
LONDON – Internet Governance Session
Wednesday, June 25, 2014 – 10:30 to 12:00
ICANN – London, England

NIGEL HICKSON: Ladies and gentlemen, could I indulge you... Thank you Paul. Thank you. Thank you very much. If we could sit down. We need to start. We'd like to be punctual at ICANN meetings. Thank you very much, we're not the GAC. No, it's... Thank you very much indeed. Thank you.

Just for avoidance of doubt, this is a session on Internet governance. It's a session that we try and run on a regular basis at ICANN meetings. I'm Nigel Hickson, a staff member. And we're delighted that so many people are with us this morning. We've got a highly touted panel, and our moderator this morning is Bruno Lanvin. He's a Board member, we'd like to thank him for agreeing to moderate the panel, and he'll introduce it. Thank you very much.

BRUNO LANVIN: Thank you very much Nigel. And good morning to everybody. The topic of this panel is Internet governance. And as we all know, that can be understood in many different ways from many different angles. So I've identified three possible angles by which this panel may wish to address that. And that includes the outcome of NetMundial, what happened in Brazil there. The second is the NCIA transition. And also we may wish to touch upon the ongoing process of the IGF and the upcoming Istanbul meeting.

The idea is to just throw these three items on the table, and hopefully have an interesting discussion around those. For this, we have a quite

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.

numerous panel here. So I will not give introduction to everybody, just mention who we have on this panel. Starting from my very left, Olivier Crépin-Leblond as the chair of ALAC. Also with another responsibility.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much. Also one of the two coordinators, or facilitators of the cross community working group on Internet governance.

BRUNO LANVIN: Thank you Olivier. Next to Olivier, Pablo Hinojosa, from APNIC. Michele Neylon, the CEO and founder of Blacknight. Then we have both members of the GSMA. We're going to hear, in a minute, from Anne Bouverot the director general of GSMA. Anne has a constraint and will have to leave us before the end of this panel.

And then we'll have a substitution, and I'll say a little word about that later on. The next to Anne and to my immediate left, Ambassador from [inaudible], who is known to many of you since NetMundial. Thank you for being with us Mr. Ambassador. On my right, Fionna Alexander, administrative director for international affairs at NCIA, working directly with Larry Strickland.

Next to Fionna, we have Konstantin, Konstantin can you help me with your full name?

KONSTANTIN KLADOURAS: Konstantin Kladouras.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Okay. Very good. And as we know, Greece made it to the second round, so we should all become more familiar with Greek names, from ISOC. And Avri Doria, researcher and a very active member of our Civil Society community. So thank you all for being here. So with no much further ado, considering that the constraints that Anne has, I will ask each panelist to speak for five, typically five minutes, on any of these topics, any other that they feel is crucially important for Internet governance.

And of course, as you know in our ICANN meetings, the end goal is to have a real discussion. So expect to [inaudible] to queue up at the microphone, ask questions, follow up questions, provocative questions to our panelists. So let me first turn to Anne Bouverot.

ANNE BOUVEROT:

Thank you very much Bruno. And I very much appreciate the opportunity to address the group here. You will then have an expert in Dominic to answer any questions. I'm sorry that I have to catch a Euro Star after this. I'm here to represent the mobile industry and the mobile part of the Internet.

And as we know, the future of mobile is the Internet. Now we're more and more, we're using our mobile devices for Internet access. But also the future of the Internet is mobile as new users are coming from developing markets where the usage is done through mobile phones. In terms of mobile today, this is the farthest communications platform in the world.

We often hear the number of seven billion, or 7.1 billion, mobile connections. So sometimes we think everybody has access to a mobile, but really those are SIM cards, and I think most of you in this room have at least two mobile enabled devices, maybe three. And in developing markets, people tend to have two SIM cards and they'll swap between devices and service providers.

So on average, people have two connections, and we have 3.6 billion people, 3.6 billion, slightly less than half the world's population, who have access to mobile today. That is huge. And that's the farthest reaching communication platform, but at the same time, it's less than half the world's population. So there is still lots to be done to connect more people to mobile and to the mobile Internet, because that is really what we are talking about today.

With smart phones that today already are around \$50 a piece, and hopefully will go even further down in affordability. Mobile Internet, mobile broadband, is growing significantly. Mobile operators are planning to invest 1.7 trillion dollars by 2020 in developing mobile broadband networks and connections around the world.

And we believe this is key, of course, for us as users but also because the mobile Internet is the platform sustaining a number of industries and services like mobile health, like mobile payment and financial inclusion, connected cards and everything.

Because of this, because the future of mobile and Internet are instinctually linked and we think more and more of the mobile Internet, ecosystem collaboration is key, which is why meetings like the ones today and any type of collaboration, is absolutely key and we strongly

support engaging in ecosystem collaboration. And mobile operators are keen to part of discussions on Internet governance.

We are also strongly supportive of the process to transition to a globalization of Internet assumptions. We need to make sure this is done in a safe, secure, and reliable way, but we're strongly supportive of this principle. We also believe in an open Internet that is safe, secure, stable, that we can trust and that is interoperable, interoperability is the key and the root of the success of the development of mobile.

Through a single standard, we are able to get devices to be affordable for people. We need to continue with something that is as standardized and as interoperable as possible for everybody to be able to benefit. Finally, the multistakeholder model we believe is a great model. We support the multistakeholder model. We are also believers that different issues need to be handled differently.

