HYDERABAD – NextGen@ICANN Sessions
Sunday, November 06, 2016 – 13:30 to 15:00 IST
ICANN57 | Hyderabad, India

DEBORAH ESCALERA: …here at ICANN 57. Thank you to our audience members who have joined us today. Our first presenter is Julie Cong from China. Julie.

JULIE CONG: Yes. Hello, everyone. My name is Cong Zhu for the record, and of course you can call me Julie. I am from China. I now work for China Internet Network Information Center which is the ccTLD registry of .cn. Actually, I am very grateful to be part of the NextGen program because it really provides me a very precious opportunity to look beyond my routine work.

And to get a full picture of ICANN and to meet these wonderful friends, so thank you very much NextGen. And today, I am going to talk about something – actually, it is some rough ideas in my mind. This is my first time to do this kind of presentation, kind of nervous but I hope I can elaborate myself clearly in the following part.

This topic is actually based on my personal research interest which is Internet Governance, of course. And I am specifically

interested in observing the relations between different players and actors in a different Internet Governance models in different regions, and to know how they are interacting with each other. So I put my topic of discussion on a very large scene as you can tell from the cover.

It is Envisioning Public-Private Cooperation Advancing in [inaudible]. But I do not want to make the presentation today to high level heart-to-heart. So I am going to elaborate this from a down-to-earth style. And most importantly I want to get inspiration from you guys. Please do share some experience all best practices from your experience, and I look forward to that.

Okay. I will start from my little question. As you know we always say, "The international community needs to strengthen the effectiveness of the multistakeholder cooperation on the Internet." But the question is how, how on earth can we do this? To answer this question, I take a close look at several global platforms for the Internet Governance discussions and actions. Here, I listed several of them.

The first one is ICANN of course, and I do not have to speak too much about ICANN because we are here. And the second one is IGF which is supposed to be the main forum for Internet Governance discussions. And I also listed ISOC here because ISOC is mainly focused on Internet developmental issues, and

also global accessibility. And the fourth one is World Economic Forum. I listed here because I want to attract your attention on this organization because it starts to pay attention to Internet Governance issues in recent years and also initiated several working groups to study the future of the Internet and also digital economy. And of course, IEEE which I did not listed here. As I know IEEE also started Internet initiative last year to promote the cooperation between technical experts and policy experts.

After I do this kind of research, I found several common features those organizations share.

Here, I listed three of them. These are just very small hints for your reference. I believe you can find more by yourselves. So the first one is are the organizations, they focus on multiple projects and task forces, and continuous opportunities to collaborate throughout the year. And the second one is all of those organizations took to facilitate Internet Governance discussion. They encourage participants to contribute insights through dedicated briefings, cause and through annual events.

And the third one is these organizations, they engage impact open-ended discussions and activities at the regional and country level. Just think about it. I think you will find that the three points are just the [truth]. But I think those three features

are the main features. They are driving those organizations towards successful Internet Governance discussions.

As we can see from the meeting we have been attending during the ICANN meeting, all those sessions, we can see that they are actually reaching some fruitful outcomes, so I think those features are actually the essence. But I have to say that even though that we are working towards some successful ends but there are some major challenge that we are going to face with the Internet, increasingly penetrating into every aspects of the society and with the Internet is bringing in everybody ways of different backgrounds from different regions and to talk about the same issue.

So the major challenge should be for those organizations of course would be how to engage with the public and private sectors to ensure perspectives of balance across all stakeholder groups. I think I have been hearing those problem discussed, a lots of platforms and occasions. I also think that this is a question that deserve our attention as NextGeners because if you are interested in Internet Governance, you always face with the cooperation problem.

So to face this challenge, we should first know these two groups, the public sector and the private sector. Of course we can see a number of organizations in the middle ground but that will

make their problem even more complicated. So today, we are just focusing on these two large groups – the public sector and the private sector. Actually, by mentioning the private sector, I am indicating mostly the technical experts or technical experts who are working for the business, companies or industries. They generally have the control of the critical systems and lot of critical resources, and they often have stronger current of technical talent and expertise.

As for the public sector, here I am indicating mostly the policy experts or policymakers. They are better placed in a position to use the regulatory and coordinating tools to promote cooperation to do information sharing or to promote some incubatory programs. But there is this problem, I put a question mark here. The problem is what kind of power balance or what kind of interaction should they – two large groups – achieve to make sure that the discussion is effective. So that is what matters in this discussion.

Also I think it is very critical to promote the cooperation between the private and the public sector because of how the Internet is structured. If there is this kind of gap between those two groups, you are doing your things and I am doing my things, you cannot understand how the policy is formulated. I cannot understand new technical trends. I think this kind of policy or technology cannot truly benefit the society.

So to really solve this problem, I find several ways to make a difference. Actually, those are some suggestions for these organizations are listed previously. I think in order to really address this challenge, those organizations of Internet Governance should at least take those [matters] to achieve the goal. I will talk about from this side.

So the first one is identify opportunities. By then you will find opportunities, I am indicating a thorough analysis of the background research of the public sector and the private sector is required. Because we need to know at least what kind of power balance it is between the public and the private sector in a certain country or in a certain region. And what kind of roles those different sectors are taking. What are their responsibilities before we move a step further to identify those opportunities.

So by identifying opportunities I am like calling for attention to do this kind of research to really to know this localized functioning ways of those different sectors. And the second one is creating favorable environment. By creating favorable environment, I am indicating that those organizations, they can use their resources to design this kind of tools or educational materials for the public sector as well as the private sector.

So the public sector, they can know the recent technical trends as well as how the Internet is affecting the society as well as this

economy. Well the technical sector can use these kinds of tools or educational materials to improve their awareness of following all these new trends what is happening back in the country so that they can cooperate with each other mostly.

