
HYDERABAD – Internet Governance Public Session
Monday, November 07, 2016 – 18:30 to 20:00 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Okay. This is a one-minute warning and we'll get started.

Okay. Good evening, everyone. A big thanks to you for coming and to the panelists for being here in this evening's session when there's competition for drinks and other things, and dinner, I'm sure. And also, just a slight apology. There was never really an explicit agenda for this session that was put into the -- that was out there for you to see. So we've rustled up some questions, and as you can see, they're on the screen behind us. And this will be the structure of our discussion today.

So you can see we're going to talk a little bit about Internet governance in the post-IANA transition period. And so we're going to take a bit of a tour de table. We'll be talking about institutions, we'll be talking about processes, and we'll be talking about issues.

And we want to make this as interactive as possible, so if you want to come from the back to the front so you can come to the mic. And we're also going to try to make this as efficient as

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.

possible so that you can get away to whatever entertainment or food that you're looking forward to.

So we have -- we have a series of questions. What I'm going to do is I'm just going to introduce the participants very quickly. We are still awaiting one panelist. Hopefully he'll turn up.

And then we're going to effectively walk through these questions. And the panelists haven't had a huge amount of time to see these questions or to think about the questions, so we'll just kind of play this by ear and see how it goes. And I urge you also to think about the questions, and when we have a moment, come to the mic and give us your views on these bullets that we have on the screen.

So I'm delighted to have tonight with us Renata Aquino Ribeiro, who is a partner at EI Consulting and a member of the Multistakeholder Advisory Group on Internet governance. We have Louise Van der Laan from the ICANN Board. We have Milton Mueller, professor, Georgia Tech School of Public Policy. We have Patrik Faltstrom, head of research and development at Netnod. Olivier Crepin-Leblond, chair of the EURALO organization at ICANN. We have Jimson Olufuye, chair of AfICTA, the Africa Information and Communication Technologies Alliance.

And Nigel Hickson, ICANN Global Stakeholder Engagement.

So what I'd like to do is I would like to open this up immediately, and I'm going to turn to Milton.

And, Milton, has Internet governance changed post transition? And if so, how? And what can we look forward to in terms of Internet governance over the next couple of years?

MILTON MUELLER:

In terms of the broad political implications of the transition, it's too early to tell. It's only a month before that exciting down-to-the wire denouement of the transition was resolved in a beautifully dramatic fashion with the cowboy Attorneys Generals being rebuffed by a hand-picked judge in Texas. Hand picked by Ted Cruz.

So I think what was changed immediately is the self-confidence of the ICANN community that we feel more comfortable with the Board, the Board feels more comfortable with the community and the new accountability arrangements. And we are now in a position to make continuing reforms in ICANN and free from the interference of a particular government.

We still have issues with governments and the relationship between governments and the Internet community within ICANN, which are still being worked out. But we -- I think that the ICANN feels like it's more on a solid footing right now.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Milton. And just looking a little bit further afield. What about over the next couple of years? How do you see the broader -- the implications of the IANA transition for the broader landscape? And this is the same question I'll be putting to those of you at the table.

MILTON MUELLER: There are several institutions that will be involved with Internet governance, and my favorite theme right now is that cybersecurity is an Internet governance issue. It's not that Internet governance is some small dimension of cybersecurity.

So what we'll have to do now is see whether a multistakeholder approach can handle the problems of cybersecurity going forward, so there will be sort of a new battleground. Essentially the multistakeholder approach has succeeded and is victorious with respect to names and numbers and the Internet infrastructure, but what about those other issues of cybersecurity, conduct on the Internet, and so on.

So I think looking forward, I would look very carefully at how cybersecurity is being handled and the relationship between multistakeholderism and these kind of security issues that are,

as we'll talk about when we talk about fragmentation, are threatening to revert back into the national state framework.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Milton. I'm going to go to Lousewies and Markus next because unfortunately, they have to leave at 7:00 but same question, Lousewies. How do you see the transition shaping the immediate environment and a little bit further ahead. Thanks.

LOUSEWIES VAN DER LAAN: Thank you very much, and thanks for the invitation, and I want to apologize beforehand that the board members here have to leave here actually at three to 7:00 because we have a bus to catch, but our wonderful government engagement team is going to stay here. So I really look forward to hearing the discussion and the outcomes and what people say. And also, this is something -- it's great that you've kicked it off this way, and especially with these questions, but I agree, of course, with Milton that it's too soon to tell, and we need to keep checking this six months from now, next year, et cetera. So it's going to be an ongoing process.

So I want to go to the question of, you know, what are -- what are the roles now? What do I think are the most important things? And I'd like to just make it clear that I'm not here

representing the Board or anything. So Markus Kummer who is sitting over there is the chair of the Board Working Group on Internet Governance, something -- a process which goes on in the Board, so we discuss these issues at length. But I want to share my personal experience because I only joined the Board one year ago, and to me, everything in ICANN was completely new.

And so I think I've made that transition that a lot of governments don't really make, because there's this very small group of people, a lot of them in the GAC, who actually understands the multistakeholder model, they understand the technical details. But there are thousands, millions of people who are with government, in government for whom it's still brand-new. And I understand where they're coming from because I was there last year and I'm still learning, learning every day.

So I think there's two really important things in the period to come. The first is we have to make the accountability work. This is a huge responsibility on all of us because I think there will be those that, when there's a failure of this system that we have now all agreed to, they will use that as an excuse to say, look, it's not working. We've got to move things. We have to intervene.

So this is a huge responsibility and it's going to be ongoing for a very long time. And it's one that is on all of us and won't ever stop.

The second thing is, is I think it's very important to keep building bridges. Bridges between what I have come to call, like, planet Internet and planet politics or planet, you know, government. They're really very, very different worlds. And that fact that they come together here, because the GAC sits here and we know them and we talk to them and they understand the issues, doesn't mean that then the governments that meet in other places also understand these issues.

So to build bridges, to learn each other's language, to try to keep on respecting the different responsibilities that we have is extremely important.

And one of the things I've noticed, and then I'll wrap up, is that sometimes I think people underestimate that the governments can actually legislate the Internet to death if they want to. Fragmentation is -- is only one example. But politicians and governments are under extreme pressure from their voters, from their constituencies to fix all problems in the world: crime, terrorism, poverty, anything you can imagine.

A lot of these things are happening on the Internet. So people then say, well, can you fix it? And they think that they can fix it by doing something to the Internet, rather than on the Internet.

And my fear is always that if you, the techies, the technical community, the people who actually understand how these things work don't help governments to find the solutions to, as you were saying, cybersecurity and other issues, to fix it in a very fine way with a tiny screwdriver, then they will take a sledge hammer and start trying to fix the problem in a way that is going to be problematic in the long run.

So those I think are the key things. Let's make accountability work and let's keep building bridges between those two worlds.

Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Lousewies.

Markus.