Some issues are relevant at local, national, regional, or global levels. And also, there are some very strong policy issues where if you talk about cybercrime, or privacy, or intellectual property rights, we believe governments have responsibilities and very valid roles that they need to be able to hold. We believe on the other hand that for technical issues, international standards bodies are the best place for that.

And we also believe that there is a strong role for commercial negotiations and discussions between various players in the industry. So we strongly support the work that ICANN is doing in discussing these issues in a very transparent way, and in a very inclusive way, and we look forward to participating in the discussions. Thank you very much.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you very much Anne. Thank you for also reminding us that for all of the faith and admiration we have for the Internet in an ICANN meeting, it is useful to remember that for the majority of mankind so far, the big revolution has been mobile rather than the Internet.

This is converging, as you said, the future will be shared, but at this particular point in time, we're still very much in this world, where the majority of mankind has yet to be affected by full connectivity to the Internet, and mobile is a step ahead. So thank you. Thank you also for reminding us that standard making body may have a few things to tell us about their own experience on keeping governments at arm's length, and also working closely with them.

So let me turn now from Ambassador from [inaudible]. We heard of the other Mundial, so we would like to hear from you. In light of what happened at NetMundial, what happened after that, what we heard this week already. I think we heard Mister [inaudible] speech and also the outcome of NetMundial. What is your assessment at this point in time?

AMBASSADOR:

Thank you Mr. Chair, good morning to everyone. Well I'll try to be very brief, because there is so much to tell about NetMundial, but I'll try to be short because I would also like to listen to others and to interact. Well, first of all, I'd say that on a personal basis that I'm very proud to have contributed to NetMundial because it was a very, I would say, valid experiment in working among stakeholder fashion, and yet achieving tangible results.

This is, I think in itself, the process that led to NetMundial, is very useful experience. One that would serve as in the future. The second point I would like to make is to be very clear about the fact that NetMundial was not a meeting organized by Brazil only, and not also by ICANN. It's not a Brazilian meeting, it's not an ICANN meeting, it was a meeting organized by the full global community.

In Brazil, of course, our participation was organized by the [inaudible] committee, which is the multistakeholder body that discusses Internet issues in Brazil, and has assured us, on our side, from the start, that it will be truly multistakeholder, it encompass views from all sectors. And we were very blessed on the international side, One Net, which was this umbrella organization that was encapsulating all the different stakeholders.

And this is very important because from the beginning, it was decided that NetMundial would retain that multistakeholder dimension in all of the preparatory stage and it needs, and even today's meeting some [inaudible] that was, I think, successfully achieved. The various bodies that were set to assist the preparation of NetMundial have this multistakeholder dimension, most of representatives coming from non-governmental sectors.

All of them were selected by their own constituencies, which in itself was a challenge for constituencies to appoint members, but it was something that was fully embracing the multistakeholder and the self-election way of appointing people.

That I think that was a key to the success of NetMundial. I think we have a lot to celebrate about the outcomes that we were, in my

opinion, successful in that format in which we came to a document which was discussed line by line, word by word, by all of those stakeholders.

And I was very glad to be a part of this exercise. I can ensure that there was no text coming from anywhere that was [inaudible] started to discuss by all those that were in the executive committee, coming from government, from Civil Society, private sector. As a diplomat, I found that it was a very interesting setting for discussing those issues, but in the end, we came out with proposals in regard to principles that should guide all Internet governance...

That should... That was the proposal [to form] all Internet governance related processes, and also a proposal for a specific interventions, specific actions that take place in the various areas, particularly in regards to ICANN, in regard to IGF. So I think there is a lot to celebrate.

At the same time, I would think, I would say that we, and being a diplomat, I take also a somber look at what we achieved because it was clear that not all areas encompassed by Internet governance were touched upon by NetMundial. It was clearly specified in its text that those issues related to international public policies were not touched upon, and this is, of course, a very important part as we take a wider look at, a more comprehensive look at Internet governance, extending beyond operational, working day to day operations, as well as mentioned by my predecessor, some very important issues.

So NetMundial did not touch on this, made a call for this issue to be taken up on a priority basis, but that was... In regard, for example, for security and cybercrime, there is a specific recommendation that

international corporations should be further developed in that regard, so it was clear that NetMundial is not going to solve all of the issues encompassed by Internet governance as such.

And also it indicated that some issues that were discussed could not be, could not have achieved consensus. So there was a call for further work to be done in that regard. So I think that should also take... As we celebrate the outcome, but those who take a somber look because it did not, it is not, let's say, a final solution for everything.

The follow up to NetMundial in our opinion, I think the logical way to follow up, one of the ways to follow up in NetMundial, of course there will be other ways, is to pursue each recommendation with regards to this specific processes, that were identified. With regard to ICANN, for example, what will be done in this meeting, you know, it follows up to what NetMundial recommended in regard to this transition process should extend beyond the ICANN community, should, that there is one or two paragraphs in that regard.

So as we are here discussing this issue, we are following up on NetMundial. With regard to IGF, the strengthening to IGF, as we move to Istanbul and we discuss, will be also, you know, a following up in NetMundial. In my opinion as well, this exercise that is to be initiated here with the formal establishment, I'm sorry, maybe not here because I understand there is a deadline for the members of this coordinating group to be appointed but as the coordinating group will be established, they will start work, I think this maybe the most important development in recent years.

Because, in my opinion, this will be, that will be, wishfully, an exercise of confidence building for all of us. In speaking particularly on the side of governments, I think it will be very important for governments to participate in this coordinating, looking a way that they will feel comfortable working among stakeholder format towards a shared goal.