And the third tool is duplicate models. By this one, [we're] encouraging the organizations to document these examples or stories or best practices from the public sector or the private sector onto have those practices to catalyze those best practices and to replicate those methodologies from one country to two or three or more countries so that people can really benefit from those best practices.

And the third tool is encompass topics. This is to say that we need to encompass as much as possible topics on which those public sectors and private sectors can work on these topics to reach consensus, and especially you can bring the business, the company, the civil society, bring all those sectors into the discussion.

And the last one is to actually [implementary] our tool which is develop toolbox. By developing toolbox where like half all of those previously mentioned for tools really implemented, we have this toolbox in hand. We can share it with more community in a broader way, so that this is noticed by more and more people.

With this vision demand, I do designed little toolkit for our NextGeners because I think if NextGeners, if you are interested in this topic, you should also take action to really engage in this topic. So this NextGener engagement toolkit is actually is spared from a lot of documents here and there. It is not originally created by me, but I really think this will be very helpful for you to help in this kind of discussion.

So the first step I think for our NextGeners to engage in this topic is that we need to tell everyone about this topic. Because awareness is always the first step.

By telling everyone, you can use your social media and you can use your research projects. You can take any advantage of your opportunities at school or in ICANN meeting, IGF meeting because I know lots of you are attending this camp meetings. You can use these opportunities to tell people that is urgent to enforce the public sector and private sector to cooperate, and jointly address the same challenge.

The second thing I want to emphasize is engage your company. By company, it could be your school, your university, your company, your industry or sector. And you can encourage your company to step out to reach out to the public sector, to the policymakers and to let them know your demands and also if you are from the public sectors, I also encourage them to step

out from their comfort zone to reach to the business, to the industry to get their real demands needed.

So the third one is link your work. By linking your work, I am encouraging you to really work as a bridge. I will explain this with one personal experience. In last year, I was accompanying [inaudible] COO to attend one IEEE ETAP meeting. ETAP meeting is Internet Expert on Technology and Policy Meeting.

I was accompanying him to attend this meeting and I thought it was very interesting. And after that, I actually paid close attention to this program. When I saw the IEEE has the intention to outreach to China to spread the influence of this program, actually I go to them. And I think this is very interesting program that we could collaborate and to do so.

This May, we finally hold the first China IEEE ETAP meeting in Beijing which turns out to be a really successful event. We have invited a lot of technical experts from IEEE, this IEEE background and also policymakers from China to sit together to talk about some specific issues and through some rapid fire and breakout discussions.

It turns out to be very successful. So I am encouraging you to also pay attention when you are attending such ICANN meetings or doing this networking. There might be some chances you can use to bring more information back to your country.

The last one is also [heritage] tool. Is that you can initiate your own cooperation agenda which means you can initiate some kind of workshops. Because IGF, the solicited proposals from worldwide every year and you can hand in proposals, this kind of proposals, you can have your own initiative stand to encourage public and private technical policy cooperation, and this will be very, very interesting.

These are just some rough thought in my mind and I hope I can get your response. I hope you can share some of your best practices back in your country. That is all. Thank you.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Thank you, Julie. Do we have any questions from our audience members? Any questions from our NextGen? Go ahead. Yes please. We are going to save questions from the NextGen to the end because we need to be conscious of time. So write down your question and then we will save them to the end. Okay.

JULIE CONG: Thank you all.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Thank you, Julie. Okay. Our next presenter is Rosalyn Liu from China.

ROSALYN LIU: Good afternoon, everyone. This is Conglun Liu from China and the China Internet Society. First, I would do like to thank NextGen program, thank Deborah and the user for any help. It is really honored to be here with you and I have learned much from this program. And today I will share some cases of our ISC, Internet Society of China and the Interest Protection Initiatives.

Firstly, I would like to briefly introduce our ISC. ISC is established in 2001. It is a long history until now. On May 25, to now the statutory is from last year and this year. Our membership may be more than 1,000 the cooperation members. And about 60 academic scholar members we have some consumer interest. We have the remissions. The first one serve the needs of members and to protect consumers interest and their rights. And the second one, promote the development of Internet in China. Third one, assist the government in policy making.

As for what ISC has do in the protection of Internet user's interest and their rights, I would like to share some cases. In 2008, we set up a reporting center called the 12321 Unsolicited Electronic Messages Complaining and Reporting Center. And we always call it 12321 Reporting Center it is easy to remember. The Internet users can report any complaints through this reporting center. They can report through various ways such as hotline, website,

e-mail, and so on. Every year, we receive large amount of the reporting from the Internet users. In 2015, we received totally 1.852 mailing reporting from the Internet users.

You can see not very clearly spam e-mails, spam [hate] messages, [inaudible] app, phishing cyber [code], telephone fraud, spam, many. You can see that later. Also we fight against malicious software. Firstly, we set up a coordination team to publish definition on malware and then we organize the signing of [self-displaying] commission with the companies with the experts and the scholars in China.

Then we set up expert committee to carry through the technical identification and through all we have done, the malware decreased 80%. In addition, we also engage in the information accessibility. Every year we launch many activities such as the assist 10,000 blind people to learn computer program and information and broadcast technology for people with disability project.

Through this project we have assist to have [going] to 32 million blind or visual disability people to access the Internet. This is also our initiative to protect the Internet users' rights and interest and to help promote people can access to the Internet.

Also, in 2008 we jointly pushed forward industry standard to guide the [inaudible] to how to improve what the information accessibility for people with physical disabilities.

And also besides that, we also do something to protect the personal data. We cooperated with other countries such as the Korea – KISA, that is Korea Internet and the Security Agency cooperated here with them to protect the Internet online personal information and the privacy. And we [inaudible] convention and [inaudible], yeah. Thank you. Any questions and any comments are welcome.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Thank you, Rosalyn. Do we have any questions from our audience members? Okay. Again NextGen will hold our questions. We do have a question.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Can you explain you called the Internet Society of China, what relationship do you have with ISOC Internet Society? Do you have a membership relationship or it is a very similar name? And I am just a little confused on identification of this group whether it is a member of the Internet's ISOC.

