda for the Information Society, which set out a sort of an approach towards Internet governance by offering a definition of Internet governance and establishing the Internet Governance Forum and mandating an ongoing set of dialogues around enhanced cooperation or so-called oversight of critical Internet resources. And now here we are ten years later, and the U.N. is taking stock of all of that.

There was a July 2014 General Assembly resolution that mandated the establishment -- the holding of a two-day high-level meeting in the General Assembly in New York in December of this year that will take stock of progress in the implementation of the WSIS and resulted in an intergovernmentally agreed outcome document. And there's been a series of meetings that have been held recently, both in Geneva, under the aegis of the Commission on Science and Technology and Development, and more recently in New York City, building into the preparatory process for all this.

So now everything is set. We're going to have this intergovernmental discussion in December, and this raises a whole variety of issues.

So we're going to start by asking people to give a little sense of where we are in the preparatory process for the WSIS+10, what happened in New York last week, what do they see -- what are the modalities for participation of nongovernmental actors, how and when should we intervene, in what manner, and so on. And what are the stakes. How

could this meeting matter to Internet governance, to ICANN, to the Internet Governance Forum, and so on.

So to take on all these issues, we start with a brief intervention from Marilyn Cade who was there in New York and has provided this lovely document here for you, and can give you an overview of everything.

Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: Thank you, Bill. And thank all of you for joining us at 6:00 p.m. So we're going to try to make this interesting and interactive. When I became involved in the Internet there were 4 million users. It was a research network.

I see some people in this room who were some of the researchers who were contributing to the information that that very nascent network was moving.

When we launched ICANN as a concept, there were 179 million users on the Internet. When we launched, we, the world, launched the World Summit on the Information Society, there were not even half a billion users on the Internet.

The face of the Internet has changed significantly. Its role, its functions have changed significantly, and the vision of the Information Society, agreed to in the second phase of the WSIS, is really what we're going to be reviewing in New York when we go to a high-level meeting in December at the U.N. General Assembly and we review the progress

that we have made as a world toward the promises made and called for, the commitments that were called for in the Tunis Agenda.

We need to -- Sometimes, within ICANN, we become so focused on what we do, which is to work at more of the technical side of making the Internet's unique indicators work and function, be reliable, expandable, reachable, that we may forget that we live in a much larger world where the average citizen cares about whether or not they're able to use the Internet, not necessarily how many digits there are in the next version of Internet protocol.

I know that's an anathema to us technical folks, but, in fact, what we're going to review in December is about the uses and the benefits of the Internet, and not so much about the infrastructure itself.

The chart that I've put together is just a pictorial coverage of the WSIS+10 review process from June the 1st through the end of the year. It's posted on the ICANN Web site. It is very subject to change because certain changes, meetings may be added, may be subtracted, the dates may be changed, but it's important for us to understand that the U.N. General Assembly's resolution 68/302 did establish a process which provides the ability for member states of the United Nations, but also for stakeholders to contribute to this consultation.

New York is very different and should be viewed as very different from the normal processes that most of us want to see when we come to an ICANN meeting, but there is the ability to contribute, and that's what I want to focus on a little bit. And then later in this session, we'll be talking about then how could the ICANN stakeholders contribute.

The process was launched on the 1st of June with the appointment of two co-facilitators, and that's the first blue box on your chart. I'm going to speed through this because you can obviously read it for yourself. But the thing for you to perhaps take note of and on the back of the chart, if you have a paper handout, or on the Web site, is the United Nations Web site where there will be continued updates that you can keep track of what's changing. And I want to point out some key deadlines.

On July the 1st, there will be the first preparatory meeting of member states. On July the 2nd, there will be the first meeting with stakeholders.

There are a number of deadlines associated with if you, as a stakeholder -- meaning not a government -- wish to be able to participate in this. And the deadlines are really upon us. That is, you need to submit a nomination of a speaker or someone that you'd like to recommend to the speaker selection committee, which I'll describe in just a minute, literally today and tomorrow.

After that, there will be a selection. Then you need to register for the consultation.

There will be a limited number of seats, but there will be the opportunity for enough seats for stakeholders to be able to attend and participate. But it is a consultation. It is not a decisional meeting. What that means is people will make short, three-minute statements, or four-minute statements. And at the end of that, the co-facilitators and representatives from the President of the General Assembly of the

United Nations, staff and the secretariat will lay out some further ideas on how stakeholders can continue to contribute.

There should be opportunities for written submissions. That may be a written submission you make an as individual organization, as a NGO, as a business entity, as a trade association. Governments will have a process themselves. There are two co-facilitators, one from Latvia and one from the UAE who will be consulting with the member states.

The two processes will be interacting with each other, but the outreach to the stakeholders is being managed by the office of the President of the General Assembly.

In September, the President of the General Assembly changes from Uganda to Denmark, and the 70th session of the General Assembly opens. So running in parallel between now, July the 2nd coming up as the first consultation, there will be the development of what's called the zero draft. That zero draft will be published, and the member states will be holding further consultations talking about whether they're happy with the zero draft, they want to see additions to the zero draft. Certain issues are not covered or they're not covered well enough. And stakeholders are going to be interested, stakeholders being groups like those of us who attend ICANN or attend the IGF or participate in some other way are going to be interested in providing comments. Again, there will be the opportunity to provide written comments, but the other way that stakeholders can contribute is by meeting with your governments back home and working with whoever your foreign ministry representatives are that are interfacing with their

mission in New York to provide further information about what stakeholders in your country would like to see in the WSIS review.

There are a number of extensive documents, but the other thing to think about is it is not a simple up-or-down vote at the General Assembly in December. It's much more complicated. We're reviewing the progress made in achieving the Information Society. We're not reviewing ICANN, although ICANN and the progress that we're making on the globalization of these -- the IANA function will undoubtedly be raised by certain governments who may still have questions, or by other stakeholders. We're reviewing a much more complex set of issues: The uses of the Internet; how, perhaps, security is being addressed; how, perhaps, the protection of children online is being addressed; whether there -- how the sustainable development goals are being integrated into the post 2015 agenda.

So when you look at this timeline and you think about, okay, how am I going to participate, do I have a path to providing my views, one thing we'll talk about today is what comments will ICANN itself, as staff or as an organization, provide, but each of you will also and should be thinking about since this is about the WSIS, your only path to contributing is not ICANN. In fact, it is a much larger set of questions.

Other ways that you can contribute are by participating in the Internet Governance Forum. You can submit comments directly. As I said, you can talk to your governments.

Some of these meetings that are on this chart will also have separate discussions on this topic. And so when you look at this, and when we

go through the questions and answers later, if you want to ask how can you also participate in some of these other meetings, I'll be happy to take further questions on it.