We think this might be, indeed, a very important confidence building exercise. So it is very important to this coordinate will be set up in a way that is, takes care of, that is inclusive, that is open, transparent. We are very glad to see that is the direction we are aiming at. And we encourage that this will be followed up through the process.

This will be certainly one of the most important developments in the next few months. So maybe I'll stop here and be available later on for any further clarification. Thank you.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you very much Mr. Ambassador. Clearly the NetMundial was the step that was expected in terms of showing that the process could work. There was a big risk taking exercise, and I think everybody in this room will certainly agree that we should be extremely grateful to the government and the authorities of Brazil for taking that risk.

And especially to the President, Dilma Rousseff, and the... And also, thank you for insisting on the fact that not everything was solved at NetMundial, it was not expected to be so. But the process of confidence building and making it really comfortable with a set of identified issues, not prejudging of how they will be addressed or less sold, is a critically important step at this stage.

So thank you very much Ambassador. Let me now turn to Fiona Alexander on any of these topics, NetMundial, NTIA transition, is there anything which is close to your heart?

FIONNA ALEXANDER:

Well there are lots of things that are close to my heart. I guess, sadly. So I guess, we've had many conversations at ICANN about Internet governance over the years, and I feel like there is a large number of people in the audience that probably could add more value to this panel than I am in many cases. So, I expect to have some great questions as we go forward in this session.

But I guess, maybe the one key thing, the point to make to everyone in the room that's participating in this, following this, is the importance of this particular year. And I know there has been a lot of important years in the threads of ICANN over the last 15 years, and the Internet discussion globally. But I think this year in particular, we've had some key milestones of success of multistakeholder, starting with the great success of NetMundial and what it did mean.

And for those of you that weren't there, it was a truly fascinating experience just to sit and watch a version of ICANN style coordination actually be broadened out to other stakeholders that were four micro-film lines. And each stakeholder group got up and stood up in line. And if you weren't there, the government line was always the longest, and people wanting to provide input.

So it was a particularly interesting experience to watch and to participate in, and a lot of credit goes to our Brazilian colleagues for

putting this together. But it really does sort of demonstrate, what you all have been participating in ICANN have known for a while the benefit, and the approach, and the success of this model, and the more people in the world that accepting it, and participating it, and being a part of it.

And I think that was a huge takeaway, at least from my perspective, from the meeting in Brazil. From NTIS perspective, you know, one of the things that we thought, and one of the best commitments that we thought we could demonstrate to this model was to actually take the step we took in March with the announcement of our [inaudible] transition, and actually turn it over to the multistakeholder community.

Obviously with some parameters in terms of what we were willing to accept, but really let the multistakeholder community work through the process. So again, another key milestone, I think, in the process for this year. And then the next one that's coming up is the Internet governance forum, and while we're going into the eighth or ninth Internet governance forum this year, I think there is a renewed vigor and a renewed momentum. And some key takeaways from NetMundial that are going to be coming to the IGF, in terms of how to take things forward, as the Ambassador said.

NetMundial identified a couple of key issues that really needed to have some further debate and discussion, and they're clearly on the IGF agenda. We're really taking this forward, and we're going to have some sessions on key topics like Net Neutrality and others. So again, a good trend line, a good thread.

But for those of you who are in the room and participated in ICANN, this is not a surprise to you. Maybe it should be a surprise that more people

are participating, which will be an interesting experience, maybe when why the ICANN meeting is so popular. This particular session, but I'll leave it at that.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you very much Fionna. So clearly, an exception earlier, 2014, Year of the Horse, claim should expect more when these processes converge further work of the multistakeholder nature will guide us. And the IGF meeting in Istanbul will be one of the milestones along this process. I'm sure we'll come back to this singularity of this year and how these various threads are going to intertwine as we get into the discussion.

Let me now turn to Olivier Crépin-Leblond. The view from ALAC.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Bruno. And I guess I'll have to wear the two hats and then to change in the middle of my description of what we're doing. First, as far as At Large is concerned, we've had the At Large Summit taken place during the whole week, and starting on Saturday. And one of the first topics that we actually touched on was NetMundial.

There was a vivid, a very strong discussion that took place with regards to the follow up. What do we do next? There was support, overall support in our community for NetMundial, for the process, for its findings. Some did find that it didn't go far enough, but I guess this really is an ongoing thing.

NetMundial was really a starting point, and I think many understand that there needs to be more work as to, has to continue. So it might be, and we're still working on it at the moment, but it looks as though there might be a statement of the At Large Summit that will be supporting NetMundial and supporting, perhaps even making some suggestions as to where to go next.

On the cross community working group on Internet governance side of things, the working group has got a charter that it's working on and that it has sent to the chairs of the ICANN supporting organizations and advisory committees. Before that, it did some work into making a submission to NetMundial, and some members of the cross community working group went to Brazil in an individual capacity and participated in the discussions that took place.

Overall, we haven't had much chance to see what we do next. Of course, the field of Internet governance is so huge. There will be a meeting that will take place after this meeting actually, and we will be putting together our own roadmap, so as to be able to see where we go with regards to NetMundial, with regards to all of the broad issues of Internet governance.

It's important to note that the end user community, as a whole, is involved in all of these processes, not only with NetMundial, but of course the IGF, the local IGFs, and also other forum that are not IGF and not local IGFs such as, for example, some of the WSIS and all of its follow ups and so on, in various capacities as well.