MARKUS KUMMER: Thank you. And I would also like to add my apologies for leaving early. We have not coordinated our response, Lousewies and I, but we very much seem to be singing from the same hymn sheet.

My brief answers to the various questions, has Internet governance changed post transition? Yes, it's too early to tell, but nevertheless, we can say one of the major issues in Internet governance was the preponderate role of one government. The role of the U.S. government was seen by many as the major issue in Internet governance, and now with the transition that issue has gone away. How it will shape the discussion is yet another story; but nevertheless, this is really something major in the history of Internet governance.

And then what forces at national, regional, global levels will shape the Internet? Clearly the new users, the new Internet users are not anymore from Europe and North America. They are from the developing world. They are from Africa, from Asia. And they bring new languages, new cultures, new sensitivities to the Internet. And that clearly will also shape the discourse on Internet governance.

And I think it will be also a challenge for ICANN to take that into account. And I feel the ICANN community is aware of that. We have to be sensitive to different culture, to different backgrounds of newcomers.

Is the Internet fragmenting? Well, we do see signs of that, and there are nice little tools that don't cooperate with others, is one element. There are nice apps for some people. The Internet is

Facebook and that's the Internet. They don't really have the full Internet experience. They say just on essentially one app. And zero rating is one of the discussions related to that and I understand has been a big issue in India.

But this is something, and also firewalls some countries build up around their borders.

But this has been an underlying tension right from the beginning. The Internet as a borderless technology clashes with the international system which is built round national borders.

But obviously for us, the challenge is to keep the open, interoperable Internet.

And the roles and responsibilities of stakeholders, they are much bigger now in the ICANN planet now that we are on our own. We don't have a backstop of a very powerful government anymore to protect us. So we have to show we are responsible and grown up. And I fully agree with Lousewies that the accountability of the system, the responsibility is paramount importance.

And lastly, I also agree with Milton on the security challenges. And we see that the United Nations, for instance, is dealing in the first committee, which is usually not on the radar of these discussions, but there's a governmental group of experts. And that is anything but multistakeholder.

And I hear the Swiss are hosting the next meeting of this group in Geneva, and they were trying to open it up to multistakeholder participation or interaction, at least part of it, but there was no note from the other governmental experts, so they will organize a lunchtime side event where other stakeholders can participate. But that's just an illustration to see. It's not just Kumbaya, the multistakeholder model has triumphed. There are other forces and especially when it comes to security. Governments have a tendency that they prefer being among themselves.

And I would -- my argument is always be open, invite stakeholders, be transparent about what you're doing, and that's the best confidence-building measures also in this area.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Markus.

Patrik, do you want to jump in?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I think the points that have been brought up are the right ones. And specifically, I like what Markus said, that we are now grown-ups. We asked for the car keys, we got the car keys, and now we have to demonstrate that we don't drive off the road.

There are some rules out there regarding speeding and not running over other people and driving on the right or wrong side of the road and other kind of agreements which are everything from legislation to norms, but make sure that we don't sort of fall over and have the grown-ups coming and take the keys from us again.

So I like that analogy from Markus. So I think -- I really, really hope that the transition that we are now sort of into the next phase, that it doesn't turn into a hangover instead. We have to demonstrate that we are -- that we meant it, that we are respective users of this Internet, and that we can take care of it. Because what we have seen, I claim, since we started deregulation telecommunication, is that there is a gap between legislation and norms. And when we got the Internet together with the utilization, and with that I mean by the utilization the sort of physical process of digitize the information or material or anything, and then Internet that makes it possible to move that data around, those two forces together I claim is among the most important thing since the sort of steam engine was invented.

And that means that the norms that we are using and the gaps between the norms and the legislation has increased. That together with us moving from a legislation, whatever, government controlled, monopoly-based telecommunication

communication system to a market forces driven evolution, those are quite a large number of changes at the same time. So I'm not surprised there is stress.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Patrik.

Renata, want to jump in?

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: Hi, yes. It's interesting that this year of the ICANN post transition is the same year as the beginning of the next ten years of the IGF. And for us in Latin America, it was much more dramatic than what Milton recalled here, because we were in LACNIC, and Elise Gerich was there and we had a whole party planned to celebrate the transition. And then the judge from Texas news came.

And we had -- we were looking at ten or so cases of champagne and waiting to see if the transition would go through or not. So when it finally was confirmed, I remember there was a huge round of applause and everybody was hugging and celebrating. And I don't know how or why, but this news came to be registered in the wiki -- ICANNWiki poster. If you had a chance to see the ICANNWiki poster, there's a paragraph there with this emotional moment for Latin America.

And while there was a lot of fraternity on the air going on, we also could feel the responsibility. So I would definitely refrain the idea of accountability and responsibility of the community.

So how -- how does that work now that we have this new organization where every step of the way we have to think about how the community will react and how the community articulates itself. This was also the first year in the IGF global that we had the intersessional thematic work, the BPFs, and the dynamic coalitions organizing sessions. And for the BPFs specifically when one discusses national, regional, and global levels, this was the first year where we had a discussion on -- of the BPF gender and access happened at the same time at LAC IGF and Asia Pacific regional IGF. And that discussion originated in Brazil IGF. Definitely those links -- that articulation in a global network becomes much easier in this new post-transition world but also there's a lot more responsibility for the community.

And when one thinks about the fragmenting of the Internet, the so-called, I love the term "splinter net," it's not -- I don't think that we are going to have important work coming through if we had all those splinters that do not come together. So one of the most interesting things is that the global south are now organized mostly through mobile messaging networks. There's a lot that's done in mobile messaging, and none of this is taken into account on, for example, policy development process

formats. In part of our research collective that we started a book on IGF in 2015, I am from the region of IGF 2015 which is why I decided -- one of the reasons I decided to be more involved. And we started the book there, and now we are launching the book right after ICANN. And we did it all from mobile messaging.

So I do perceive that this is what happens, we have to bring together the community, the entire community, in this post-transition world.

MATTHEWS SHEARS:

Thanks, Renata. I'm just going to jump in here before we go to Olivier and just relay a little personal story from the transition. So I came into ICANN to work on the transition. I was on the -- both of the working groups on the IANA transition and ICANN accountability. And as you know, there was a huge amount of work for many of us at this table and in this audience. The one thing is my kids would ask me, what are you doing on this call so late at night, what are you doing on this call so early in the morning and all this kind of -- I'm trying to -- working on if transition, and that was impossible to explain what the transition was. So when we got to the end game, as Milton was describing it, and, you know, we have this judge in Texas on the Friday, I think it was, before or whatever it was, and we got to the actual day of the transition, I woke up that morning, went

down stairs, a bit of a sigh of relief that, you know, the Internet was -- you could turn it on and it was still there. Went to the kids and I said, have you noticed any different -- anything different? No, no, no. Oh, well, we've transitioned. Oh, okay. And that reaction was exactly what we strove to have throughout those two years. Oh, okay, we've transitioned. Great. Everything's working as normal. And that's -- I think kudos to the community for making that happen.