ROSALYN LIU: Yeah. We are planning to be a member of ISOC and I hope one day we will be a member of ISOC. Thank you for your question.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Thank you, Rosalyn.

ROSALYN LIU: Okay. Thank you.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Next we are going to hear from Fidya Shabrina from Indonesia.

FIDYA SHABRINA: Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. My name is Fidya. I am from Indonesia. I worked in a research center in Gadjah Mada University. This is one of our research entitled "Are We Ready for Entrepreneurship?" This research was conducted in 12 Indonesian cities. And for the data collection, we use survey and we use interview and also focus group discussion. For the survey, it involves 120 respondents in each of the cities. So it is 120 times 12 cities.

You see entrepreneurship has become a major driver of innovation, competitiveness and also growth in many developing nation. It exhaust the growth of employment rate and also the quality of life. Yet Indonesia does not have yet an

ICT-based to entrepreneurship education model that integrate the high school curriculum. Therefore, the lack of facilitation hampers the youth in developing their entrepreneurial capacity.

First, I am going to explain about the entrepreneurship in city. So the development of ICT industries are centralized in cities. City is the [hoop] for economic infrastructure development especially the ICT infrastructure. It is necessary to assess the evolution in big cities which has now become the industrial ICT groups. The similar development pattern may be developed in other secondary cities.

And city is an ideal ecosystem for developing entrepreneurship because it is equipped with various means and infrastructure which facilitates the productivity. And education here is one of the tools for self development because to produce high skilled entrepreneurs, both training and education is definitely required. Training gives opportunity for the students to apply their knowledge to try and to evaluate while learning, envisions the students to be an entrepreneur and to develop their own businesses.

The second is entrepreneurship and education. Entrepreneurship and education is about awakening the entrepreneurial potential that the student have. People need not just the knowledge but also the skill and the mindset to

generate creative ideas and the entrepreneurial initiative to turn those ideas into action.

So ICT used to strengthen the learning process that bridge the knowledge transfer between the teachers to the students. And due to the advancement of ICT, teacher may act as a learning motivators and facilitators because the student can do the fact-finding independently and proactively. And here, the school facilitates the students to improve their intellectual capacity with creative ability.

However, climbing the success of entrepreneur requires a process which in some cases involves failure because by failing then, the future entrepreneurs are motivated to constructively use their experience to try again, stuff like that. To access this entrepreneurship in 12 cities, we use six indicators. I will explain it later that is urban infrastructure and then urban policy and governance. Then the human resource, then the school infrastructure, then the school management, and also the digital community.

First, I will be explaining digital community. Digital community have a crucial role in the development of entrepreneurship in Indonesia. In a way that they promote the utilization of digital networks to showcase their ideas and to perform their business activities while promoting entrepreneurship values. The digital

communities here are the key players in the digital industry because they have their own stories and they differ from one city to another.

Those who have business in Jakarta may develop different products in other cities like in Jakarta or perhaps Palembang or something like that. Usually the communities outside Java Island still attempt more to get the attention for the city governments.

Next is the urban infrastructure. It should be noted that city infrastructure is a vital factor in nurturing entrepreneurship because this relates to how the technology itself is used by the people. You see, urban infrastructure itself is important for the government to create a source of data to improve the human life. Without technology, it will be hard for the government to actually know how is the situation at the field and how to improve the situation for the sake of life betterment for their citizen.

Cities which have advanced infrastructure reflects a good environment for entrepreneurship in general. This is due to the fact that the infrastructure of the cities possess and reflect the economic prominence of those cities. And cities which have solid economic performance may be giving a lot more spaces for the efficient and credibility for the citizens.

Then we have urban governance and policy. For all the cities that have been observed during this research that we have 12 cities, six of them are in Java Island and six of them are outside Java. There are only two cities that have a clear roadmap and efficient to equip the entrepreneurship development for its citizens. And both of them are located in Java Island. Those cities are Denpasar and also Bandung.

On education level, the government does not intervene with the curriculum system because it is under the regulation of the central government. So it is not autonomy given to the local government. Well there are particular autonomies but only two at particular level and it diverse in every city.

The cities with very massive incentives on entrepreneurship really took policies tend to also implement decision of smart city and e-government. This is largely due to the fact that a clear element of smart city and development with entrepreneurship. So cities in Java like Jakarta, Bandung, Jayakarta and Surabaya, they tend to play bigger roles in giving support to the entrepreneurship ecosystem by, for example, providing working space and incubators for the suited who want to engage in entrepreneurial activities.

Next one is human resource. There is a perception amongst teachers and students that the younger generation have a better

understanding about computer and Internet. Because young people are those called digital natives and elder are more of a digital immigrant. So it is more common for the young people to be fluent in using smartphones, in using Internet, in using computers.

The notion of this gadget ownership is proven empirically by a research that is there is only less than 3% of the student who does not possess any gadget. And demographically, students across 12 cities have a basic understanding of how to operate computer, mobile gadget and etc. And the possession of gadget combined with the expertise of basic Internet skill makes the students more versatile in digital worlds compared to their teachers.

Next is about school infrastructure. So the infrastructure and management in schools device similar story with the infrastructure and management at the city level. Sometimes there is even a bigger gap between schools in terms of management and infrastructure, especially those schools in Java Island and those schools outside Java. Like for an example in Jakarta, one computer can be used by… The ratio of users for one computer can be used by three students. While a city outside Java and Samarinda City, there is only one computer in the school. Like the student have to bring laptop if they want to

use Internet or they want to do things with technical ICT stuff like that.