Since we're all Internet users and some of us wear several hats. I'll leave it at that. I see there are a lot of people in the room and perhaps they will want to express themselves. Thank you.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Well, thank you Olivier, and thank you for confirming that, indeed, this multistakeholder work is taking place. And thank you also for flagging the fact that, because we're talking about the largest communities of all, the users, the fact that we meet here in London today. There was a meeting in Brazil, they will be meeting in Turkey, should not lead us to forget that other things need to happen at a local level, regional, sub-regional, etc., especially for the user's community.

So indeed, we should expect a lot to actually percolate up from this work. So thank you very much. Next on my list is Avri. You knew you were coming up at some point.

AVRI DORIA:

Yeah, I knew I would be coming up at some point but I had no idea when. Okay, thank you. So, in thinking about NetMundial, in thinking about it was an achievement. I think it was actually a rather grand achievement in that a group finally showed that a multistakeholder, and yes ICANN calls itself multistakeholder and is, but an international group like that could actually come to an outcome.

Because in the IGF, we had heard frequently that oh, no, no. We couldn't possibly come to an outcome in these things because people would negotiate and we would get into that wordsmithing [sic] suffering

over bracketed text that one often sees at the ITU, and that we therefore... And NetMundial showed that we could get beyond that.

It was wonderful in that we saw everybody speaking together as equals, or rather, on an equal footing. And that was a wonderful thing. It was also grand in terms of its transparency. Part of the transparency though, gave us an opportunity to see that even at NetMundial, with all of its success and all of its achievement, at the end of the day, there were indeed some players who were more equal than others, and various wording fixes happened at the last minute because various governments and others could not accept various language.

So, even as perfect as NetMundial was, it does show that we have a ways to go in terms of truly developing a multistakeholder process on an equal footing, that stays on an equal footing to the very end of the process. But that doesn't take away from its achievement, it just points to the fact that we still have a little bit of ways to go in terms of getting to the point where we all do participate on an equal footing, in a meeting from beginning to end.

So, now one of the things that I'm worried about already with NetMundial though, is that we're already beginning to lose that momentum. We're already beginning to question, well, how did they come up with an outcome? Could we come up with an outcome too? What we can't do exactly what they did, so since we can't do what they did, can we do anything?

So part of that... And that sort of leads to the IGF. The IGF, which stepping back a second, which was sort of first thought of by the working group on Internet governance as an alternative to oversight in

Internet governance, as a forum where we could all talk, we could all sort of speak with each other, and then make recommendations to others, and to other entities, to other forum, on how to improve their processes.

It continues to sort of still be in a startup mode. It took one or two people in the mag, to really force the issue of, let's try and look at how we can get outcomes. When outcomes were first presented to some of the leadership in the IGF, what we heard was, maybe in 15, maybe in 16. So it's good to see that the multistakeholder advisory group, the mag, did actually push and say, "Well let's see if we can come up with at least something that looks like an outcome this year."

And I'm hoping that they do achieve it. One of the problems that the IGF still has in terms of being a full multistakeholder outcome oriented organization is that it's constantly on a short tether with the UN, five years at a time, that means it gets to sort of spend two years worrying about its renewal. It gets renewed, it spends one year celebrating its renewal and spends about two years doing work.

So, you know, hopefully they will manage to get by that in this particular time. It's also still kept on a very lean, short leash in terms of having a secretariat. Everyone knows that it's a secretariat that sort of keeps the work going, that helps the members constantly work to church out, to write down the things that are said, and to move the work forward.

And until the IGF achieves a proper secretariat, and I don't mean to cast dispersions on the few people that work really hard to keep it running with pennies, it will be, and I understand that ISOC is helping in that and

that's a wonderful thing. But that's part of it. That the IGF has to go back to being seen as the alternative to oversight.

We've gotten back to the point of saying, "How can there be a global oversight...?" We look at what the ITU is talking about this year, and they're talking still about the need for some greater oversight. And it's something that we're constantly defending against. The IGF is supposed to be able to fill that gap in some way, yet it hasn't been allowed to get there.

In terms of the last thing, the transition, I think it's really good that it's starting, but I don't quite understand why we're having so much trouble getting started. It's already been a couple of months since the call from NTIA, and we're still sort of, you know, spinning our wheels trying to figure out how to do it.

And I guess the last point I want to make on that, is that it's not only the function of the NTIA that we need to replace, that specifically, it's responsibility. It's that both intrinsic and extrinsic of that knowledge that it was the last check, that knowledge that at the last minute on accountability, they were there. And that's something. So the whole tie in of accountability with any transition is something that ICANN and all of us really have to take seriously going forward. So that's what I would like to start with.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you Avri. And that's indeed a very rich way to start our discussion I think, because it not only intersects with many of the points that were mentioned, follow up to NetMundial, NTIA transition, but also

because you reminded us of the time element. That indeed, we have different bodies, that the mag is one of them, IGF, and they all have their own time cycles.

They have their own way of getting elected, getting in place, celebrating all of these elements. And this is something that will require specific engineering in terms of making the best, hopefully generating some resonance within these various frequencies. You also mentioned the support received from ISOC and the work of the group, the mag.

So that gives me an ideal segue to turn to Konstantin Kladouras, this way I got it right. And ask what is the view from the Internet Society.

KONSTANTIN KLADOURAS:

Thank you. Hello everybody. I'm very glad to be here. So, I think that one of the critical things that we need to understand is that all these things that are happening in NetMundial, the NTIA transition, the IGF, and all the other discussions on Internet governance that are happening at a local and regional level are part of a story.

And that story did not start this year. That story started many, many years ago, and that story continues to evolve, and we really need to start tying its pieces together because it's a rich story, and it can provide us with a lot of material and a lot of lessons.