So a different kind of celebration to yours with crates of champagne, but still a little silent celebration inside that nothing had really changed. Anyway, over to you, Olivia.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Olivia Crepin-Leblond speaking.

And it's funny because we often hear IANA transition and really, was there really a transition of IANA? No. Strictly speaking the IANA functions have not changed. They're still the same. They're still -- have the same quality of service, and in fact, for end users out there, there shouldn't be any change -- any difference whatsoever in the before and the after. We're looking at IANA stewardship transition. And that's where I think that what Markus said was another interesting thought thinking that well, until now we've had a single government with nuclear weapons that would be able to step in if anything happened to

IANA, to ICANN, to all of this multistakeholder model that we have here. And yet, as far as I feel it, there isn't any change. It's a little bit like (speaking in non-English language) the more it changes, the more it's the same thing.

In 2012 we saw this showdown in the World Conference on International Telecommunications where we had a clash -- I guess it was a clash, between the multilateral model on the one hand and the multistakeholder model on the other. Then things slowed down a little bit, and we had these small skirmishes, I guess perhaps here and there. Until more recently the World Telecommunications Standards Assembly that took place just last week in Hammamet, in Tunisia, which we have to remember, telecommunication standards, this is just technical stuff. This is supposed to be technical standards. Nothing political about it. And then suddenly we got shocked by the -- the discussions which took place there revolving around the article -- was it article 47 -- assembly -- standardization assembly resolution 47 and that pertained to domain names.

Now, why did this come here? Was that connected somehow to the transition, to the perception that perhaps now ICANN does not have this big government behind it and now is the time to try and go and attempt another go to get the whole Domain Name System and everything that basically pertains to the Internet's identifiers moving from the multistakeholder model to a

multilateral model? I don't know, but I think that in the forthcoming years one of the things that has changed is that there's no further perception that a big government is behind us. So we will have to show that this community works, works well, that the multistakeholder model works well, and we will have to, I guess, fight our fights with our usual allies and with those countries that do support the multistakeholder model. And I hope that one of the challenges we have on our plate, which is to get more countries to adhere to this model, is a challenge that we're ready to go and to do and to basically spread and go to reach out to these countries, reach out to those governments, reach out to the actual communities who often think that a government is the government of last resort, if you want. They trust our government in actually doing things that the private sector isn't doing.

So maybe if that's a change, that's what we have -- we have to think about. I know that some people think well it's not really ICANN's -- ICANN's job to go out there and get involved in Internet governance. Well, it is. It is our immediate environment. It is where threats will come from. And it's not threats just to ICANN's functions but threats to the model that we operate with, the multistakeholder model. And that's why we have to be very vigilant.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Olivia. Jimson, I'm going to turn to you next and then I'm going to go to Nigel. So taking into account what we've been talking about, post-transition how's the world changing, if at all. Maybe you can give us a regional and national dimension to that as well. What -- are we feeling anything yet and what might we be feeling from this transition in a couple of years?

JIMSON OLUFUYE: Thank you, Chair. Well, let me first say that I would like to cut and paste the session of Olivier in terms of vigilance and more engagement post-transition. Again, my name is Jimson Olufuye. My day job is managing an IT firm in Abuja, Nigeria, contemporary. Is a member of Africa ICT Alliance, which is an alliance of ICT associations, companies in Africa. We started a six -- a company of six countries membership, now 27 country membership.

We a member of the business constituency of ICANN, and we're also in the International Chamber of Commerce. Business action is a part of the information society. We -- our product of IG, if I may say, they need to engage, that is, private sector from Africa to engage in the conversation. And so let me also say that I have the privilege of being one of the five business members of the working group, the CSTD, that is United Nations Commission

for Science and Technology for Development Working Group On Enhanced Cooperation.

Where this working group emanates from the need to address some IG issues, so to speak, enhanced cooperation. But before that, let me talk about I started with the WSIS 2003 and 2005 was convened partly to talk the issue of critical information infrastructure or what ICANN does. And it has been a major contending issues, and from that IGF came about, IGF forum and also the second string that is enhanced cooperation.

Well, IGF has been running, it's a multistakeholder forum wherein all stakeholders can hear the view, you can go back home with a lot of take-aways and replicate the same approach to tackling domestic issues, national issues, regional issues. And this has been highly beneficial to us in Nigeria because right now there's a lot of constructive engagement nationally and that has dovetailed into even subregional level whereby we discuss issues like cybercrime, cybersecurity, privacy issue, freedom of expression online, and whatever.

When it got to the effect of the stewardship transition, I support Suna (phonetic) because it was a big deal really. But I was also surprised that as Milton said, it was just like that. It just went through. It was a big deal for us because we talked a lot about it, and a lot of people said no, it's not going to happen. In Africa,

they said no, you can't trust the U.S., it can't happen. So finally I said, it's happened. They said, no, there is a catch, there is something. I said, it just happened. Really? So it's a big deal. So it's a big deal that right now a lot of confidence repose on the business constituency or the business community to engage other stakeholder government. And that is just nitty-gritty.

We had a summit two weeks ago or three weeks ago in Namibia and we saw engagement of the government and the private sector and it's usually something that would benefit the community. So the whole idea is to get all the inputs together from all stakeholders so that we can better provide good living standard for the people. So from Africa it's very important perspective. It's important that we maintain this multistakeholder approach bottom-up and on an equal footing.

So I don't see much fragmentation that will happen because this is a business issue. We want to transport, information, communicate, exchange ideas, so we need to interoperate, basically. So it's a business issue. And the business justification, I don't think fragmentation to that extent will happen to cut people out.

So we just need to engage. As Olivier said, we need to be vigilant. There needs to be more capacity building. The government are one of us, they are part of us, so they want to

move forward in providing good governance. So it's not left for those that are already mature like ICANN to provide more resources, to engage more constructively like compliance issues and law enforcement people. You don't need to just put up the website and say it is there. You have to go to them. Okay? You need to reach them that this is available. When they know it is available, I can assure you my people from Africa mostly -- the solution is here, so let's work with it.

So we need to support the multistakeholder approach. Every one of us need to talk about it's a big deal really, and let us really celebrate it and push forward the model we see working in ICANN. Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thank you, Jimson. So both you and Nigel, if I've got this correct, are members of the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, and that's kind of code for where -- what's the role of governments in Internet governance.

This process was going on before the transition and now it's continuing on after the transition. So in a way, what Olivier was saying is absolutely right, that there are some things that just don't change, right?

So maybe you can just comment on where you think the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation is going, because clearly that's a continuing issue is the role of governments in the Internet space, right?

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Yeah. Excellent feedback.