Next is school management. Schools largely follow directions from the Ministry of Education [and] the central government that they can innovate. The recent years, a promise that there will be incorporation of the advancement of computer sciences onto the curriculum of the students which is a really good [seek] now. And development is unlikely to happen if human management cannot maximize the advancement of technology. Therefore, synchronization between technology and human management is definitely required.

To wrap it up, I will mention about a little about our research conclusion. In general, cities in Indonesia are still on the initial stage of formulating the correct recipe for the driven survival of entrepreneurship in this era. And some cities are more advanced compared to the others in doing so by establishing smart cities and adequate infrastructure. Because smart city has the core concept delivers a solution for social issues by implementing technology in areas of focus. Education is one of the most strategic and crucial segment of the city that requires strong concentration on by the government itself by proliferating the practice of entrepreneurship.

That would be my presentation and if there is any question, I will glad to note them. Thank you.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Thank you, Fidya. Are there any questions from our audience or our online participants? Okay. Thank you. Our next presenter is Aditya Garg from India.

ADITYA GARG: Hi. I am Aditya from India. I am a third year law student in National Law in Western Delhi. Today my presentation is going to about transparency and accountability in a post IANA Transition ICANN. Before we begin, let us talk about what really is transparency and accountability and why is it important in and of itself. It is a necessity for us to understand that if there is any mechanism or body which exist, unless until people believe in that body. Unless people have imposed some sort of faith in that body, any decisions taken by that body will have no value in whatever it does.

It once was said by Lord Acton who is a lawyer chancellor of United Kingdom at one point in time that absolute power corrupts absolutely. So you need some sort of checking mechanism available upon every single body and transparency and accountability is necessity for that to take place.

Moreover, our benefits in and of itself it arise out of body being transparent and accountable. Simply because people now believe in a decision making far more, all decision are far more acceptable. Decision making, criticism and decisions allow for better decisions to be made. And ultimately, this is so much very important for some body like ICANN to impose these processes.

When the Internet began, it was only looked upon as a technical advancement. Something for people to go and use to connect with each other easily, share information easily. However, recently – and this is quite like three or four years ago – even the Human Rights Council is going ahead and recognize Internet as a fundamental right as something which is required for every single person out there, which means the body which manages the Internet, the duty upon that body to be accountable to every single person for whom Internet is a human right is just so much more.

Now understanding is the difference of transparency and accountability issues. Before IANA Transition and post-IANA Transition, which were within Work Stream 1 and Work Stream 2, respectively. Issues that fell within Work Stream 1 were going to be issues that when necessity to be handled before the IANA Transition takes place.

These were issues about the accountability of the Board in the new ICANN, the relationship of the new body within the United States of America and to the multistakeholder body. Hence for, these are the issues we should be taken care of before the IANA function was passed on to the stewardship of ICANN.

However, what we will now go forward to are issues that will be present in ICANN once this transition has taken place. These were issues which were not considered early on because of the quick process nature, the fast track nature of the IANA process. However, are now important and have to be considered.

So now there is a shift of gears. What is the shift of gears for? The shift of gears is now from Work Stream 1 issues to Work Stream 2 issues. These Work Stream 2 issues, which shall come to a moment, are now being considered by the ICANN body and the multistakeholder communities as a whole. This being the first conference after the IANA Transition, these issues have been at the forefront. Even in the CCWG Accountability face-to-face meeting which took place on Wednesday right here, these issues were at the forefront of discussion. There have been new debates which have been going on and these issues will largely we will discuss at ICANN for at least in the next few meetings.

What are the Work Stream 2 issues? Largely I have listed out four broad issues here. However, there are many more to be

considered. First is the DIDP or the Documentary Information Disclosure Process. For those who are unaware, Documentary Information Disclosure Process is a process available within ICANN in which you can ask the ICANN a question in regards to a document or information that you designed for them and they will respond back to you with that information, albeit with its own limitations.

However, there have been criticism of this process specifically from the Indian multistakeholder community that this process is very limited in its approach. In the sense, the limitations which have been imposed upon the questions which can be asked when the documents which can be obtained is so astringent that the amount of information ultimately available to you is not truly representative of what an accountable and transparent body should be.

Second will be the issues of jurisdiction. This was a widely debated topic present in the Work Stream 1 issues as well and ultimately jurisdiction of ICANN was sought to be retained in California in the US of A.

Now what are the implications of jurisdiction of a body like ICANN in a state of United States of America? This would mean that any decisions which have been taken therein are now in question to the state laws of California. It is a body incorporated

within California and therefore the law of California will apply in certain conflict of law provisions and certain choice of law provisions. As suggestions have been provided for multiple people that you can actually go forward and change this and you can reach some sort of immunity, even immunity process within the United States of America or reach an agreement as states like the Netherlands have with bodies like the International Criminal Court especially court for Lebanon.

It is internal and external audits of ICANN. As we all know, audits and review processes are extremely important for anybody to be truly accountable and transparent to these operations. Audits take place in ICANN internally and also externally.

As regards to internal audits, what is important is that the standard of these audits is something which must be set beforehand, which means that the standard way which these audits operate has to be approved in multistakeholder community in regards to better functioning of ICANN and for the ICANN staff to be more accountable to the people and their stakeholder community.

Next are the external audits which take place which the ICANN staff delegates to external authorities. What is more important here is that [acting] mission of how these authorities are then chosen and what are the standards followed by them. An issue

common to both of these audits is the things and the mechanisms which are audited by them and what is the level of auditing and review that takes place within them.

Lastly is the accountability to the multistakeholder community which the last three by themselves also are superimposed under. The accountability of this body is extremely a necessity especially in a post-transition ICANN. There were many people who were concerned that when ICANN which was so powerful, it has so much responsibilities all year round, now it has additional responsibility of also managing the IANA function, which would mean that there are too many responsibilities with one body in regards to the Internet. Which means the accountability and transparency in that body just has to be that much greater. While a caveat has to be issue that the body has really managed to retain faith of so many people which is why we are all sitting here, there is still a long way for all of us to go.