We should not think about the meeting -- the high-level meeting in December as a replication of the big bang that created the universe.

It's something that is really a much more elongated discussion. We should think of it as taking stock, and then looking at how we're going to work together post 2015 for the next 15 years in order to achieve the Information Society and the benefits of the Information Society for all.

Again, that means that ICANN, as an organization, has one set of comments and role to play. You as stakeholders at ICANN, but also at the Internet Governance Forum and elsewhere, have broader views to express. And we are going to face the opportunity to help to guide how the world benefits from ICTs, from sustainable development goals, and what the Information Society may look like in 2015 into 2030.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you, Marilyn. We have six other people who also have to say something, so we need to move.

Thank you very much.

Let's hear from Jimson. Thoughts and response to Marilyn's comprehensive overview.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you very much, Bill, and good evening to all. It's certainly a great pleasure to be involved in this discussion because it affects my region so much, developing countries. In fact, when we're talking about the beneficiaries, we should be looking at our direction.

First and foremost, I want to appreciate the effort of some people I saw here in the process. Markus Kummer, used to be chair of IGF and now board member. And Mr. Peter Major, who is very active in the process, now the chair of CSTD. And I can see also my friend there, Mr. Arasteh of Iran, at the CSTD.

Well, when this thing started 1978, ICANN started, Marilyn talked about 178 million people on the Internet. At that time in Africa we're looking at 0.000 something percent. In fact, in Nigeria in particular, got about 0.05% Internet penetration. Between that time and now, we have Internet penetration about 54%, and tele-density that used to be 0.03 to 5%, too, is now about 100%. And we have really achieved a lot. The economy has moved forward from being maybe number 34 in Africa to number one in Africa, all due to ICT and all due to the goals set by WSIS.

And when we talk about the mechanism and frameworks, the organization I also speak for in Africa, called the Africa ICT Alliance, is one of the outcomes of WSIS.

And from 6 countries to about 20 countries. ICT Association want their voices to be heard. Small, medium enterprises also want to have a say in the policy development and want to access broadband, cyber security issues and cybercrime issues and many issues like that. So

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

we're very much involved and well-engaged and interested in ICANN supporting the movement, supporting the process.

Two weeks ago, I think May 27th, I was to make a presentation in Geneva, high-level presentation. And I couldn't travel because I had (indiscernible)

I said, "Okay. I want to intervene remotely." And they told me no, there's no facility, remote facility. I said what? ICANN has these resources. ICANN, we do it readily. We do conferences readily available. Why is ICANN not -- (indiscernible) in line with ICANN to make that possible?

So this is some of the gap that ICANN can fill in the process going forward so that we can get more benefits.

So, in short, I couldn't make the presentation with regards to my paper. And at the July 2nd high-level discussion in New York I'm really, really disadvantaged. So that maybe there will be no such opportunity.

So, going forward, how can developing countries participate more effectively? ICANN needs to be involved. There are a lot of tools that we have here. We are a lot of people here. There are governments here that believe in the multistakeholder approach. And we can really sell these benefits to the world.

So, engaging forward, these are some of the things we need to do. We have a great product. MS is a great product. In my country Nigeria, I think also in Egypt and probably South Africa, government doesn't

make policy -- take any policy position without consulting with the private sector or other stakeholders. So this has to do with the benefit, and we need to sustain the process going forward. Thank you.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you very much, Jimson. So, from the standpoint of the European Commission or your personal viewpoint, Megan, where do you see us being right now with this process?

MEGAN RICHARDS: Okay. Thank you very much. The previous two speakers have more or less covered the entire area. And I think the ICANN paper on the WSIS process is very clear and very good, so I recommend that to you.

But I think there are a couple of other aspects -- I'll try to be as brief as possible -- that haven't yet been mentioned. One is relating primarily to the role of ICANN. Why would ICANN itself be interested in WSIS+10 review? Primarily in the context of Internet governance.

I think, of course, the rollout of the information society is something that affects everyone in this room. Everyone is interested in it. We have seen from the report of the CSTD on the last 10 years how things have changed. A number of you have mentioned this already.

The growth in access to Internet is about 20 times more in the developing countries than in the developed countries, which, of course, is perfectly normal. Because, if you start from a lower base, of course, you expect a greater increase.

But one aspect that's particularly important is the extension of the IGF mandate. And this is something also that will be determined at the end of this process in New York. So this is something of interest to all of us. I think that's the most important aspect.

The others relate primarily to development, to rolling out the information society, making sure that ICT has a role in achieving the sustainable development goals, et cetera.

And the reason the role of many of you in this room, not in your ICANN capacity but in your other capacity at home, is important is that, as Marilyn and Jimson have said, on the 2nd of July, there is a meeting of stakeholders from civil society, industry, et cetera.

But that is not the only occasion. The president of the General Assembly can also identify other options -- other opportunities, excuse me, for discussing with stakeholders. And this is something that we are looking forward to seeing over time.

The other aspect that I think is particularly important in looking at the review is the role of private sector. How has the private sector helped to contribute to these changes that we've seen over the last 10 years? How has civil society helped to achieve some of these changes? And, of course, governments both in the developing world and in the industrialized world. Everyone has an interest in making sure that this development and change takes place and continues.

So I don't think I will talk any more. The opportunity for lots of others to say something. But -- so we're looking to a very successful and interesting set of discussions over the next months.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you so much. So Megan has set a new standard of 3.5 minutes as an intervention. I think that that would probably be a good one for us to try to stick to as we try to fit everything in in the time that remains.

I turn to Bertrand De La Chapelle. Bertrand.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you. Just a quick remark. You can always look at things with a glass half full or the glass half empty. There's a lot to put on the half empty glass regarding the WSIS review process.

And let's be honest. For those of us who have participated in the WSIS almost 10 years -- more than 10 years ago now, not much has been achieved by the WSIS process itself. Everything that has progressed has been basically outside of it.

So the review is more the review of how the information society as a whole rather than what the WSIS itself has produced and the intergovernmental processes have not produced much.

And, to be frank, it's a little bit frustrating to see that 10 years after the WSIS had established the modicum of multistakeholder interaction,

the review process initially was mostly intended as a two-day intergovernmental process.

I won't belabor the glass half empty.

What I want to highlight is that there are some elements that are glass half full. One of the important things that has happened in the course of those 10 years is, fundamentally, the practice of multistakeholder interactions has vastly expanded.

And one of the reasons for that is the main outcome of the WSIS itself, some say even the only one, is the creation of the IGF, which has actually institutionalized a mode of interaction among the different stakeholders that was completely different. And not only has it established one form, but it has established replications involuntarily in many spaces at the national and the regional level. Not to mention that, in the recent years, the growth of ICANN and the increased credibility, I would say, of ICANN and the fact that the process now on the transition is moving away one of the most contentious issues that was on the agenda in 2005 is making the agenda much less about ICANN than it was before.