So, I don't think that we need to start looking at these initiatives in isolation. They're all tied to the multistakeholder model, and the multistakeholder model is now tied to the Internet, and its growth, and its evolution, and what it stands for.

If I were to focus on NetMundial, I think that one of the great things that NetMundial did was that it really reenergized a lot of people and it created buzz, it created a part, a celebration of the multistakeholder model. It also demonstrated the ability, not only the ability of stakeholders to actually cooperate, but also it affirmed that through these corporations, great things can happen and a lot of things can be achieved.

The timeframe for NetMundial was really tight, but all people worked together towards a common goal, and they managed to come up with some tangible outcomes that the community has adopted, other people are thinking about it. But it has created, has stimulated intellectually a lot of people to actually start thinking how we can use this experience in moving forward.

So Avri talked about responsibility, and I think that we need to look at the responsibility of stakeholders in a much larger context, and to look at responsibility through the great opportunity that we have right now. We are presented with a great opportunity to forge agreements, to develop mechanisms that will actually allow us to come up with creative in innovative ways of addressing some of the very crucial issues that are before us and that are challenging in order to ensure that everybody eventually gets connected and gets the benefits of the Internet.

Another thing that I think that all of these processes and initiatives demonstrate is that there is not a one size fit all model for multistakeholder participation, in that multistakeholderism as a governance arrangement, is not and should not be seen as end in of itself. It is a process.

It is an evolving process. It is a challenging process, and it is a learning curve. Which leads me basically to the IGF, which for many, many years has been considered as the hub of multistakeholder participation. It is and it was and it is and it will continue to be the place where people gather to discuss, to bounce off ideas, to brainstorm.

But, and I think that one of the things that everybody started realizing over the past few years and NetMundial affirmed was the, need to strengthen it. And Avri said it, the Internet Society has committed to assist all stakeholders, strengthening the IGF, and to assist the community in continuing to work hard and to come up with mechanisms and ways that will achieve that.

It is again, it's only the beginning, we have to be patient, but at the same time, we really have the entire community needs to support and needs to be behind all of these people who are doing all that work in order to find the way in Istanbul to create the same energy, to replicate the energy, to replicate the [inaudible] that NetMundial has created. And I'll stop here, thanks.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you Konstantin. I clearly, the word innovative is absolutely key here. I think this is something that was recognized at NetMundial and has been reiterated. We don't know what the solution will be, what the outcome will be, but we know that we will have to be innovative in our ways to define them, to frame them, to address them, and hopefully to solve them.

The reference you made also to the multistakeholder environment, as not being an end of itself, but the tool to an end, it's critically important. What we've seen at NetMundial and since then we had seen before, is that there is a maturing of the multistakeholder approach, which recognizes also that bottom up is not an end of itself, that at some point a combination of bottom up and top down is what will lead us to an innovative solution.

But I don't want to extrapolate too much from what you just told us. Let me now turn to my left, and hear from another part of the world. We have Pablo Hinojosa from APNIC.

PABLO HINOJOSA:

Hi. I work for one of the more technical organizations in the ecosystem with this APNIC, the regional registry for Asia Pacific. We provide IPv4 and IPv6 addresses in this region, which actually is also one of the most culturally diverse and with a big portion of the world's population and the highest growth. So, our community is mostly made by the people that behind [inaudible] and configuration, and architecture, and setting up of networks.

People that make things work. And obviously, these are people that have created the technological innovation that has changed how society functions. And that is where things start to get complicated because when these societal economic political impact sort of confronts us, that's when governments start to pay attention. And that is where issues start to get complicated.

However, we still seem to be very far from the technical realities and operations of the network, like this discussion somehow is quite on a distance from that, and it is difficult to build the engagement or the connections that Anne was talking about, the collaboration, the understanding between sort of the government thinking and the technical community. So I want to just throw this at the beginning, I have more things to say, but it seems to me, if I can throw an image, and please allow some flexibility on this, but we're still living the world summit on information society, we just haven't reached the summit in the sense that...

I mean, for example, from my community, there is a lot of rigor and need to measure how to measure the outcomes of these meetings, how to standardize sort of behaviors. And I think we are still sort of working on that, on building information society, and finding excellence in multistakeholderism and trying to test how this works.

And I think that was part of the meaning of all these interactions happening after the WSIS, the NetMundial, IGF, and the process that Fiona was telling, 2014, very important ones. I'll start from there.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you very much Pablo. And indeed, this reference from the more technical part of the spectrum, say okay, when the economy and politics get into it, this is where it gets complicated. I've often heard the other way around. That is for diplomats, not pointing at anybody, from our policy makers, you get them into, you know, a certain number of issues, you might consider as very non-technical say this is where it gets complicated.

So we have to combine these complexities, and that's what makes ICANN so beautiful. Let me turn to Michele Neylon, the CEO and Founder of Blacknight. And immediately after Michele uses his five minutes, we want to get to the interactive part of this session. So we now have Dominic [inaudible], who joined us where we had Anne Bouverot before. So welcome as a member of this panel Dominic.

And of course, you start to feel free to line up behind your favorite microphone. We have only one, not four, but that should serve us well. So again, let me turn to Michele, and let's start the interactive part immediately after that.

MICHELE NEYLON:

Okay. Thank you. I'm Michele Neylon, I'm... For those of you who don't know me, I'm a registrar hosting provider, within the ICANN circus, I happen to be the chair of the registrar stakeholder group. The one thing I say is purely mine and is not a reflection of anything the registrar stakeholder group might take a position on, so they don't murder me later.