Let's not forget we have come a long way. We have made significant progress. Here we are in the beautiful and incredible India, and the Working Group on Enhanced Cooperation, we know the position of India on these issues, and we've made progress. We know the position of the Islamic Republic of Iran on the issue, and they came here and we all see how valuable the contribution of Mr. Arasteh has been. It's very valuable. So we are making significant progress. So we just need to keep up the conversation. Those who are yet to be in this forum, we know some are yet to be in this forum to really see the benefit of this collective engagement. They need to come and see it work. And this is for the benefit of their people. So -- and discussing the enhanced cooperation issue, I think we need to cooperate more at the local level, at the subregional level, and at the regional level, whether in Africa or Latin America or Asia, so -- for capacity building and for resource sharing and for exchange of information to tackle social and domestic issues.

So we need to keep the conversation alive and we need to present our case as we have been doing, and we have been making progress. Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Jimson. We're moving into the second bullet and I'd like to go to Nigel now.

Nigel, you've got your ear to the ground in Geneva and other places. You've got a good feel for where these various pressures are coming from, so what -- what are you feeling in terms of forces that could shape the Internet and Internet governance post-transition?

NIGEL HICKSON: Yes. Thank you very much. And I'll be very brief.

So, yeah, I'm Nigel Hickson. I work in the government engagement team with Tarek Kamel and Anne-Rachel in Geneva.

I think it's fair to say that governments have always had a role and are always perceived to have a role, and we go back obviously to the WSIS, as has been mentioned. And I think as Olivier and Lousewies said, the perception of governments has

changed from time to time, and over recent years it's become much stronger in terms of the Internet governance agenda.

Quite clearly, before the WSIS took place, it was very difficult to get governments to focus on the Internet. If you'd have asked them if they wanted an Internet policy in terms of any technical parameters, they'd have probably told you that they didn't really have -- have such an interest.

But now, because of the issues that Lousewies added -- raised, and Olivier also mentioned, in terms of cybersecurity, in terms of privacy, in terms of jurisdiction, in terms of fraud, in terms of child abuse, et cetera, governments need to react to the pressures that they're under to, so to speak, do something about it.

And therefore the governments that we interact with, the governments we come across in the international government organizations are much better briefed and understand the issues a lot more. But of course they are also under-resourced. They only have so much capacity. And I think that, to an extent, underlines what we saw at the WTSA, as Olivier referenced to, last week.

There was a proposal, if you like, that some governments put forward to discuss such issues as geographical names, national names, country names, in the various ITU study groups.

Now, around the table here and on the floor, you'll say, "Well, these are the names we've been discussing here all this week. This is the names that the GAC is giving advice to the board on that the board is passing a resolution on that we all keep discussing."

Yes, indeed. But for some governments, they find it much easier to discuss those issues at the ITU and perhaps at the U.N., as we're seeing in the various committees, than perhaps they do at the -- at ICANN.

And that's a challenge for us. That's a challenge in terms of reaching out, engaging, capacity building, as others have said, and we needn't go over those issues.

The Internet Governance Forum, of course, is an incredibly important dynamic organization that can, in some ways, bridge some of these gaps, in that people do feel at home going to the Internet Governance Forum. It's very, very open. It's not structured in the same sense as some other organizations. And we hope that discussions can also take place there, and we know we've got a representative from Mexico, Yolanda, that's going to tell us a bit about this important forum coming up in Mexico later in the year.

So I mean, just -- just to conclude, in terms of the Internet governance agenda, I mean, it goes on. It perhaps goes in

cycles. Some years are more busy than others. But you can never say this year is going to be the final year, so to speak, in terms of the ITU agenda.

The plenipotentiary, when important decisions is made, is not until 2018, around two years from now, but preparation will -- will start fairly soon.

We've got obviously the Internet Governance Forum. We've got the government group of experts which has been alluded to that's meeting in -- in Geneva. And of course there's work on enhanced cooperation. There's this feeling of some governments that their -- if you like, their legitimate right to making public policy decisions on the Internet, they don't have a locus for doing that, and this is -- this is something that we have to discuss. We -- we believe we -- we provide it here at ICANN in relation to the mission of ICANN, but in other areas there are some concerns. Thank you very much for the opportunity.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Nigel. What I want to do now is actually move to the third bullet, which is, is the Internet fragmenting, and if so, how do we preserve the open Internet?

Three of our community -- Bill Drake, Wolfgang Kleinwachter, who is on the Adobe, and Vint Cerf -- authored a paper for the

World Economic Forum at the beginning of the year on Internet fragmentation, and this comes back to the issue of what's occurring at the architectural level, the level of -- technical level and what's occurring at the governmental level and what's occurring at the commercial level that could, in whatever form, be it through technical issues or through standardization or through policy, actually undermine or threaten the open Internet?

And that paper is available and it's a good read, and if Wolfgang has any comments he wishes to make, he should -- he should let us know.

But this is something that's been alluded to by a couple of people on the panel. There are these other pressures. We have a multistakeholder model that's been proven to work, but there are these other kind of real-world pressures, if you will, that are out there, and so that's a document on Internet fragmentation that's worth taking a read.

There are, of course, differing views on fragmentation, and I'm going to turn to Milton now and let him talk a little bit about his perspective on fragmentation and what kind of pressures those bring on the open Internet.

MILTON MUELLER:

Yes. Thank you, Matt.

I think that the fragmentation issue is one that I've been doing some research and writing about lately, and I want to reconceptualize that issue.

I think the word "fragmentation," particularly when you're talking about technical, economic, and various forms of political and legal fragmentation, has become so all-inclusive of different kinds of phenomena that it's probably not useful to talk about fragmentation unless you narrow it down specifically.

For example, to give you a *reductio ad absurdum* of the fragmentation discussion, I've heard people say now that the digital divide is an example of fragmentation. So that would mean that we're all getting less fragmented because, of course, we have some several billion people connected now, whereas when the Internet started, there were only, you know, a few hundred. So why are we worrying about fragmentation?

I've heard other people say that fragmentation means people speaking different languages. Well, this is not about the Internet; this is about differences in culture.

So what's a useful thing we can say about so-called fragmentation?

I think at the heart of this issue is a very profound, very fundamental issue of Internet governance, and that's what I call alignment, which is the attempt to make the cyberspace, which is global, fit into national territorial jurisdictions. That most of what we're talking about when we talk about the current trends towards so-called fragmentation is about attempts by governments to assert authority over the Internet in a way that imposes territorial jurisdictions upon it.

An example of that is data localization. Okay? Localization is not about fragmentation. The data is still accessible. It's there. It's just that you're forcing somebody to put it in a particular geographic region so that legally you can get access to it.

Let's talk about one of the paradoxes of alignment. Let's take the example of the so-called right to be forgotten. The French say, "We recognize this right and we're going to impose it on Google in our territory," and then they discover, well, because the Internet is global, people who don't use google.fr but use google.com don't have to recognize this, are not controlled by our decision to have a right to be forgotten.

So what does France do? They try to globalize their jurisdiction.

So alignment creates all kinds of contradictions. France would like to make Google recognize this right to be de-linked

everywhere in the world, even though they have no legitimate authority.