However, we still have the challenge of making sure that this process of review is producing something that is interesting.

And so, to stick with the saying that, you know, pessimism is just a matter of mood and optimism is a matter of will, what can be done?

Let me list just a couple of things. The first thing is that I would encourage all of us not to spend too much time on this. This can be

intensely sucking energy in everybody's activity. Been there, done that. A lot of us in this room know what I'm talking about.

What I mean is that, at the same time, there is a bunch of actors, including some that are on this panel, that are dedicating significant time to precisely put the pressure where it needs to be, which is to make sure that the process for preparing this is as inclusive as possible.

I know there was a meeting in Geneva recently, organized by ISOC, General Global Partners, and CDT that facilitated coordination. There are discussions about what people in this community can do to put pressure.

I hope that governments that at the national level are pushing and promoting multistakeholder approaches will be voicing their concerns regarding the process and that the procedure for preparing will be as open as possible.

The second thing, quickly, is I hope that there will be no problem in reconducting the IGF. I think there is a very important thing that needs to be done that will help tremendously is to continue to encourage the replication of national IGFs. And I hope that the association that has been created for the support of the IGF will also take the task of encouraging the development of national dialogues for Internet governance.

But I want to highlight that there is a subliminal message that needs to be sent very, very strongly. If, for whatever reason, the governments

do not agree on reconducting the IGF, I, personally, have no doubt that the IGF 2016 will take place nonetheless.

And I want this idea to sink in because this is what gives strength. This IGF needs to continue, and it will take place whatever. Then, finally, because the issues of -- regarding ICANN are moving a little bit out of the core focus, we collectively need to encourage people to understand that what ICANN and the ISTAR community is dealing with is the governance of the Internet and it is working and, yes, it is improving and it is ongoing. But what is at stake and what I believe will become the core set of issues in the WSIS+10 and in the discussions in the upcoming years is governance on the Internet, issues that are not related to what ICANN does but issues that have not found spaces for being discussed appropriately, things that are now the topic of a proliferation of conferences that make the agenda of everybody extremely difficult to manage. Some of the conferences have been mentioned.

This is increasingly weighing on. And the key threat that I would love to see is to discuss how to transform this ongoing proliferation of events into ongoing work on an issue-by-issue basis. So these are three suggestions.

BILL DRAKE: And very interesting ones. Thank you very much, Bertrand.

Mr. Shears, you would be next.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Bill. It's a pleasure to be here.

So the panelists so far have covered quite a lot, so I'm just going to focus on two things, one of which is a little bit of history and another one is why we're at a very interesting and confluence of events and period in Internet governance, the time scale of Internet governance.

So in many ways the whole debate about Internet governance, as you may well remember in the WSIS process, was borne out of the issue of one government having a role in the management of the DNS.

So, in many ways, the WSIS and ICANN and its future are kind of intertwined. I think it's important not to forget that. And that role for the government and what role the U.S. government has in the DNS is, again, another issue of discussion this year.

Because this year we have three things that are coming together. We have the IANA transition. We have the culmination of the WSIS+10 review, which has, as you well know, had a significant focus on Internet governance issues. And we have, most likely, the adoption of the sustainable development goals in September of this year.

And these three things are interlinked and incredibly important.

When you look at the IANA transition, obviously, we are debating in great detail, as we have done these past couple days and will do so the rest of the week, on the role of stakeholders.

We have been talking about the role of the board. We have been talking about the role of the SOs and the ACs and the governance.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

That same debate will occur at the end of this year. At the WSIS+10 review meeting in Geneva, we will have a similar discussion about the role of governments, the role of stakeholders, things like that.

So this debate that we're having in this kind of ICANN bubble, if you will, right here, will also occur in a slightly different dimension in the WSIS at the end of the year. So it's not that we're discussing these things in isolation. The issue of governance and how the Internet -- governance of the Internet continues to be with us and will continue to be with us going into the future.

The reason why this is important is because this year we're really talking about the SDGs, the sustainable development goals. In the past, when we've been involved in the WSIS discussions, we've had a great deal of difficulty focusing on the original purpose of the WSIS, which really was about harnessing the potential of ICTs for development. So this time this year we'll talking about a new set of development goals, sustainable development goals. And it's going to be really important for us as a community and ICANN and the ISTARS and other players in this space to think about how ICTs can help us to achieve the sustainable development goals.

A long time ago back in 2003 and 2005, that was the purpose of the WSIS, to enable ICTs to help achieve the millennium development goals.

Now we have another set of development goals, 17 of them, from everything from eradicating poverty to sustainable cities to sanitation. And every one of those sustainable development goals is enabled by

ICTs. And this is something that we need to bear in mind when we think about what do we want the WSIS post 2015 environment to be about. What we want it to be about and what we want the discussions to focus on in New York is how can the WSIS post 2015 really enable ICTs to help achieve the SGDs. So, when somebody says what are the SGDs about and how do the ICTs fit into that, you say that's really what we need to focus on in the WSIS. And that's the message that we and others are taking to New York. Thanks.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you so much, Matt. Marilia. You were in New York last week. How does the world look to you?

MARILIA MACIEL: Thank you very much, Bill. I'd like to focus on three main points, one about substance and one about process and one quick political evaluation being one of the few people coming from the developing world in this discussion.

The first is about substance. I think that one thing that is important in the review process is that it is very clear that the vision that inspired the WSIS 10 years ago is still valid, that we should achieve a people-centered, development-oriented information society.

Countries have agreed that this vision is still important, but this should be more than a bumper sticker. We need to find ways to translate that into reality, not only in the day-to-day of international

organizations, but also organizations that are non-governmental. And the different stakeholders should collaborate to make it come true.

Like being here in ICANN, what ICANN can do in its policies to make sure that we have a people-centered information society.

We are having a discussion on ICANN's policies and how they impact on individuals and how they impact on human rights. That's a very important point that we should discuss in the organization.

How can ICANN contribute to development? How can we make sure that the DNS industry is present, robust, strong, creating jobs and reinforcing the economy on developed and developing regions of the world. This is something that we do need to take into account more seriously. We have some recommendations that have been produced some years ago on how to make the new gTLD program more accessible to the developing regions of the world. And it has not been implemented in a successful manner.

So our organization should commit to this vision that we'll animate the WSIS -- the next phase of the WSIS.