I'm also involved in a variety of other things like the Internet infrastructure coalition. I dabble around the PWG. I also obsess some ccTLDs. Yes, Internet governance for me is one of those things that is a kind of necessary evil. I'm not a politician. I'm not a full time policy person. I'm just a small business owner trying to sell a few domain names, sell a bit of hosting and make a bit of money.

I hope you don't begrudge me that. I ended up being called to speak on a lot of these panels around Internet governance and the future. There

is lots and lots of wonderful acronyms that some of you understand and that some of you don't understand, and we keep on inventing new ones.

And I suppose the thing from my perspective is, you know, what's this all about? I mean, why on earth do I care? Why on earth do any of us care? Several people on this panel and several people in this room, you do this on a full time basis. You do this for governments, you do this for big, big organizations. You do this in academia. For those of us at the other end of the scale, all we really want is to just be able to get on with doing things.

And how do we get on with doing that? By having a free an open Internet. That's the kind of stuff that we're fully behind. I mean, we're all disagree on a variety of things, and ICANN is one of the forum where we can disagree, preferably without drawing any blood. Although sometimes the temptation to draw blood is probably quite strong.

And yet the governments are taking more of an interest in what's going on in this space. I mean, the first speaker on this panel was talking about the importance of mobile, the number of users that are using mobile. The number of users that are using mobile to get on the Internet. I mean, we look at this in some of the statistics that we see whenever we send out a newsletter.

I mean, years ago, everybody was using a desktop computer, possibly a laptop. Now when we look at the statistics, we're seeing 30, 40, 50% of email opens, it's on an iPhone and on an Android device. And some other kind of handheld device. I was talking to some of the technical

staff from ICANN last night about all of the infrastructure here at this meeting.

And apparently the hotel owner, or the hotel manager rather, was very surprised that people were using iPhones. It's like, "Oh my God, we weren't expecting that." And the reality is that's what we're seeing. Hands up, who in the audience doesn't have a smart device? Who doesn't have an iPad or an Android tablet or some other method of getting online and consuming content?

But the question, I suppose, within this context is, you know, can we continue to consume content freely? How do we strike the balance between providing a safer environment. You know, are governments getting the balance right? I normally skip the opening ceremony of ICANN meetings. I fully admit to that.

This week I went along because I was kind of curious. You know, see what was going to be said. And there was a minister from the British government, I'll get his name wrong but I'll try to get it right, [inaudible]. Ed [inaudible], thank you. And he gave a speech at the opening, and it wasn't one of those vacuous, buzzword filled speeches that we've so often heard in the past.

It's like ICANN comes into town, we'll truck out a local dignitary, and they'll use a bunch of buzzwords. This was an actual, somebody who really gave a damn about that interaction between government, private enterprise, Civil Society, academia, that entire kind of mishmash, that cocktail that we have here.

I was looking for the transcript, unfortunately it's not online, but there is a lovely bit where he said where, you don't want me governing this. I can't remember the exact wording and I wish I had the transcript. And that to me really struck home. I was standing in the back of the room and I thought, "Wow. This is great."

And I'll tell you the reason why I'm here a lot of the time, it's because my government doesn't seem to give a damn, which kind of upsets me. But that's the thing, that we're trying to get that balance right. And I see people around the room, like the gentleman at the front there from Lyncs, oh yes, we went live with you guys by the way, thanks.

And you know, the fact that Lyncs that provides pure network stuff has somebody who spends half his working day interacting around policy is very telling. They shouldn't have to do it. But, you know, that's the thing. This kind of, how do we get that balance, and I don't have the answers. I don't particularly want to have the answers. But I think it's fascinating and it's fun, but it's also a challenge and it scares me. Thanks.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you Michele. And clearly, this is something we've seen. You mentioned what we heard from the host country at the beginning of this meeting. I think it's fair to say that we are hearing more and more people able to speak across communities, whether they come from government, from business, from academia, from Civil Society.

Clearly, the listening part has been taken place, taken place at some point. The debate is much richer because of that than it was a few years

ago. That this is something that, it's a vibration that we all felt. I also took note of your disclaimer, I think these are my personal opinions, not speaking on behalf of registrars, which reminds me that I forgot my own disclaimer, which I'm here as a member of the Board of ICANN, and I cannot speak on behalf of ICANN.

So if you have any question about ICANN, I will be very happy to direct them to Tarek Kamel and Nigel Hickson sitting on the first row. We've heard, okay, from this panel, very diverse views. At the same time, giving us an idea of the degree of convergence that has started to appear, that NetMundial had confirmed, and that we hope to see maturing again as we go towards IGF, and we move along the NTIA transition.

Yet, Avri reminded us that what, characterize as a singular year, this is something very special about this year. We can see our wheels spinning. I felt some degree of impatience there. Is that, is anybody on the panel of the same opinion as Avri? We are losing time somehow, it could be, we could be moving better, or is it the other way around? Please.

PABLO HINOJOSA:

I will use Michele's sort of questions, how do we get that balance between sort of the day to day operations between the technical inner workings with decisions made at the government level? That also effect back the way this can grow, and this can take different directions? So we departed probably from technical people that told governments, "Hey, leave us alone. We're just working here."

From a realization that we need to work together and we need to try to understand each other better. But for this to happen, we need to be meaningful between sort of the technical and the policy languages, but also in all languages that affect different cultures in the world, and this is particularly [inaudible] in Asia Pacific.