Now, my view as to the solution of this is actually quite radical in the sense that I think we have to take what Nigel called "the legitimate right of governments to control the Internet in their jurisdiction" and question that and say, "Does sovereignty make any sense in cyberspace? Do states have sovereignty in cyberspace or do we need new institutions like ICANN that are global in authority to deal with some of the basic issues of Internet governance?"

And I'll leave it at that, but I think that the fundamental takeaway here is that it's not like the Internet people are disconnecting. It's quite the opposite. Think of the Internet of Things. We're connecting more and more. That's why some people are so afraid and they're trying to assert different forms of control that territorialize the Internet.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Milton. I'm going to come to Patrik in a second, but -- so just coming back to the bullet we just talked about and the issue of this being a force at national, regional levels, how do we address that? How do we -- apart from questioning governments about their national authority over their digital

space, what -- what's the role for the multistakeholder model in this? I mean, how do we -- how do we bring that to the fore?

MILTON MUELLER:

Well, that's what multistakeholderism really is about. Some people think that it's just about different stakeholders getting together, but that happens at the national level all the time. In any sort of pluralistic democracy, multistakeholderism exists.

So at the global level, multistakeholderism is a way of creating institutional frameworks for people to make policy across national boundaries, and so that's what we have to do to deal with these problems that threaten to territorialize the Internet.

We have to come up with multistakeholder -- i.e., transnational - - institutional frameworks for solving Internet governance problems.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

I just wanted to note to those of you who are in Adobe that there are some great questions being asked by some of those who are following us on line and it's definitely worth keeping an eye on that. Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Thank you very much.

I also have been looking into fragmentation and the fragmentation issue because I've been sort of very interested during the sort of last 20 or 30 years, the change of telecommunication architecture from being vertical silos where we have one communication channel per application to a more horizontal model with multiple layers where we are reusing the underlying layers in the form of what we normally call the Internet, the IP protocol and the supporting protocols in DNS.

What -- and then all the different kind of applications on top of that.

That model, from my perspective, has led to very high interest from commercial forces and market forces to ensure that communication works. It should be possible to communicate.

But on the other hand -- and so that is sort of market economy forces want the network to stay together.

On the other hand, if we look at the higher layers, I see an increased amount of fragmentation, again, back to silos.

If we look at electronic mail, you know that you can buy whatever email client you want and you can -- you can send email to me regardless of what email client I use.

That is not the case with chat. That is not the case with turning on and off light bulbs. That is not the case with almost anything in the Internet of Things.

So unfortunately, I see market economy forces having an increased interest in fragmenting the Internet in the form of the higher layers, but just because they're also -- from a market economy standpoint, there is an interest of collecting data on when people turn on and off light bulbs and what temperature they have at home and what electricity meters say. Everyone wants communication not to be directly between the light switch and the light bulb, but from the light switch to some service in the cloud and then back to the light bulb, just so the cloud service can collect data, do big data analysis and sell that.

So the business models for today's services above the Internet is in favor of fragmentation, but for the cloud to work, the Internet must stay together.

So we have increased solid IP layer in the Internet, but increased fragmentation on higher layers, and when talking about papers and making ads for them, I've actually written my own paper on this.

[Laughter]

PATRIK FALTSTROM: I was part of the research group connected to the Oxford Institute and the Chatham House, our Internet program, which the Swedish former prime minister Carl Bildt was chairing, and one of the research papers in that group is one that I wrote about this -- on this topic. Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: So how to we address these issues? In your paper, what did you conclude?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: The conclusion is that market economy forces are not interested in open standards. They are not interested in standardization. They want their own solutions.

And on the other hand, when I interview people and talk to governments, talk to public sector or private sector in their public procurement process, they think market economy is interested in using the open standards.

So the first step is for parties that do believe that market economy is essentially using open standards, wake up and understand, no, they are not.

So they start to ask for it. That is the first step.

I don't -- I'm not -- I don't see legislation or anything be anything that actually works. But I see, for example, different procurement processes that we have in the ICT and health sector, we should actually make sure that when someone is actually procuring communication mechanisms, for example, X-ray systems, whatever, use as much open standards as possible. That is the only way to breaking up that.

We need to increase the push -- raise the level where we are moving from -- excuse me -- the layer in the architecture where we are leaving standards and using proprietary solutions have gone down. We need to push that up again. And that is something we can only do by actually using market economy forces, which means be better on putting requirements when we buy things.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Patrik. A whole 'nother dimension of forces that are shaping the Internet.

I know you that want to comment on that Olivier. And then maybe Milton.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes. Thank you, Matthew.

And I actually quite like what Patrik was saying here.

We keep on thinking, well, how do we preserve the open Internet? What can we do to continue with the model that we support?

We forget that the Internet is actually just a network of people. People are what made the Internet different from any other computer network that was there before. There were a lot of private networks out there before the Internet became what it is. And the very fact that people brought more people to the Internet, and users, this brought services. This brought more -- further people coming in. We did not evolve the Internet into an America Online model, where you had a very closed system, centralized control, et cetera.

So when we look at the open Internet that we see today, an end user doesn't really care whether that Internet is fragmented or not. What they want is to have the services that they're interested in coming to them. They want to have that choice. They want to be able to go where they want to go, not where somebody else tells them to go. And this is where we really should be thinking about the end user. Because the end users are the ones that will ultimately decide whether the Internet will be fragmented or will not be fragmented.

If we make our product offering as an unfragmented Internet that is attractive to an end user, I firmly believe that at that moment the Internet will continue to be unfragmented. We had already attempts in the past in the early days, the Internet was many different small networks that had their own private services on one side, and then that little bridge to the Internet as a sort of side issue. We saw that the offering of the open Internet was the one that actually won. So that's one thing.

I do have concerns, of course, because you do see that some companies are absolutely huge. They have -- they're quasi monopolies out there. But we are still in very early days. And, you know, the next, insert your unicorn name, is just around the corner. And we -- you know, we tend to always think, well, that's now everything that had to be invented has been invented so far; we can't go any further. But in fact we'll see a lot of changes. And I'm not too concerned about the fragmentation of the Net. As soon as it will impact users negatively, there will be a huge push to bring it all back together.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thanks, Olivier.

Milton, you want to come in? And then I'm going to go to Jimson.

MILTON MUELLER:

Okay. I think Patrik and I have a fundamental different approach to the so-called fragmentation issue. Again, I emphasized alignment. He's looking at actually the application layer, okay? Which is not actually an Internet governance issue. It's a different -- it's mostly an economic policy issue.

None of us are denying that the Internet layer, the TCP/IP, the third layer, the networking layer, that's the middle of the hourglass, everything goes through that. That compatibility is so valuable that nobody's going to willingly give it up, except for some kind of a government that maybe wants to censor and control everything.