The second point is about the process. Of course, we will have some points in which it will be possible to put pressure into the WSIS review. There will be opportunities for face-to-face meetings. There will be opportunities to present comments. But let's be frank. It is an intergovernmental process. And we're not sure of how these inputs are going to be taken into account. Are they going to be incorporated into the documents that are going to be produced or not? So I think

that we need to be kind of strategic here. And I think that maybe there are three things that we could do. First of all, is to work individually with governments. It's very important to work with the delegations and to approach governments that have a more progressive view.

The second point is to work in a cross-community manner. We need to make sure that we join voices on the points that we agree. Some work has started to be done by ISOC, by CDT, by global partners and others. And I, frankly, believe that maybe this is an opportunity for ICANN to work in a cross-constituency manner to produce something that will also guide the review process as an input into the discussions. On the political issues, I think that the Tunis agenda had two main outcomes. One was the IGF. The other was the process of enhanced cooperation, which would allow governments to develop public policy on an international level on an equal footing. And there is an understanding -- and I saw this again in New York two weeks ago. We were there. And there is a general understanding among some governments that we made a lot of progress with the IGF. But we did not make enough progress with enhanced cooperation.

And I think that this debate about enhanced cooperation kind of proves the theory that some physicists have that we live in parallel universes, that there are parallel universes. Because a group of people firmly believes that enhanced cooperation has been implemented and has coordination between actors. And another group believes that nothing has been progressed in this area. I'm not going to argue the merits of this conversation.

My point is just to say that maybe this is something that will come up again in the WSIS process. And maybe it will be a condition even for the renewal of the mandate of the IGF. Are we prepared to negotiate that? Are we prepared to discuss that? What are the options ahead of us? And maybe nothing will happen. Because one of the criticisms that I personally have with the countries that advocate for enhanced cooperation is that you want enhanced cooperation, show us a model that we can sit around the table and discuss. It's not just an idea. To me enhanced cooperation is a general feeling that we're not satisfied of how the information society has been worked out. We are unsatisfied because we have problems with jurisdiction, because we believe that distributed Internet governance is a fallacy because we see all these big corporations concentrated in developed countries of the world. We have problems with taxation, and the list goes on.

So that is general unsatisfaction and I think that some points are true. They are based on facts, but then show a model that we can sit and discuss and there is no model. That is the reason why that I think that this discussion about enhanced cooperation will not lead to anything again by the end of the year but it will be a stalled conversation, and this is something that honestly is not feasible to continue like this. We need to find a way out. Processes such as the IGF cannot be continue to be held hostage of enhanced cooperation, and other than that we have a large portion of the world that is more and more digitally included that feels that the information society that we are building so far does not corresponds to their interests for different reasons. So I think that we, by not looking into what these people are saying and

what they are advocating for and sitting on the table and discussing, we are putting at risk something that is very valuable to all of us which is the universal global nature of the Internet. We are taking the risk of facing fragmentation down the road. Maybe not now, but maybe at some point in history, legal and technical fragmentation. And this is not anything that we want to see. So may the WSIS process be another starting point for us to have more frank, honest, and constructive dialogue in all the areas. I think that dialogue has happened and has been very constructive in many areas. But there is some progress to be done. Thank you.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you, Marilia. So parallel universes going nowhere. I think we're -- we're on track here. And a final benediction from Dr. Kleinwachter, please.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Nearly everything has been said. In so far I will make a more practical proposal. As Bertrand has said, a lot can be done via processes. That means if we have the right processes in place we can achieve probably a result and the result we -- we see at the horizon is to find a document in December, adopted in -- by the governments. And so far to look into the option to have probably a complementary process to the (indiscernible) intergovernmental process could be an interesting idea. We know that it's in the hand of the president of the General Assembly to organize the input from non-governmental stakeholders into the process, but it's unclear how this will work. Consultation is

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

okay, but we made the experiences from a civil society, from the civil society groups in the first phase in Geneva in WSIS 1, we produced a lot of input in form of 96 recommendations. And then when the first draft came out from the intergovernmental process, 92 recommendations were totally ignored and 4 recommendations were reflected in very vague and general language in some of the paragraphs. So that means consultations is a very weak mechanism to achieve something.

One conclusion in Geneva 12 years ago was -- among the civil society groups -- to say okay, if they ignore our input, then we start to draft our own document. And we negotiated with the intergovernmental committee, Adama Samassekou at this time, that at the end of the process, you know, we handed over them our own declaration called the civil society declaration. It was not an official document of the world summit, but it reflected a lot of ideas. And some people after reading the intergovernmental document and the civil society document, they concluded that the inter -- the governments used language which could be done and the civil society used language and said what should be done. And I think this is an interesting historical experience.

The proposal was already made that in parallel to the intergovernmental preparatory meetings in New York we could organize a series of non-governmental workshops, meetings, round tables which could put use a number of conclusions or messages from the round table. And then to summarize these messages from a series of 8 to 10 round tables which are organized as non-governmental

events could be the basis for a document from non-governmental stakeholders, which could be then presented at the final meeting to the governments so that we have a process where we organize ourselves as non-governmental stakeholders, you know, what would be our contribution.

If the consultation processes are as open as -- and transparent as we know from ICANN meetings or from the IETF meetings, then it's fine. There is no need to do this. But I'm afraid that we will see the traditional intergovernmental, you know, dealing and horse trading behind closed doors. And so I think this would be a good option to make our voices heard and to say okay, here we recognize that intergovernmental processes are intergovernmental processes. Nobody can change the rules of procedure of the United Nations General Assembly, but here's our voice and we present our voice in organized form. Thank you.

BILL DRAKE: Exactly on time. Thank you very much. Let's see, are there any interventions from the floor? Sorry -- please, come up to the front. And I'm sorry, the timing is a little bit problematic here. Try to be concise. Say who you are, please. Thank you. Raul, try the button on the back, the bottom of it, to see if the power is on.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: It's on.

BILL DRAKE: It's on. Just -- there you go.

RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Thank you very much. I will be as precise as you are usually, Bill, okay?

BILL DRAKE: Touche. Who are you?

RAUL ECHEBERRIA: Okay. Sorry. My name is Raul Echeberria. I'm vice president of global engagement of the Internet society. I'm really glad to see it was a very interesting panel.   Sometimes it's not easy to be original in the comments in an Internet governance panel, in an environment like this one, but there were plenty of interesting things. So thank you very much for your speeches.