What is that we forward? First – and I have to credit the Harvard Research Association for this point of view – is that we need to work on a change of perception of ICANN. The change of perception being as a non-profit body to that of a [so generous] body. What is a [so generous] body? A [so generous] body being a body which works for the people in this regard, which not only helps people manage policy decisions but also actively endorses certain ideas in regards to the Internet.

The second idea of being open in public dialogue which the ICANN currently has probably managed to exceed brilliantly at in terms of the public common processes in terms of their discussions and mailing list which are available, and in terms of the regularity of its meetings and the consciousness of the multistakeholder community.

Third is the need to question status quo [when] necessity. With any review process that takes place, what is most important is that no question must be answered by saying that this should exist because it is [so was]. Everything should be questioned as to the basis of why it so exist and which is necessity for us to truly build what is an accountable body to the entire group.

And lastly is the multi involvement of the multistakeholder community in all steps of this process. Not only has the community to be involve in different parts and then to become one central body. The community has to be involved in every single stage of what is to take place from here on. Everyone has to come together and recognize their own responsibilities.

All of us sitting in this hall also have a responsibility going forward and telling as many people as possible about what is happening with the Work Stream 2 issues, telling them that they can tune in, put forward their comments, understand the process which is going to affect all of us in the few years. Then

also contribute to making Internet far more accessible place for all of us.

I would now leave you with a quote. This quote was given by the author who is now a staff writer in [inaudible]: "In respect to what he believes is the Internet. The Internet stands for disclosure and transparency in a world of authoritarian governments. In a world where governments are trampling the rights of people, the Internet stands as the beacon of hope."

And as people who claim to run the Internet, these people who claim to make policies about the Internet are duty to be accountable to everyone else and to be transparent is just that was great to all of them. On that note, I thank all of you and I hope you have a great stay here in Hyberabad and in India.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Thank you so much. Do we have any questions from the floor? Okay. Thank you very much. Our next presenter is Ihita Gangavarapu from India.

IHITA GANGAVARAPU: Good afternoon, everybody. I am Ihita Gangavarapu from Delhi, India. I am currently my third year of engineering at Shiv Nadar University. This is my first time at ICANN and I am part of the NextGen program, really honored to be here. Today's topic for

presentation is The Penetration of the Internet in the Multilingual and Developing societies through Internationalized Domain Names or the IDNs.

So my plan of action is to conduct a survey to getting to know the status and to identify corrective actions for the community to take regarding the same. India has a population greater than 1.2 billion and according to the Telecom Regulatory Authority of India or the TRAIs, December 2015 reports, the total number of Internet subscribers are around 313 million which is less than 30%.

And as you can see from this slides, the urban users are around 220 million and the rural Internet subscribers are around 100 million. So clearly there is digital divide. Now what is a digital divide? Digital divide has been applied to the gap that exist in most countries between those with a ready access to the tools of information and communication technology and the knowledge that they provide access to and those without any of such access codes.

Digital divide can be because of three main reasons: accessibility, lack of affordability, and due to the presence of language barriers. Now I will be explaining each of these terms.

Accessibility. Lack of accessibility is because connectivity cannot be reach in every geographical region especially in India because it is so vast.

So the Universal Service Obligation Fund or the USOF provides widespread and non-discriminatory access to quality ICT. ICT is Information and Communication Technology services at affordable prices to the rural and the remote areas. So it is a project by the USOF as I said, defined the Universal Service Obligation Fund, the project is called the [Product] Net. They have categorized a lot of villages into clusters called the Ground Panchayat. This Ground Panchayat they make sure that this Ground Panchayat have connectivity by laying optical [inaudible] fiber cables into each Ground Panchayat. And other technological options like the satellite have already existed, they are being used to reach all of the totally inaccessible areas.

The second point is the lack of affordability. In India, there are a lot of service provider companies and because of this, there is a lot of competition between them. And because of this competition, the tariffs are very low, which is a good thing. This lowering of tariff has helped there into the proliferation of the Internet use but this further much has to be done to address the issues of poverty and economic barriers.

The third point is the language barriers and language barriers is something that is existing in most of the countries across the globe. So now India has a unique privilege of rich cultural and linguistic diversity.

So according to the Constitution of India in the 8th schedule, there is a list of languages and there are approximately 22 Indian languages. So there comes the concept of the IDN that is Internationalized Domain Names. It does in this context that ICANN has a role for the work on IDNs while content of local languages are being addressed elsewhere through a content machine translation.

So now talking about the IDNs, as I have told you there are 22 official Indian languages that dot [inaudible] that has delegated seven scripts are covering 15 languages so the remaining seven languages still have to be included in the IDNs. So these are the languages that have been covered: [inaudible] Nagri, Bengali, Telugu, Urdu, Tamil and Gurumukhi and these are the scripts, so hence covering 15 languages.

So the IDNs face two major challenges – the universal acceptance and the adoption by the community. So the universal acceptance is the base for multilingual Internet. So it is like a user can navigate entirely through the Internet in any local language as he or she wishes. It means that the Internet

applications and systems must treat all the top-level domains in a very consistent manner be it generic top-level domain or an IDN.

The ICANN came up with the committee known as the Universal Acceptance Steering Group and it was established in February 2015 that make sure and it promotes effective application of the universal acceptance vision.

The other point is the adoption by the community. I have tried to make sure that I attend all of the meetings and the sessions related to the IDN. There [are matter] officer from their CDAC that is the Center for Development of Advance Computing. And then he told me that adoption by the communities is a very large scale issue. What the government is trying to spread awareness regarding the IDNs, because seven scripts, 15 languages in a lot of population, they are also trying to make sure that the software developers and coders have make sure have a platform that accommodates IDNs. And it is still being done, the advancement is slow but I hope there will be a drastic change soon.