So at the -- just to give you an example of why I'm not worried about fragmentation at the application layer, he was using the example of chats; right? You have WhatsApp. And so on my phone here, I have Skype, Telegram, and WhatsApp. And I may eventually install WeChat for some of my Chinese friends.

Now, is that a big deal? No, because it's basically costless for me to have duplicate versions of these chats. And it is compatible in the sense that you just duplicate a piece of software on a single platform, and you can communicate with all these people.

And when people do converge on a single platform at the application layer, sometimes they get worried about monopoly, like Facebook and Google.

So those are interesting issues. Those are Internet policy issues. But they're not really global Internet governance issues, because they don't deal with the actual Internet layer. They're more at the -- sort of the layer of economic regulation, antitrust, those kinds of things.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

So this is an area where you differ significantly from the World Economic Forum paper, where it talks about commercial fragmentation.

Jimson.

JIMSON OLUFUYE:

Yeah. Thank you, Matt.

I actually mentioned earlier that is initial business. Based on business model, you could decide whether I want to access this market or not, or whether I want to provide this service or not.

But as Milton said, when it comes to that technical layer, well, it's in business interests or most countries' interests that there should be interoperability.

But the real concern about fragmentation, to me, is the DOA -- involving DOA phenomenon, wherein we have some countries alone trying to control or handle the servers for the DOA, digital object architecture. So that is a major concern. And that is where I think we should focus more on.

If a country says, okay, I want to block a particular service, well, at this point, at this moment, sorry, they have the right, in a way, to do that, until we do away with maybe our passports or until we do away with any national identification, we'll still have that layer of fragmentation. But, generally, I think the Internet will remain open. And the way that will be a challenge from what we have seen now, like with DOA, we need to look at that seriously.

Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Renata, I'm going to come to you in a second. But I just want to follow up on DOA.

Nigel, you saw a lot of references at the WITSA on DOA. Can you give us a feel for how that's playing out, because that, for some, is an issue of some concern.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Yes, at the World Telecommunication Standardization Assembly last week, there were a number of proposals that referenced the digital objects architecture technology in terms of work that should be done in the study groups at the ITU in terms of projects and different initiatives concerning the Internet of things.

So, for example, if -- one major project was on mobile phone theft, and the suggestion was that the digital objects architecture could play a role in that in tracking -- in tracking mobile phones.

I mean, it clearly is an architecture that has use, and it does have use in many applications. It's used in the British Library in London for tracking books, et cetera.

But in the end, it was felt at the ITU, and the outcome was because generally work on particular projects are supposed to be done in a technology-neutral way, that although this was clearly a technology that could be used, that it shouldn't be given any special preference over other technologies.

But it's something to really watch. And some people had suggested that in certain areas, perhaps it duplicated or could replace some forms of, you know, the domain name system or the Internet. But, you know, I think people understood that it probably was limited.

Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thanks, Nigel.

Renata.

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: Yes. I would just like to come back to the point of open standards and interoperability.

ICANN has just launched the Open Data Initiatives. And I think one of the things that helps on Internet fragmentation is also the lack of education towards open data, open standards. And the sheer, I think, meaningfulness act of trying to block one application of the other, for example, in Brazil, we had many problems with the blocking of WhatsApp. And recently, the Brazilian School of Internet Governance, for instance, started an edition directed to law professionals. And to me, this is very welcome, because sometimes judges who don't even understand how the Internet works decide on these blockages, decide on these fragmentation acts.

So I follow a bit the discussion on DOA in the ITU. And, again, this comes back to also discussion and education about open data standards.

Many of the open data professionals organize in collectives. And this is all discussed in online forums. And we need more space to bring these discussions. It's amazing that only now ICANN had this move towards open data, but it's very welcome.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Thank you, Renata.

We are going to hold the last question on the last bullet until the end. So what I'm going to do now is, we're going to -- we have a representative from the Mexican government who is in the Adobe, and Yolanda Martinez. And I think she's going to just say a couple of words about the IGF, if she's available and we can get her to say a couple of words.

Then we're going to open it to the floor. So I hope you've written down your questions. I hope you have answers to the questions that are on the screens or other questions for the panelists. And then we'll wrap it up so we can all go have a beer or something somewhere.

Do we have Ms. Martinez available?

Hello?

Okay. When we have her available, you can give me a signal. We'll --

Okay. Going to open it to the floor.

Do we have any pressing questions from the floor? Otherwise, we'll keep going. Yes, please. Come forward.

If you can take -- line up at the mics, that would be great.

And if you can say who you are.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Good evening, good evening. I will speak in Arabic.

MATTHEW SHEARS: (Off mic) panel as a whole.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: In fact, it's a comment -- in fact, it's a comment, it's not a question.

In fact, it's a comment. It's not a question.

At the outset, just to continue what my colleague mentioned here, he said we became adults, and, in other words, we can drive the car. Yet, driving cars needs laws and legislations. But the real question here is, can we even move this car to be under those laws and legislations? And when we talk about the mechanisms of IANA transition, so we will keep the stakeholder

model during the transition of IANA functions, or we'll continue on this model in light of the different legislations and law.

And here also, I would like to tackle capacity-building. I -- and especially that I work in Internet governance. So far, the definition is -- could be ambiguous among many of the people, because when you look into the term "Internet governance," people may say, okay, it's related to governments. And it is not, you know, implementing the multistakeholders approach. So we -- I -- I believe that we have to work on capacity-building and on the awareness on the stakeholder -- building and different governments and different parties. And the reference here could be as I heard that we may have several definitions when we talk about Internet governance, where I remember launching of Internet governance was during the WSIS meeting, where they decided on a certain definition, which is the participation of everyone in terms of legislations, (indiscernible). By "everybody" here, I mean the governments and the technical communities and other communities in the decision-making process.

So here, the governments sometimes could be sensitive towards certain issues. So if certain governments decided that -- where -- do we have a real part in decision-making? So during WSIS, we said the partners will create the proper environment for the governments to take -- to make the right decisions within the

current situation. In other words, the -- bringing other parties will not be at the expense of the governments, no, not at all, but to create a better environment for better decision-making process.

And thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking. And I actually agree very much with the points that have been made here. The barriers to Internet governance are huge.

First, there is, indeed, the problem of language as you rightly said. In some languages Internet governance means Internet government. In others it's Internet regulation. Regulation, of course, it's always seen as oh, well, the government regulates things. So you have this problem.

You also have the societal and cultural problem in some countries in that I recall a conversation I had on the sidelines from the World Conference on International Telecommunications sharing the experience that the delegation that I was with, which was the U.K. delegation had.

And the experience was we had a multistakeholder delegation. Because in the U.K. we have a multistakeholder advisory group on Internet governance, where the government has convened

private sector, civil society organizations, and the technical community to work with them and meet regularly. And also has opened the door to us being able to come together at a conference run by the ITU.

So -- or United Nations conference, et~cetera, all the other things that allow for larger delegations.