I want to do something that Bertrand said. I think that it's very interesting what you say, Bertrand, in the sense that the WSIS evaluation is not about WSIS itself. It's not about what WSIS did or how WSIS is involved with this, how the community or the world has done in those in the last ten years. It is very interesting to see that we have made a lot of progress. It's not only in Internet governance. We usually, because in the business what we work on, so we usually focus on Internet governance models. But also I think that's one of the most interesting things that's one of the most interesting consequences of the summit was that in those ten years we have really developed a

new way to interact between different stakeholders. And it has given an opportunity to work together, not only in Internet governance models but also to develop a collaborative approach to work in development (indiscernible) projects. So it's organizations like the Internet societies usually working with governments, with private sector, with technical community in different projects around the world, building IXPs, training people, building capacities, or working in Internet governance issues. And so really it's a -- I think that you made the very interesting point. We should really do a different summary of what has been the progress, not only since specific things but all the things that we are doing together as a consequence of the maturity that the community has developed. It's really -- it's not a happy issue that saying that this is exactly the most important outcome of those ten years in -- to see that -- it's been a very closed process. If the process would have been different, it would have been probably the perfect cherry over the pie to close a cycle of really a magnificent change in the world that's an example also for other activities, other human activities, and to implement the kind of work that we have developed in the last years.

Also brief comments about what Marilia say about the enhanced cooperation. It's very interesting approach. Thank you very much for that. There was never a single meaning of enhanced cooperation, and this was exactly the reason, because this expression was selective. I was one of the 20 people that were in the room in Tunis negotiating that. So we were looking for something to close the differences, to bridge the different positions. So the ambiguity of the expression was

EN

exactly the beauty of the concept. And so it is -- it is natural that we have this universe, parallel universe, and I'm one of those that think that's exactly this progress that we have done in the last ten years is exactly the enhanced cooperation. But I understand also the positions that other people have in that. And I think that maybe the point is that we can -- we have to change the focus. We don't have to find what is the -- the single meaning of enhanced cooperation but probably the maturity that we have achieved in that will permit us to develop a common understanding. But no time to explain what we do. There was no explanation. There was never a single meaning of that. But maybe we can work together, trying to find a new meaning to -- looking to the future. Not sure if this is -- this should be a point for this process. Maybe it will disturb the evaluation of the WSIS. I think that's -- this should be only positive evaluation, so I don't know if this controversial topic is good to address it now, but I'm very happy to work with other people from the community trying to find a way out in the future after December.

BILL DRAKE: Excellent. Thank you very much, Raul. Walid.

WALID AL-SAQUAF: Walid Al-Saquaf, ICANN fellowship. First of all, I'd like to say that I agree on all of those points. But a person coming from the developing world, I really would like to drive home a very substantial point. One of the biggest issues that -- or obstacles for the engagement from developing countries is business, the economy, the resources. I mean,

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

an example is that many of those that have brilliant ideas would like to go to the IGF but can't. Why? Because it costs for them to come there, and it's basically very simple things that we may overlook that actually drive a huge -- let's say that's a major incentive for some people who have the money and others who don't. So we're thinking of things in different levels, on different things.

So I'd like to pinpoint the issue of a matter of resources. How can developing countries get more of a share when they enhance their capacities? And I'd like to also refer here to the -- I'm not sure if you've been at the global conference on cyberspace in The Hague and there they raised the issue of -- which is an intergovernmental conference, but they raised an issue of what they launched the global forum for cyber expertise. Is that an idea that is worth pursuing, even though, as I've seen, it didn't really include all the stakeholders. There was one missing, the civil society. But is there really a method through which one could drive capacity building through such initiatives? How would that shape the future? Thank you.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you very much, Walid. And we close the line with Costantinos.

CONSTANTINOS KOMAITIS: Thank you, Bill. My name is Constantinos Komaitis and I'm with the Internet Society. And following on Walid's point about participation, and I am fully aware that this really doesn't fully address it, I would like to turn the attention to everyone on the best practices forums that

are currently happening at the IGF. And one of those best practice forums is on developing meaningful multistakeholder participation mechanisms, and the secretariat is asking stakeholders to contribute their experiences, good or bad, in multistakeholder mechanisms. Information can be found at the IGF Web site. There is a deadline which is -- I will tell you right now, if I can find it. It is on the 30th of July. However, the process will still be open for anyone to contribute, and this is one way that the community can help shape the discussions. Thank you very much.

BILL DRAKE: A really helpful initiative. Thank very much. And I turn -- oh, we have a comment from the remote. Yes, Renate.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: We have a comment from Avri Doria. Unfortunately I can't be in the room, but I want to say I agree, we have been involved in enhanced cooperation for years now. A new meaning has emerged, and it should be recognized.

BILL DRAKE: Okay. Thank you, Avri. That's very interesting. And Megan, a quick comment, and then I want to turn over to Peter.

MEGAN RICHARDS: Yeah, I don't want to continue the discussion much longer but just one thing on capacity building, and I appreciate very much what Walid

said about knowing more about what's going on and increasing and improving capacity building. And now I have to give a plug for something that the European Commission has been trying to develop, and that's called the global Internet policy observatory. And what we're trying to do is establish a platform that will allow people to have greater access to and more information about Internet governance and to be able to use it -- so I'm not going to use the time here to tell you all about it, but my colleagues have put some brochures at the reception and various other places. So if you want to participate and join in and know more about it and participate to make this capacity building tool work better, I can only encourage you to participate. Thanks.

BILL DRAKE: Thank you so much. And now I turn over to Peter for the next part.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thank you, Bill. And like others, it's a great honor to be on such an experienced panel. But also to look out and see, as others have noted, there's an enormous depth of experience in the room, including fellow MAG members helping organize the IGF, which we'll come to.

I think in the interest of time I might -- you'll see on the agenda there's supposed to be some time for summing up. I'd like to just move to some aspects of that on this topic, if I may. Just to point out that this panel has been put together by the Cross Constituency Working Group on Internet governance. So that's a large group that ICANN has

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

formed, a community working group putting this all together. And the -- we're having a meeting on Wednesday at which aspects of this can continue. So, for example, what should ICANN's position be on these issues that you've heard? You've heard some interesting divergent views about whether the glass is half full and so forth. If Bertrand is correct and it's no longer so much about ICANN's role, could we simply stay away and not participate in some of these debates? I don't think that's likely. But it should be considered.

We've talked about support for the IGF. Are we talking more about more than just support for the IGF? Are there elements of the WSIS that we should also be addressing. Marilyn has raised a number of those. Jimson has raised those. What about the request, for example, that's been made that ICANN should help the U.N. with streaming these meetings? Are there other aspects that we can help the United Nations develop in terms of our experience in running multistakeholder meetings? Marilia's called for much more cross-community work by ICANN in this area. And I just pause to observe that we don't actually have at ICANN any bottom-up community-developed position on some of these issues. What we do have is an extremely talented staff that's been working in this area for a very long time. And I think we're satisfied with what we're doing. But what is the position for new issues, and how should we resolve the questions that the panelists have raised?

Should we put together some kind of a principles paper on some of these topics at a high level? Would that even be possible? We've seen that there's deliberate ambiguity around the use and construction of

the phrase "enhanced cooperation." Should we stick to that or should we -- you know, is it possible to develop that? And then what are the options, at least for ICANN to participate, and how should we do that, and Marilyn and others have raised some of these.