Doesn't only translate technical policy, but also you have to translate into all other languages, and I think this is the key challenge to work in a very small timeframe, as Fiona was saying. We have these big challenge, and NetMundial was a beautiful sort of installation of trying to get an outcome, trying to put these worlds together and produce some sort of agreement in as many languages as possible.

But still, we don't have a common yardstick. And some will say like, this doesn't pass the excellence of multistakeholder, and some will say, well, look at what was accomplished in the time that was made and how that happened. So how to get that balance, I think you put the right question.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you. Clearly combining various languages is part of what we're trying to do, and recognizing that indeed, even if we all try to speak specific languages, we're using a lot of English here, for instance, we still speak the language from our own background communities, etc. So much has been said about the importance of coding in the Internet world, and how to get kids to code before.

But we have a big effort to make in decoding right now, and making sure we understand what the other parties mean. Ambassador [Francesca], you wanted to add on this same item?

AMBASSADOR:

Yes. Also very briefly, and concurring what was said before. One of the lessons we have learned from organizing NetMundial, is the importance to put in place mechanisms that will be seen as leading to outcome. That will be seen as legitimate by all of those that participate.

So it took us, I think, one and a half, two months, to put in place those mechanisms, but I think that it was not a time that was wasted. I think that was a time needed for the communities to organize themselves, to appoint members, to select those members that would be seen as the legitimate representative that will lead to a legitimate outcome.

So I would probably not be too much concerned about spending some time in organizing the process, because I think this is key to the kind of outcome that, to the perception of the outcome that will emerge from it. For example, in regards to this coordinating group, it is important that those who will be there, this is a problem we face because we have these high level committees, the executive committee, and the proposal was for those bodies to help organize the inputs that were coming, because we said those are not aimed to themselves to write the documents, but rather to organize and to give some uniformity.

But even though it was very important to realize that those people that are sitting there will be seen as legitimate representatives. In some cases, for example, this is not something unknown, in the case of the

government representatives, the present government took upon itself to select on the basis of consultations, trying to achieve some balance among the regions, but there were some question on what were the criteria.

So to the extent, to the maximum extent that the communities themselves can select members, I think this will be very important for the outcome itself. And again, this was one lesson we learned, and I think, it's not the time wasted to put into play, to design a process that really leads to an outcome that will be, to the least [inaudible] possible, challenged by any participant. Thank you.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you Ambassador. So clearly, the outcome is what guides us. We want to maximize that. And if time is needed to build and recognize the legitimacy, and bring everybody to their respective comfort zone, it is time well invested to maximize the outcome. Going back to the time issue, I would like to now to turn to Fionna.

So, we have this announcement made earlier this year, saying September 2015, IANA transition. We started to hear this week that maybe some of the committees will need more time to get their act together. How should we regard this September 2015? Is it a milestone? Is it a deadline? Is it an objective?

How flexible should we be about it?

FIONNA ALEXANDER:

Sure. So maybe before I answer that directly, and I will in a second, I think it's important to keep in mind something that Konstantin said, which is multistakeholder is not the goal, it's the model, it's the approach, and the goal is a free and open Internet. And this is what pulls Michele and others into the process, because we're doing this not because we want to be multistakeholder.

We're doing it because we want the Internet to develop. We want to have economic growth. We want social development. And this is the tool that you get to that. And the multistakeholder model has these elements of that. It's open, it's participatory, and decisions are made by consensus. And building consensus takes time, and that can be frustrating for people that participate in the process.

And that can feel like wheels are spinning sometimes, but as the Ambassador said, it's an important process to get right. I think in terms of the IANA transition, September 30th of next year is when the current term of the contract expires, it's a milestone in the contract. You know, there is not a problem with us. We have two, two year options to extend.

And I think the community taking the time to get the process right, being comfortable with the coordination committee, getting the right people on the process. Each stakeholder group or customer of the IANA services, taking the time to figure out how they want to provide input into the process, and really figuring out this broader accountability work stream is important.

So, you know, I know it can seem frustrating if things take a little bit longer. And I think in the ICANN process you have this butting of heads

sometimes of the need to get to consensus, but at the same time, people that are in business, doing business, and I think it's an inherent tension in the model, and probably a healthy one, but probably a frustrating one for many people here.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you. So giving time to time, as we say in French, is important that critical time, and we should expect that indeed, we're not going to have a homogenous definition of time. It will be acceleration. There will be time to build. Avri, does that make you feel more comfortable about our spinning our wheels?

AVRI DORIA:

Oh, I'm very comfortable with spinning our wheels. You know, it doesn't make me uncomfortable at all. I don't know how long we'll do it for. It's sort of, as I watch the discussions that take place on various lists, every time something happens, we seem to go through the same set of discussions again. And it's not that I'm frustrated by it at all, but it's also that I recognize that in going through these discussions, those who wish to delay things, have a perfectly receptive audience of people who love to discuss things to the bitter end.

And so, maybe I'm a little premature in the spinning wheels, you know. As soon as I see them start to slip, I start to call that the wheels are spinning. So I feel in the last days I have seen the wheels start to slip, and therefore, it's sort of, I'm comfortable with it, but I would like to see them actually moving forward as opposed to spinning.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you Avri. And indeed, we should make sure in the process, that with all the caveats that Ambassador [Francisca] and Fiona had mentioned, that is it's necessary to get it right, it's necessary to build the multistakeholder model in its true, respecting its true values, and at the same time, maximizing the outcome.