The person looked at me and said, "Well, no. I'm really sorry, but our people are not ready for that. They're not ready for that sort of thing."

So you have these barriers which are here and which we really have to try and push down by capacity building.

Very, very important. Being able to explain what we are on about when we speak about multistakeholder governance and what we mean by Internet governance. The fact that the Internet just doesn't govern itself. It's not just one of these serendipitous activities where things suddenly fell in place. But, at the same time, there was some concerted work that came together to make it what it is today and that kept it as open as possible for innovation.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thanks Olivier. We'll alternate, because we have some great questions in the chat. So go ahead. And then we'll take a

question in the chat. And, if we get the lady from Mexico back on, I'm afraid I'll have to interrupt you. Go ahead.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm Anit (phonetic) from the Center for Internet governance. My question is to Milton and possibly Matt.

So, when I look at the second question, if you look at regional global forces, to my mind, one point that wasn't addressed but I don't know how relevant it is to ICANN -- is that of international trade. Immediately I can think of two ways in which it could possibly affect the multistakeholder model of Internet governance in terms of participation. Because the trade process is actually multilateral. And, in terms of the substantive impact it might have and governments might take issues that are negotiated in multistakeholder arenas to trade issues, especially if there are strong business interests. Now, I realize there's living in the short term. But I'm interested in knowing what you think how this might settle in the longer term or how the trade regime might interact with existing regimes or future government regimes.

MILTON MUELLER: It's critical. It's one of the reasons I mentioned cybersecurity and emphasized it in my comments. But trade belongs right up there with cybersecurity.

In both cases you're dealing with a negotiation of boundaries around the nation state. And we are in a very reactionary period right now in which people are retracting from open borders and free trade and are reasserting these boundaries.

And, of course, this is very much related to Internet governance. I think in information services, for example, the TPP, trade agreement dealing with the transpacific partnership, has very good provisions for information services trade that would be very progressive. But it's being held back because of intellectual property and lots of typical protectionist sentiments.

So this is one of the primary areas in terms of that second bullet point. This is one of the major forces is the politics of trade that will shape Internet governance in the post-transition world.

NIGEL HICKSON: Thanks, Milton. Stephanie, if you can hold on, I'm going to pull up a question from the chat, if I can find it. Okay. Here we go.

Question for the panel from Mike Nelson. Can we ever really have real multistakeholder process where very few representatives from law enforcement or intelligence agencies

show up in the ICANN, IGF, IETF, W3C, et~cetera. And, if they do, there are limits on what they can say and share. Today in most countries, raising, for example, a spectre of terrorism, child pornography, piracy, fake drugs, and other crimes trends to trump concerns about online privacy, free speech, and innovation. Great question. Who wants to take it? Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Law enforcement and similar sort of public service -- sorry, public safety organizations, they all present here. And they have their own working group that is part of GAC. And they also cooperate with SSAC. So I actually think they are here.

The whole idea with these organizations is that you should not detect them. So I actually think they are here. That, joke aside, from a technical standpoint, I definitely see that they are cooperating just like any other organization's stakeholder group that, of course, they themselves are fighting with using more modern tools, working in a more modern way and fight to get funding just like us and engineering just like anyone else.

So I actually don't see any very specific issue there like the person that issued the question.

That said, we need more communication between stakeholder groups regardless of what stakeholder group we talk about. And that includes the public safety stakeholder groups.

MILTON MUELLER: If I could just jump in, they are here. How much do we really know about what Olivier does for a living?

[Laughter]

NIGEL HICKSON: That's funny. We were just going to tee up Olivier.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: No comment. I will respond to you off line.

Just to add to what Patrik was saying, actually, there are a lot of things that are wrong in the world, that go wrong. There's child pornography, child abuse, terrorism, hate crimes, racism. The list is endless.

The concern I have is we've seen a lot of linking to all of this to the Internet because some of it happens on the Internet. And the law agencies have actually been focusing on the Internet to an extent that sometimes you think, well, they focus more on the medium itself, the Internet, rather than the problem itself. The problems have been around before the Internet. And they

seem to still be around and only now we know more about them. So that's one concern I think that I have on this.

And it looks as though every time the answer is, oh, we have to control the Internet more. We have to control the allocation of domain names more. We have to control the allocation of IP addresses. We have to listen to the networks. We've seen recent worrying examples in the United Kingdom. The regulation of Investigatory Powers Act seems to have new ideas with regards to controlling a connection and being able to enter someone's computer with the approval of the Internet service provider. It's something that, unfortunately, might be spreading to other countries. And that's a concern that I do have. I wonder what other panelists think about this. And people in the audience, of course.

NIGEL HICKSON: Stephanie, sorry to make you wait.

STEPHANIE PERRIN: That's fine. I'm Stephanie Perrin, a GNSO Councillor for the non-commercial stakeholders group. I do have a question, but I'd like to answer the last question first. We do have law enforcement here. What we don't have is data protection law

enforcement. So there's a bit of an imbalance. There's a vacuum there.

So, predictably enough, my question is about data localization. And, certainly, in the data protection community, we've been talking about transporter data flow and blockages to transporter data flow since the '70s. The Europeans did it with the directive in '91 when that was tabled. Or introduced. I should use that word instead.

But it hasn't been effectively implemented. I'm always struck by the fact that we seem to be better at enforcing copyright law globally across borders than we are data protection law.

And we went through a whole decade or so of trying out privacy enhancing technologies, most of which have failed to get a market share or be implemented.

So I'm wondering what the panel feels is the alternative to data blockages and keeping your data at home. Please don't go to Milton first, because he's not going to be sympathetic.

PATRIK FALTSTROM:

Okay. I can start. Let me continue my analogy of sort of transportation method. Because part of what we see is, I claim, is both a gap between norm setting legislation so we might not have the right tools for whatever we actually expect. The other

thing is that we have reached different levels of harmonization and different levels of view on the data protection issues in different countries and different jurisdictions. And that clashes with the global -- with the global sort of design of the Internet and free movement. Because you move from one area to another one. It's similar to -- from the beginning when we built railroads, we had different distance between the railroad tracks, which was, like, pretty difficult when you wanted to draw your train from one end to the another. We found a way for cars that I can drive my car from Sweden to the U.K. But I have to remember to drive on the other side of the road when I cross a certain border. So I think we have those differences sort of in the real life. But I claim that, unfortunately, we do not really know how to take care of that in the digital world, those differences. And that will take some time because we also have different norms and different cultures. And that is also creating some stress when they meet. So the globalization that want things to be global and reachable is sort of contradiction to the sort of -- the different -- the fact that we do have different norms. And all of these forces fight with each other.

And I think -- I think by adding time, we will actually be able to work out something.

So your question what do we do instead, in the meantime, while we have these differences, very, very difficult. Specifically, you

don't have legislation tool that we need. So, unfortunately, we will live under stress. And I'm really happy that, like, all of us are here in this room and that we are people that are trying to resolve these issues. A lot of wrinkles to iron out.