So these are some of the things we're going to carry on talking about on Wednesday. But I'd like to shift now just to help people understand the tapestry of Internet governance activities. We've got this real focus in the months leading up to the vote in New York in December on the extension of the IGF and WSIS and much of our time has been spent directed at that. And efforts will continue on that. But you need -- we need to understand that nothing happens in a vacuum. So I just picked out a couple of the topics that the staff paper that you've been given, and I recommend you look at that. For example, and it was raised by somebody else, the global conference on cyberspace formed the multistakeholder expertise panel, but have also made an explicit reference to supporting the IGF. But then a month or so ago, a complex process which the staff paper describes, the ECOSOC put together after its commission on science and technology for the development of the CSTD to develop a report and it produced that report producing WSIS outcomes a ten-year review, which ran to some 250, 290 pages.

It provided the basis for discussions in Geneva in May but stopped short in its final of thing of recommending anything about the WSIS or the IGF.

So my question to the panelists, and anyone can take it, should we be concerned? What do the U.N. watchers say about a U.N. body looking at all these issues, not taking a position?

Wolfgang? Bertrand? We'll come to the floor in a minute. We'll come to the floor, but let's give the panelists a chance.

WOLFGANG KLEINWAECHTER: I think we are -- One of the key issues here is the transition of the IANA function, but for the global Internet governance ecosystem, we are in a broader transition.

So we had the ten years experience in Tunis, but with all the new initiatives which have popped up in the last couple of years, including NETmundial, the other initiatives which are listed here in your slide, you know, will lead to a situation, probably in the year 2016 or '17, where we have to take a break, lean backwards and to say, you know, how we reorganize this.

There are so many new issues which has been not really on the table in 2005 in Tunis. When I see now the discussion about cybersecurity, this is an issue which has reached a totally new level. The first committee in the General Assembly of the United Nations, the group of governmental experts discuss issues like confidence building measures in this field, they have discussion about cyber war, cyber weapons and all this. This has not been an issue in Tunis.

And the question is what is the right place to discuss this issue? Everybody will agree that security is a big issue, and we have to find a

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

way. Whether this could be done by a nongovernmental organization, I have my doubts. Whether this could be done by governments alone, I have also my doubts.

That means we have to invent, we have to create something new which covers the neutral interests of the years ahead of us on the basis of the experiences we have made the last ten years.

And the same thing is with the economy. I think the -- everybody agrees that the world economy would collapse without the Internet. But the big driver for the world economy are the Internet companies, both in the U.S. with the so-called (indiscernible) -- Google, Amazon, Facebook, and Apple -- but in China now, you know, it's Baidu, it's Ten Cent, it's Alibaba. So these are the big players in the world economy. Is this outside of the discussion on Internet governance or do we need a place where we discuss the consequences from this change in the world economy?

And I will not touch human rights because this is discussed in a good framework. We have the Human Rights Council which has made good progress, but there are also new -- and that would be my fourth basket, the technology development. Not only Internet of things and (indiscernible) computing, but this face recognition. All these new technical developments have an ethical dimension which is not yet fully understood.

And insofar with the new challenges which are coming from the issues, we have to be open minded and to create environments which allow

finding of solutions for these new challenges. And insofar, 2015 is not the end of the story. We will have exciting five years ahead of us.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thank you, Professor.

Matthew, you want to comment on the CSTD?

MATTHEW SHEARS: Actually, I want to comment on a couple of things. Just two minutes.

On the issue of participation, what we have to really understand about the WSIS, just going back to the WSIS for a moment, is this is a different form of engagement with this intergovernmental conference at the end of the year. So that means tha we have to think differently about our engagement with governments.

It's fine for to us meet in this room and to talk about the WSIS, about you we all have a relatively good, I think, general understanding of what the WSIS is.

But where we really, really have to work is on our national governments. And we have networks. We have the ICANN Fellowship network. We have the ICANN community. We have the ISOC chapters. We have the chambers of commerce. We have whole sets of networks that need to be out there talking about the importance of ICTs for development in the context of the WSIS culmination in December.

Second point. On the GCCS. There were some very interesting developments in the Hague -- sorry, the Hague meeting, yes. The Hague meeting and part of the London process. A couple of things in the Chair's statement that were important. Yes, it did not mention the IGF, I believe but -- it did mention the IGF but it mentioned two other very important things. One of which was a lot of support for the multistakeholder mom, and that in the context of cybersecurity is important.

Second important thing, a lot of recognition of the importance for human rights for cybersecurity policy development. And those are two kind of key breakthroughs that are in that text that I recommend looking at.

And finally, I can't agree more, if there's any way of having an impact with government, just talking about economic development and the impact that ICTs have on pocketbook. So we need to talk about economy. We need to talk about the importance of IXPs, et cetera, et cetera.

Thanks.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thank you, Matthew. We did say that the conference mentioned the idea but the CSTD didn't. And we have somebody here. Peter, would you like to take the floor and respond?

I'll come back.

PETER MAJOR: I'm Peter Major, chair of the CSTD.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Or you could kneel down.

                         [Laughter]

PETER MAJOR: Anyway, so I am the chair of the CSTD, and I was present when we had the discussions and I was chairing also the resolution on WSIS.

                         So you are partially right that we didn't take any recommendations as for the continuation of the WSIS process or to give any recommendations as how to go forward. However, we had a one-day discussion on the paper you mentioned, which is a 250 page or 260 page paper, and it has been approved in the resolution to forward it to the United Nations General Assembly as a basis for the discussion.

                         And during the discussion, which is the interesting part as well, there was a unanimous -- and I repeat, a unanimous support for the continuation of the IGF, including countries which previously did not support the IGF. This is a very important thing.

                         As for the multistakeholder model, just for today, this morning, during the opening session we heard a significant country statement about the usefulness and the commitment of the multistakeholder model.

Marilyn mentioned earlier that we are in a context which is very, very complex. We have a lot of global events going on. We have the sustainable development goals. We have the financing mechanisms, which is the (indiscernible) conference in Addis Ababa. We are going to have the climate change conference this year, and at the very end we are going to have the WSIS+10 review.

So we are at the very end of the plan. So we have to keep that in mind.

By that time, many, many things have been be already decided.

Having said that, as I'm always optimistic, I still encourage all the stakeholders to voice their wishes, to voice their ideas, to come together and present these ideas.

And just one other idea on the enhanced cooperation, which was a very interesting experience as well during the CSTD meeting.

The result of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation was a mapping exercise, which showed what are the issues, public-policy issues, and what are the existing mechanisms and where are the gaps.