So as I told you that I am trying to conduct a survey and find out the status of India. There are a lot of questions that have been unanswered. So I have made a set of questions that need answers. And if I get the answers then I think I can contribute to

very soon. A few questions are like, “Can you raise the website after typing the IDN in the address bar?”

When you have a page, you have your username and your login ID and your password. So in your login ID, you can give your mail account and your mail account can be an IDN. So right now currently, if you write your e-mail account in a particular script, it does not properly direct you to the respective page. That is a problem I think that should be as one of the challenges.

I forgot to tell you that for a URL, the IDN you needed an xn-- as a prefix and that is when you know it is an IDN. It is still being implemented when I really so I hold there will be a change soon.

That is all. Thank you so much and looking forward for suggestions. I would like you to please share your knowledge because I am working on it right now. Thank you.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Thank you, Ihita. Any questions? No. Okay, our final presenter is Anna Liz Thomas from India.

ANNA LIZ THOMAS: Hello. I am Anna. I am studying law here. I am a fourth year law student here at the NALSAR Law University in Hyberabad. Today what I am presenting on is something we have been hearing a

lot about over the past few days. It is the IANA Transition and its impact. Because we have heard so much about the IANA Transition, I am not going to dwell too much on what exactly the IANA Transition is. What I will be doing instead is focusing on the context behind the IANA Transition and the impact.

So I think in our introductory session, we were told about how originally the IANA Functions were being done by Jon Postel. He was the sole person who was doing that function but this was being done in a contract with the government at that point of time. So it was a government contract with the University of South California, Southern California Information Science Institute.

But from 1994 itself, there had been a lot of discussion with respect to privatization and shifting away from the government. This was sort of being discussed with the ISOC at that point of time. But again federal governments kept questioning how this was going to happen. And simultaneously what took place was also that the NSI had all they received permissions from the government to start selling domain names.They were making a lot of profit from that industry but what NSI was doing was not something which was in consonance with the technical norms of ISOC.

There is a lot of conflict between both of these bodies with respect to how they wanted the IANA functions and how privatization of the IANA functions should actually take place. There were lots of trial runs where lots of proposals were brought forth with respect to how privatization can happen.

There was an international ad hoc committee that was instituted which suggested something along the context of gTLD MoUs. But again, all of this field what took place was that the U.S. government began to realize that some sort of intervention was necessary. So I should move to my next slide.

So the NTI was required to intervene and this was an intervention that was asked by a lot of parties. So there was a lot of culprit law being happening for this. There was I think pressure from various government as well who believe that some sort of control needed to be established over IANA functions. So the Commerce department came up with whitepaper on the Internet Address System. But what that whitepaper said was something very different from what had been expected by most of the parties present who were lobbying for privatization. But what they ask for was they required that a cooperation be formed which commands consensus among stakeholders. And it would be to this cooperation that transfer of the functions of IP address based on allocation protocol, parameter as I had mentioned etc. would happen.

So this is sort of like an introduction to how the ICANN itself came to be. But again when this was happening during the Clinton administration and the sort of keywords that were being thrown around at that point of time was industry self-regulation and leadership of the private sector. But this is being done through government intervention and the question is like it is still questionable by the government intervention was necessary at that point of time because all of that actually needed to be done was to let the IANA and the NSI contracts expire but that did not take place.

If that has expired what would then happen would be that the Internet Society would sort of try to create a system on their own. But the government by what kind of law being that was happening decided that no, there is needs to be something that we have to do.

At that point of time what happened was that there was an agreement that while the Department of Commerce would transfer the authoritative root servers to the ICANN at some future point of time, it had no plans to transfer to any entity. It's policy authority over the root server. So this was the MoU, this is the contract between ICANN, NSI and the Department of Commerce.

Even at this point of time, they had expected that the transition, this future event, the transition would take place by September 30th, 2000. As we can see it happened just now. So what are the reasons for it taking place right now?

I think one of the major reasons – and here I am relying extensively on an article by Pranesh Prakash. He is the Policy Director at CIS. So one of the reasons why the transition is happening now is the fact that ICANN has been a judge [too] matured enough. There were a lot of questions with respect to the legitimacy of the organization in 1999 and 2000 when the transition proposal was made. But I think that has died down to a great extent now.

Then there was this northern affair of 2014 and it was during that time of this northern affair, what took place is that a lot of people was seeing that the west government needs to sort of step back from the role at least with respect to Internet Governance. There were some people who told that by virtue of kind of experience that the U.S. company has in the historical development of the Internet, that should not really take place but then proposals being brought out by the [inaudible] for example, for establishing a civilian multi lateral framework for Internet Governance. And so this seemed like a good opportunity for the U.S. government to take a step back.

Other concerns, for instance, the problem that the need for the transition to take place before an [inaudible] president comes into office for instance.

Finally, at 2005 caucus of the WSIS, what had taken place was that they had required in that statement that the declaration be made, that ICANN will negotiate for an appropriate host country agreement to replace California in cooperation while retaining whatever remains. So there was a lot of questions that the WSIS worry with respect to U.S. influence on ICANN. The tenure review by the WSIS is scheduled to take place soon and that is also one of the reasons why the transition had to take place now.

Moving on, I think just to give an idea about how this transition is taking place and what other functions that are being shifted. What is going to happen is that a large part of the technical functions are being shifted to IANA. While as we can see all of the policy discussions, all of the policy decisions are being made within ICANN in keeping with the global multistakeholder model of governance.

So we already know what the ICANN functions are. We decide on policy general practices, operational policy, etc. With IANA functions, what is going to happen is coordinating IP address systems with respect to Internet number resources, allocating blocks of addressing system numbers to Regional Internet

Registries, maintaining the root zone database, processing routine updates from TLD operators, route DNS key signing, and finally protocol assignments to maintain code and numbers used in Internet protocols.