NIGEL HICKSON: We're going to have to go to the lady from Mexico. We're bumping up against a time limit. We might miss the bus. We'll hold on any more questions. Just please hold on. And we'll take you, and we've got one more in the chat.

So Ms. Martinez, are you with us?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: We will miss the bus.

No?

NIGEL HICKSON: I'm not sure if you can hear us. I do apologize, but we don't seem to be able to get your audio on this side, I'm sorry to say. We'll keep trying, but we'll go to other the questions in the interim.

I do apologize. Go ahead. Introduce yourself, please.

SHARADA SRINIVASAN: My name is Sharada Srinivasan. And I'm a research fellow at the University of Pennsylvania.

The question/comment that I wanted to make is that I see Internet governance moving forward as facing a challenge of pace in that the pace at which we bring together, bring new users on board and new stakeholder communities on board through initiatives to connect the unconnected communities right now seems to not be matching the pace at which we are bringing the same people onto the governance fora. I feel like those voices and the fact that we are not listening to those voices as much as we should be because of the numbers at which they're coming in might present a challenge.

And, in that regard, I would like to ask a question generally of the panel on what they feel can be done to act, A, whether or not they feel this is a problem in that there is a mismatch in pace of bringing the constituency of consumers online and the inclusion of the same consumers in the process of governance. And, secondly, if there is that problem, besides capacity building are there any formal processes that we might need to think about in order to make governance a more inclusive space?

NIGEL HICKSON: That's a great question. Renate, you want to take that one? Jimson as well.

MATTHEW SHEARS: That's a great question.

Renata, do you want to take that one? Jimson as well.

RENATA AQUINO RIBEIRO: Work on regional engagement and Internet governance fora in ICANN even can be much improved. It is very interesting as far as input to remember the session that was just now on underserved regions. ICANN is talking about underserved regions without even a definition, a hard definition, of what that is.

And, yes, for the next billion of connected people, 600 million are women. And that percentage of, for example, ICANN leadership which is made out of women is 26%. And, yet, in the fellowship program which is a flagship program in ICANN, very complemented, you have gender balance, you have regional balance. So where do these people go to? Why do they not continue engaging in ICANN?

And this is also a concern which WSIS is very related to. WSIS had today in both -- this year both on the WSIS forum and in the WSIS review the idea of trying to act on regional engagement in Internet governance.

If we don't have these populations present in Internet governance debates, it is very likely that we cannot have the empowered community, the accountability processes, and, yes, the fragmentation and other difficulties we're living through.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Jimson, very briefly because I think we will have the lady from Mexico on the phone. So very briefly.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: I agree with you it is a problem. It is challenging to get everybody on board. I think part of the solution should be that as much as possible identify the champions in the community and give them all the encouragement to connect because somebody in the locality need to take the initiative. So it lies with everybody.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you, Jimson.
Ms. Martinez, are you there?

YOLANDA MARTINEZ: Good night, everyone. Greetings from Mexico.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Apologies for not being able to get you on the line earlier on. We can hear you. It's a funny line, but please do go ahead.

YOLANDA MARTINEZ: Thank you so much. My name is Yolanda Martinez. I'm the head of digital government unit and member of the national citizen strategy team for the government of Mexico.

First of all, I want to congratulate the ICANN community on a successful transition on the IANA transition process and all the progress related to the ICANN accountability (indiscernible). The process is a (indiscernible) of the multistakeholder model.

In Mexico, we believe in the multistakeholder model. For that we offer our country as a host of the 11th meeting of the Internet Governance Forum even before its mandate was renewed by the United Nations General Assembly.

In consequence, during this year we are ready to welcome you, the overall Internet community, in Jalisco, Mexico.

The meeting will take place the from 6th to 9th of December in the Palace of Culture and Communication, located in Zapopan, Jalisco.

The IGF agenda was built by the Internet community (indiscernible) over 100 workshops, 33 open forums, 15 dynamic coalitions, and four best practices forums.

The IGF (indiscernible) offers diverse sessions and a high-level meeting during day zero scheduled December 5th. We are ready to welcome you in Mexico.

Please keep in mind that the registration process will be open November 17th. You can find information related to the visa application process by application and several services on the website, igf2016.mx. We look forward to welcoming you in Jalisco, Mexico. Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Ms. Martinez, thank you so much for joining us. And, again, apologies it took so long. Many of us here will be coming to Guadalajara and are looking forward to attending the IGF and participating in the many workshops and best practice forums and everything else. Thank you very much for joining us again.

YOLANDA MARTINEZ:

Thank you. See you in Mexico, all of you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Okay. I've got one question here and one question there and then we've really got to run. Are we done? We're done now or do we need to -- one minute. Okay.

All right. Why don't you go ahead? You have been standing there. And then we'll close.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: I'm (saying name) from India. I work in the human rights and democratic rights spectrum as an activist. So my question is: In India, there are millions of people who speak certain languages which do not have scripts. Definitely all over the world there are such populations.

So what is the mechanism that -- is there any mechanism developed by ICANN to bring these people into Internet who do not have scripts? And asking them to learn a language close to their geographical area is kind of violating their democratic right. Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS: Thank you. That's an excellent question.

Patrik?

PATRIK FALTSTROM: So there are -- there are multiple things there that are done. The first thing that is happening is that language that don't have any -- sorry, spoken languages that don't have any writing languages, that's the first thing to address.

What is done in the Internet Architecture, Internet Engineering Task Force and other places and also other various other forums is to develop software and other features where you don't have to use a keyboard and you don't need reading and writing. Instead you have similar tools that you also use for disabled people.

There's a little bit unbalance in development of these tools because in the parts of the world where people have a high literacy, most of the development is made for people with disabilities and not for people that speak languages and that don't have any -- that don't have any writing language. So there's a little bit unbalance there. But I do see personally some cooperation. That's the first thing.

The second thing that is happening is that for languages that do have a writing language, okay, that do not have the characters and script on computers, that's slightly a different thing. What is happening with those is that the Unicode Consortium is working on in every new version of the Unicode character set, new characters are added. And the standard for internationalized

domain names that are used by, for example, ICANN and also the IETF and various standards, they do incorporate the new characters that are added by the Unicode Consortium.

The third thing has to do with given that the Unicode Consortium characters are added, it is a question of whether the email client can actually handle input and output and display with those characters. And ICANN do have a process that is called universal acceptance that is looking into those issues. And they also look at the ability for the first problem I looked -- I was talking about, disabled people and people that are -- that don't have an ability to read and write for some reason, that they also can communicate. That's how you close the circle. And those are approximately the group involved for the things that ICANN touches. Thank you.

MATTHEW SHEARS:

Fantastic, Patrik. Maybe you can take that offline with him. I'm sure he would want to learn more.

I really apologize. My thanks to you for sticking with us to the very end. And I apologize. And I think we should still be able to make the buses hopefully. Round of applause for you and for the panelists. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]