And it was interesting to see the swap from the intersessional meeting in November where many countries recognized that, yes, there are results, and other countries were saying, well, there are much more gaps.

And these countries also said that (indiscernible) useless. And during this time during the meeting in May, the two camps somehow changed

places. I don't know what the reason was. Apparently we have been doing (indiscernible) work.

Thank you.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thank you very much.

Jimson, we're running out of time. You want to just make a tiny comment? We've got other topics to move on. And Marilyn. And we'll have one from the floor. So very short comments on this and we want to move on to the next topic.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yes, just quickly to underscore the points Walid made earlier about appropriate funding mechanism to ensuring that all stakeholders are engaged. Just to mention that there is IGF SA -- that is, IGF Support Association -- and there is need for many that are committed to bringing everybody together and ensuring WSIS succeed and IGF to succeed to support this initiative, to ensure that all stakeholders are really on the table, to hear their minds and to communicate their ideas.

And also, awareness. This goes strongly to support awareness. In developing countries, we have poor awareness of what is going on globally. So we need to focus on that and let that be in the WSIS outcome going forward.

Thank you.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thanks.

Marilyn, I'm trying to get comments restricted to the CSTD work. Are you going to comment on that?

Thank you.

MARILYN CADE: The Commission on Science and Technology for Development's primary mission, until 2006, was the focus on the role of science and technology for development.

In 2006, the U.N. agreed, through ECOSOC, to add a dual mission, and that is to focus also on the WSIS follow-up.

So prior to 2006, we people in industry called the CSTD the haven for the mad scientist both from the government and from the industry. It really has changed and evolved, and I mention that to you because it is a place where a number of governments come together, but also stakeholders are coming together to talk about many of these issues that relate now to what we're trying to do in bringing together the role of ICTs with the WSIS follow-up.

So I would say, myself, that we should be thinking very seriously about the continued mandate of the CSTD. It will have a continued mandate in science and technology for development. It has a role in the WSIS follow-up. And I think we ought to be thinking about how we benefit from that.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

ICANN as an organization and stakeholders participate as well as governments in the CSTD, and it is a really good place, I think, to look forward to continuing the debate and discussion about enhanced cooperation.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thanks, Marilyn.

Renate, let's go to the online comment.

Thank you.

RENATE DE WULF: It's a question from (saying name) from the Ukraine hub. Governments are being elected by citizens and in such a way it legalize their actions. What criterion should we use to guarantee legitimate representations of other groups of stakeholders like business or Internet users?

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Okay. Let's take that on board. I'm not quite sure it relates to the topic of the CSTD work, but we'll see if we can come back to it.

What I would like to do is move on to a completely different forum, because there are many of these, and part of the purpose of this session is to explain and share some of the complexities.

Another one of the topics mentioned in the staff paper is work going on at the International Telecommunications Union. And you'll know

that the ITU has formed, and ICANN has been participating in this and watching, two key working groups. An ITU Council Working Group on WSIS and the CWG Internet. And the ITU has recently invited stakeholders to -- and I'm quoting from the ITU page, "Stakeholders are invited to elaborate and exemplify on the challenges faced and identify widely accepted best practices for the design, installation and operation of IXPs," and those submissions are requested by towards the end of August and there's going to be a consultation in October.

Now, this, many of you will remember, was a reasonably contentious topic at the plenipotentiary in Busan, and some people protested that the ITU didn't have much of a role in relation to IXPs. And there was a reasonably concerted effort to make sure that the ITU didn't insert itself as a standard-making body in relation to IXPs.

So, Marilyn, you've had some experience, I think, of this as a body. What should we be thinking and doing about this?

MARILYN CADE: Well, first of all, I -- Marilyn Cade speaking. I want to say that at the last meeting of the ITU Council working groups, both the one on WSIS, which meets in an open environment, and the one on international Internet public-policy issues, which meets in a closed environment, a really interesting breakthrough happened in my view. There was a proposal made, led by the United States government during the ITU plenipotentiary meeting but supported by the European governments, by the African governments, by many, many other governments who are here in the room today, to call for an opening up of the Council

working group on international be Internet public policy. And to my absolute amazement, in the last meeting we agreed on an open consultation process which will take in a wide number of consultations, and in writing, they will be synthesized, and then we will a one-day open consultation in which stakeholders can get accredited and come and discuss. The working group will then meet to consider the inputs.

But the fact that this open consultation has been called for and agreed to by the member states in the ITU Council is a major step toward openness.

The other thing that we agreed to is to make the documents, all submissions available online, open without password, which also means that we are opening up the access to views and opinions.

I like to think that we are, as former President Bill Clinton would say, stumbling in the right direction in terms of openness. It may be a small step, but it's a pretty big step.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thanks, Marilyn.

And Bertrand.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: I mean, we're touching in the last few minutes of this thing on a range of issues that can occupy the end of the day and the next three weeks as it has occupied all of us for the last ten years.

On what Marilyn just said, it's an amazing evolution. I fully agree. It is wonderful. Except that the first ITU plenipot that I participated in in 2006, we had a working group in the plenipot that actually produced a resolution that established the concept of the working group regarding the participation of other stakeholders in the activities of ITU. And it was endorsed by all the participants in the group, including China and others.

Guess what? When the meeting took place afterwards, the working group couldn't get its act together on opening it up. And so I'm very happy that ten years later, we have the opening that there will be a consultation on how to open and have the participation. And I have been participating as a French representative in the working group on Internet policies. And the contrast between the lack of discussion in that group when the governments were only alone and the other working groups that have been set up that were open, was staggering.

And it is penalizing for the governments themselves. I'm very happy that it moves. And, actually, it is not at all -- and I want you to understand this, it is not at all a criticism of the ITU itself, because ITU has made a lot of progress in other domains. In the preparation of the WSIS+10, the consultations have been open. They have organized the WSIS forum every year and they've made a great effort to have the participation of all the participants.

I take what Marilyn says as, indeed, an evolution and a positive evolution, and I want to believe that it is going to be beneficial for everyone.

The fact that groups are limited to only one category of stakeholder is penalizing for the very category of stakeholders in question.

And what I want to highlight here is when we look at the way to prepare even intergovernmental documents, we need to take into consideration experiments that have worked pretty well.

The WGIG -- and Markus is there -- produced the only two real elements in the WSIS documents, which is the definition of Internet governance and the IGF. This is something that came from a multistakeholder group, and was endorsed by the governments.

I have participated personally in the exercise of two recommendations that were drafted in the Council of Europe. And Wolfgang was actually also in this group, where a small multistakeholder group of five people was tasked with preparing two recommendations that were then endorsed and validated by the Committee of Ministers. And it worked. And one of them is on the principles and the other one is on the universality of the Internet and the responsibilities of state.