Again, so now going back to impact. While the IANA Transition itself is something which is quite commendable and I don't think anyone would have a problem with the IANA Transition itself. I think one of the major problems as [Aditya] has highlighted is jurisdiction. So jurisdiction again here what is happening is even the affiliate of ICANN which is going to be administering IANA Functions which is the Public Technical Identifiers, PTI iss also required in Bylaws to be incorporated in the State of California itself. So the same jurisdictional issues that will arise with respect to ICANN are going to arise with PTI as well.

What are these jurisdictional issues? This includes sanctions. The list goes on to a great extent and it includes questions of legal sanctions with respect to changes made in the root zone, resolution of contractual disputes, competition, antitrust law questions, financial transparency. And all of these issues will depend on where bodies like the ICANN, the PTI, and the root zones are maintained or incorporated.

And what is also interesting is the fact that when the NTIA was asking for proposals with respect to the IANA Transition, one

thing that Larry Strickling, the head of NTIA had mentioned was that if what was being proposed was a shift in jurisdiction, then that proposal would inevitably daunt down because what that proposal would do is sort of affect the security and stability that is currently being maintained.

So that might have been true maybe like a really long time back maybe in 2005. But I think right now even if that jurisdiction was being shifted from one place to another, I think a lot of countries across the world have the capacity to deal with questions of jurisdiction. And again, it is not necessary that jurisdiction itself be shifted. So Aditya had mentioned that something that could be done instead is sort of establish immunity for the entity which is administering those technical functions.

I think U.N. bodies for instance have immunity in whichever country they are located. So they do not have jurisdiction implications by what you of the country they are located in. But that is not the case right now with respect to ICANN and PTI.

Again, it is necessary to have such immunity with respect to code DNS functioning and like political pressures of the country will not be felt in whichever country that infrastructure is located in. One of the other legal immunity, one of the other things that can be done is the division of the core Internet operators among the multiple jurisdictions. So I think as of now

10 out of the 13 root servers are located in the U.S.A. itself. Again this is where we come to India.

So in 2015 what had taken place was India had pitched the option of having its very own root server which would be in India. They said that it would be all right if one root server was either transferred to India from by where it originally located or a new root server, a 14th root server was introduced to India. So earlier that was a place that could be made to the U.S. government. Now, what is happening – so it is not the U.S. government that is in charge of this question anymore.

I think yesterday someone from Pakistan had raised the question of having a root server in Pakistan at the public forum. But I do not think there was an adequate response to that because the response that was given was that it is kind of complex question that needs to be answered.

So originally what India had hoped for was that what will happen the post-IANA Transition is that the question of who would maintain root zones would be sort of thrown to a global tender. So what ICANN would then do would be have an open affair, transfer in democratic process with respect to who should be maintaining the root zone. But then that did not take place because… That was a public comment that was issued by the Government of India. But I do not think that was accepted

because what… I think the root zone maintenance function has also been subcontracted to PTI.

So perhaps now the only option that India has with respect to establishing this sort of jurisdiction resilience to having its own root server would be to see where that would go with under [inaudible] variable to get its own when this question can be answered by ICANN itself. With that, I think I am done. Thank you.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Any questions? Okay we have 15 minutes left and we're going to open the questions to the floor and to everybody. Go ahead.

JASON: Hi. Jason from the Fellowship Program. I was wondering about that last bit about the root server. And I was wondering what is the difference with India having a root server and making it 14 root servers versus hosting a mirror of an existing root?

ANNA LIZ THOMAS: So it is slightly technical question and I am not aware of what the exact differences are. But there is a report by Anja Kovacs on internetdemocracy.in which deals with the difference between having a root server and a mirror.

First, what a root server itself would do is that it gives a lot more control to the country where it is located in. So there are a lot of things that can be done with respect to the root server which includes determining how many locations the root IP address will be served from, what those locations are and what hardware and software can be installed with respect to maintenance. And again, I think there is one root server located in Los Angeles which does not have any mirrors at all spread across. There are no root instances anywhere in the world with respect to that root server. Again, just some sort of control that country has which is perhaps necessary in the multistakeholder [inaudible] that ICANN service, that is required with respect to the Internet.

MOHAMMAD HAOLADER: Awal from NextGen Program. Just a follow up of this thing. I really like this question because this is kind of technical. I think if every country want a root server by its own, then it is going to be a big problem right? So maybe mirror should be okay and if every country want some model that I need a root server because I have lot of Internet user in my country and I want some control over the root servers, then maybe there will be around 200 root servers in the world. The purpose is same. Thank you.

ROHAN WADHWA: Are we all to address questions to the other presentations at this point?

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Yes, let us finish with Anna. Any more questions for Anna Liz? Thank you, Anna. Did you have a comment?

ANNA LIZ ESCALERA: That was a question right? Okay.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: You had a question for one of the other presenters, correct?

ROHAN WADHWA: Rohan, NextGen. I had a question for Julie. Thank you for your excellent presentation. My question is regarding the status of some of the topics in your presentation especially about the status in China. So your presentation talked about power of balance but in China as very publicly well-known that the state overpowers the stakeholders and there's the entry of the multistakeholder model now. You remember of CNNIC which is also the part of Ministry of Information Industry, part of the Chinese government. So it is great that you are actually promoting this, but in reality how practical is this? And will the

government actually plan to embrace a multistakeholder model and include other stakeholders in the discussion? Thank you.

JULIE CONG: Thank you Rohan for your question. First of all just wanted to clarify that CNNIC is not part of the government, at least we are not officially part of the government. What we do is like public affairs, so government do interfere a lot but we are not officially part of the government.