It can be done.

Having multistakeholder preparation of something that is ultimately endorsed by government respects the respective roles of each. And it is an operational methodology that I painfully regret is not even considered for the preparation of the WSIS+10. Is it too late? Isn't it possible to suggest to the facilitators that they form a small group of 5, 10 people from the different constituencies whose exclusive role will

not be to prepare the resolution but to prepare the input and the resolution and direct the consultations. This can be done.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Bertrand, sorry to interrupt. We're really talking about what we should be doing about submissions in relation to IXPs. Let's just move on and do the last one in the last few minutes that was mentioned.

Let's let NETMundial initiative, which is quite interesting, because there's interesting controversy around that. It was formed, as you'll remember, with support from ICANN after the NETMundial meeting. And we heard in February from ICANN staff that the coordination council for the NETMundial had been put together and seats had been reserved, allocated to ICANN, to nic.br, and to the World Economic Forum and seats had been reserved for, amongst others, the IGF.

There's been a rapprochement meeting, I think, with ISOC and others that had expressed some concerns. And the terms of reference for NETMundial were then published. And we've had a first council meeting.

So a couple of panelists are involved with that. Wolfgang, perhaps you can -- is there a quick update on where the NETMundial initiative is at? I think there's a council meeting coming up. But you've already had a meeting, I think. And you've had applications for funding. So tell us more about that.

WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER: Yes.   You know, the oldest started in Sao Paulo in April.   There was a lot of steam, and some people were afraid that the steam will go and the very good document from Sao Paulo will disappear in the archives if there is no follow-up.   And so it was very natural that some people said we need a follow-up.   And this is the NETMundial initiative.

This is a step into unchartered territory.   This is new territory. Something is absolutely clear.   The NETMundial is not another IGF.   It's a platform where you can do something to employment projects.   The IGF is no new travel service.   So it's an opportunity to go beyond talking the talk and walking the walk to promote projects to implement what was achieved in the Sao Paulo conference.

The first meeting was a working meeting in Stanford three months ago.   And the so-called official first meeting will take place next week in -- in Sao Paulo, the place where the whole conference started.   And this will be a meeting where we adopt the first basic documents, the terms and references and some guidelines for doing projects.

And then there will be a second meeting on the eve of the IGF also in Brazil, because Brazil really has made here to speak for Internet governance.   And Brazil is the right driver for this initiative.

So let's wait and see what will the meeting produce next week.   And Marilia is also in the council.   Bill is on the council.   So probably they are working in special working groups.   We have three working groups that they can give some more information about the forthcoming meeting.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thanks very much.   Bill, Marilia, do you want to add a one-minute addition to the input we just received? Don't have to. No? Please do.

MARILIA MACIEL: Maybe to add information about the transparency which has been one guiding principle that we have adopted since the beginning. All the communications and meeting minutes and all the information can be found on our website. So all our communications are public. If you want to see the meeting minutes, they're all there.

Like Wolfgang mentioned, we have created three working groups. One of them is discussing governance and operational procedures of the initiative. So what is the role of the council? What is the role of the secretariat? This document will be put online for public comment as well. Such as will happen the same with the document that we'll provide criteria for interested people to submit their projects in the NETMundial initiative platform.

So we are trying to make sure that all the documents that we produce they are made available to the public and give everybody a chance to chime in and contribute and make their comments. And those comments are going to be incorporated into the documents afterwards.

So there's plenty of opportunity for you to participate and be involved and help to shape the initiative that is just starting. Thank you.

ICANN | 53
Buenos Aires

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thanks. And Bill.

BILL DRAKE: I'll simply add that the initiative has a time frame for operating until -- into the next year. And I personally hope that we will see over time the evolution of a closer coordination between the NETMundial initiative and the IGF in various respects so that there's more buy-in and more engagement on the part of everybody in the activities. Thank you.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thanks. Jimson. And then, Marilyn, you might like to comment on what happened to the seat that was reserved for the IGF. Jimson.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Yeah, just to note that the NMI, as we got to know, represents stakeholders like business, civil society.

                         So just recall again that the representatives, they need to connect down to the grassroots. It is not sufficient to be at the council and everything is council, information was going down. And has to be some form of recognition of the ICANN model, bottom-up engagement.

                         So anything going forward is important we engage the stakeholder at the bottom. The businesses from developing countries is also key to be consulted.

And maybe I could just say this, you know, that ICANN should indeed support the IGF, the coordination of IGF. ICANN should support the CSTD working group on enhanced cooperation. Because it was said we need to continue the dialogue. Yes, it's important. And, of course, Africa supports all this to enrich the discussion. Thank you.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thank you very much and the very last word, because we're going to close out of this, Marilyn.

MARILYN CADE: It's no secret that the announcement of the NETMundial initiative raised questions from some sectors who -- for whom seats had been reserved. And one of those includes the broader business sector where a number of questions had been -- requests had been put forward. They're all publicly available, a letter sent from ICC basis raising a number of questions.

And so there's still ongoing discussions in examining some of the questions. And the NETMundial initiative representatives have been certainly willing to engage in dialogue with the industry.

I'll leave that now and focus on -- there was a seat reserved for the MAG chair, for the MAG. It's -- it's really kind of an interesting idea that they the chair of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group of the Internet Governance Forum would be put in the position of taking a seat since the primary purpose of the MAG is to plan the IGF.

So a number of questions were raised by MAG members about the appropriateness of taking such a position. And the sort of perhaps conflicts that that might present in terms of different roles.

The MAG has been evaluating -- I am a MAG member, as are others who are both on this forum and in this room. And the MAG has been evaluating and has been working toward a liaison role between the MAG chair, Janis Karklins, and including our secretariat Chengetai Masango, so that there would be ongoing dialogue but not a taking of an official council position.

I heard one of my fellow panelists suggest that perhaps there should be closer coordination between NMI and the IGF. And I would say as a MAG member that I'm not there, because I think that the IGF has a number of entities that it wants to continue to engage in. And such a discussion would have to take place within the MAG in the future.

PETER DENGATE THRUSH: Thank you.

Well, thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for attendance and staying. A reminder that more about these exciting topics can be heard at the Wednesday meeting. You're all very welcome to attend. But for now please join me in thanking this extraordinary panel. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

NIGEL HICKSON: Could I just give one commercial? First of all, I would like to thank the panel on behalf of the staff. Thank you, Peter. Thank you, Bill. Thank you for the cross-community working group.   We've worked very closely on this. Thank you very much. Thank you all for turning up as well. Thank you, Renate, staff, for all your help.

And --

[Applause]

And please do come along on Wednesday at 1730 to 1845 in Aguila for more discussion on this. Thank you very much.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]