About your question about the multistakeholder whether Chinese government is going to embrace this multistakeholder model. Actually a few think back to London, ICANN London meeting, I think we have a minister from server space at the Administration of China. He do publicly said that China will embrace multistakeholder model in his speech in the opening ceremony. But I know that years ago, the policies of the government do changed a lot. I think in many regions that happens. So I cannot speak on behalf of the government today that we are now still officially announcing that the government is still embracing the multistakeholder.

But from my point of view, if we see the practice what is really happening today in China, it's actually the government is really opening themselves to different voices. That is why I am doing this presentation is because they are really taking notice of the

advice of more experts by establishing some kind of Experts Advisory Committee which is affiliated association or something. But they do take advice from the experts now. At least that is the condition.

ROHAN WADHWA: Small follow up. Someone probably needs to correct the Wikipedia entry for CNNIC then. It is not part of the government. And the second part is that the Ministry, we are talking about is probably Lu Wei which was representing China at ICANN 50. I think he since then he left his post in the Ministry. It would be great if there is an update that you can share from the government, any document which could be helpful regarding this later on.

JULIE CONG: I think I can share the website of the server space administration of China. And they do really some kind of newsletters regularly to state some of their opinions. And that Lu Wei actually he stayed several years after that ICANN meeting. Now he is the new Minister, you are right, but that is why I am talking the policy has changed. I don't know exactly what's the position now of the government. Yes, I will share some resource.

ZAINA DEGHLES: I have a question for Julie again. This is Zaina, NextGen. Julie, I thank you for your presentation. It was awesome. But can you tell me more – I have two questions actually. This is not your first ICANN, right?

JULIE CONG: No, not my first time.

ZAINA DEGHLES: Okay. Can you tell me more about your mission about the IEEE event you did actually? From your experience or last experience, how did you think that you can manage or have some cooperation or something to make the two organizations, IEEE and ICANN, relate to each other and which specific field and also topics, from your experience or your expectation after you came back to your country?

So I have two questions about the events for the IEEE and the cooperation between the two organizations together. Thank you.

JULIE CONG: I think I can have the three questions answered when I explain more about the ETAP meeting. Actually, the first ETAP meeting was organized by IEEE then I initiate that if you can find more

information from their website, I am not going to talk too much about that. And when I was invited actually I was accompanied the CEO to the first meeting, I thought it would be very interesting because I seldom see the technical experts and the policymakers. They are sitting in the same room and they talk about some topics they are commonly concerned at the same page. I think that is a very good format.

That is why IEEE reach to China. And I think it will be good if they can co-organize this event. That is why this past May, we have co-organized this ETAP meeting in China. And at CNNIC, we are in the middle of the technical community and also the topic of policies as Rohan has mentioned.

So we have the advantage of inviting some policymakers and also technical experts from China to join this event. And this is kind of experimental event, so we adopt format of rapid fire and breakout discussions format to make sure that everyone could speak. Because policymakers, they always hesitant to speak, so we adopt this new format to make sure they speak and they can talk to each other.

And actually the major topics are contributed by every and each of the attendee. We set this major theme but we do not give them specific topics. After rapid fire, what you are interested in,

we select several major topics and we continue the breakout discussion on that, so that is the way.

ZAINA DEGHLES: Okay. Thank you.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Any more questions?

ELIZABETH OREMBO: Hello all. I am Liza Orembo from Kenya, NextGen Ambassador. Your presentations are very awesome, I really like them. Now my question goes to Aditya for your awesome presentation on accountability. I would like to ask what are some of the best approaches for ensuring accountability in the multistakeholder community within ICANN especially with the IANA Transition.

ADITYA GARG: Thank you for your question, Liz. As I highlighted some of the issues which can take place right now and which are already present is first of all, intra-body accountability and accountability within the multistakeholder community to each other and then to ICANN itself. These are three different categories that I would like to classify here. Let me deal with them one by one.

First is the accountability of ICANN as a body to the community. Within that IANA Transition issues such as the DIDP process in which the stakeholder body and basically any stakeholder the Internet is allowed to ask questions to the ICANN staff and therefore they will be able to answer them and provide documentation.

Second would be accountability which arises through jurisdiction. Because ICANN and also highlighted by the very virtue of a body being situated under the laws of State of California, the decisions of it are always up to challenge. So the IANA Transition itself had been challenged in the court of law in the U.S. although the people was not entertained. That is one issue.

The third thing issue is in terms of production of documentation for everything else. Even in yesterday's public forum as well you could have seen that one question was asked about the travel documentation of the Board members. So in terms of the financial accountability of the body as well.

These were few issues with the body then they review the accountability of the multistakeholder community to itself which again arise through processes such as public comments, mailing list, production of documents, transcripts of all particular meetings, all presentation and everything has been

put up. Accountability and transparency things are broader sort of ideas which arise out of minimal effort upon [inaudible] up on different parts. Largely being contributed the idea of sharing all information that was discussed and opening it up to criticism by every single person that was involved. So that is stakeholder community within each other.

And lastly, is the responsibility of sort of the stakeholder community to the ICANN as a whole itself. Because considering that there is a great power sharing which is happening here between ICANN and the stakeholder community, the stakeholder community also has a certain responsibility in terms of producing documentation with adequate reasoning as to why they are reaching certain decisions. It can also be seen in the documents produced. Let us take for example the most recent the IANA Transition wherein reasoning has been provided the same as it always noted within footnotes or reasoning is given or certain questions are highlighted as to why a certain decision was reached.

So these are broadly some of the mechanisms available in terms of transparency and accountability in the current forum.

DEBORAH ESCALERA: Thank you very much. I want to thank the NextGen for their incredible presentations today. We are out of time, but thank

you. Also, I want to thank our audience members and thank you to our interpreters today.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We will be having our group for tomorrow at 2:30, so you must bring your NextGen t-shirts, okay?

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]