We should not, we should ensure that we are not giving extra power to those who have an interest in delaying things. I think this is something that we can read differently depending from the point of view we have, but we should never forget that the biggest force in the universe is called inertia. And if we do nothing, inertia prevails.

So and I've heard some analysis saying that the biggest merit of NetMundial was to come early with very little time for preparations. So something could be done. If we had more time, maybe we would have been deeper into bracketed text and other elements. That's a point of view that maybe addressed.

I don't know, Olivier if you have a point of view on that. I see you nodding.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Yes, thank you very much Bruno. One of the things which one notices after a few years in Internet governance is that the spinning of wheels seems to be what some might call, in other circles, a standard parliamentary procedure. There often is certainly a flurry of activity immediately after an announcement is made, and certainly when it comes to making committees and putting committees together, we seem to have 100 candidates for each seat.

And it has been very difficult to actually select candidates, especially since we are all the different stakeholder groups and we have to find people with various qualities, including the one to actually relate back to our stakeholder groups. So that's one of the things. One concern I have is with regards to the pressure, the time pressure, because during the time in which one makes the selections for the committees, there are also some solutions which some stakeholders are trying to work out, and which might be seen later on when time is really short to reach consensus, as being fully cooked solutions that would be imposed on others.

And I think we have to be quite careful about seeing those solutions and thinking well, we only have a couple of months left, we're just going to have to take something off the shelf that might not actually satisfy everyone. So we need to keep that debate open, and we need to have solutions that are fully bottom up and that come from all parties.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you Olivier. Let me get back on this and maybe turn to the whole panel, unless somebody wants to stand next to the microphone. And again, this is an invitation, I'm reiterating. I know we have lots of experienced, competent, and views in this room, so the, I'm sure the panel would like to hear, to hear those.

But let me turn the, the question that Olivier just addressed. That is, what would be the most difficult? Okay? What should we fear? And not wanting to give a negative spin to this discussion, but rather to avoid the wheels spinning for too long, from your respective point of views, what do you think would be the major possible hurdle? The one

we would have to be totally aware of that, because it may derail the process?

If you have to give it priority for the whole community, from your respective point of view, what would that major main hurdle be? Anybody wants to pick the hurdle question? Olivier already gave us an indication, but please...

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

It's a really, thank you Bruno. It's about picking hurdles, I think, each one might see a different hurdle, and I think we're all a bit concerned about the hurdles we might see. That the hurdle as far as the Internet end users are concerned is really that the end user element lost in the overall game, because I've already heard of the contracts, there is several layers to this whole thing. It's a bit like a cake, and when you peel one layer off, you've got another... [CROSSTALK]

But no there is a lot. There really is an enormous number of layers and the complexity is really difficult for all of the parties to understand, so communication will have to be very important on all of the issues. With regards to the process and afterwards the solution, it clearly is a very complex thing, because we're looking here at a stewardship which provided some stability to a function, and now we're going to remove that facility, that stewardship as such, from the hands of these stabilizing factors.

And now we're looking at a situation where we need to invent something in replacement, and inventing something is never easy.

BRUNO LANVIN:

That might be one difficulty that is how innovative we can afford to be, knowing that we all come with our own background baggage, possible missions and agendas that cannot be ignored. And how to remain collectively innovative and outcome oriented in that context.

The line is starting to shape, so let me turn to the mic. I will ask you to introduce yourself very briefly and tell us to whom your question is directed, if anybody in particular.

CHRIS [TASSIK]:

Thank you, thank you very much. My name is Chris [Tassik], I'm with ISOC Canada. And back home, I'm a lawyer and I do a lot of governance work. This is my second ICANN, and it's a very interesting and eye opening experience. I've been involved with ARIN for a while, but it's my first ICANN.

The multistakeholder model is absolutely essential to the open Internet, but given the number of constituencies that are represented, and the complexity, I think there are a few things ICANN might be able to do, that would help move things along. And I'm going to focus just on three. The first is, I think everybody who chairs a committee should have compulsory training on how to chair a committee.

No, it's a very basic thing, but you know what? I've been in meetings in the last couple of days where chairs let two people go on for an hour, arguing one point with 30 people in the room. That should just never happen. I know we have to be tolerant and allow expressions of points of view, but at some point, things have to move on.

The second is for every committee meeting, the last 10 minutes should be a required time for people to indicate whether they've agreed on anything. What's the consensus if any of that have been achieved? Maybe there isn't any, maybe it's not important, and even if it's a consensus that wasn't on the agenda, if something comes out, an idea, and there is a consensus that forms around it, why not capture that?

And make sure that it gets recorded because consensus is hard to come by in such a complex organization. And my third observation is, I think we need to create more bilateral opportunities for different stakeholder groups to interact with each other.

And the reason for that is a very basic human principle, people like and deal with people who they know. People don't empathize with strangers. And so I think we don't want to be strangers to each other, we want to become friends. Those are my observations. Thanks.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you. [Applause] Thank you very much. And so I noted already important key words, the training, the keeping on record where there has been achieved a certain point, especially for at a least a consensus, and that meeting is not an end of itself and we should indeed give ourselves the tools to go beyond our usual circles and maximize bilateral interfacing opportunities.

Each reminds me, I think it was Mark Twain, but [inaudible] otherwise, the, who said something about, he said, "My wife and I live very happily for 30 years. And then we met." So, Nii, since nobody knows you, please introduce yourself.

NII QUAYNOR:

Yes, my name is Nii Quaynor. I'm very At Large. Having been a member of mag, [inaudible] taskforce and so on, I offer the following observations. We are here discussing Internet governance, which means that the Internet may be more impacting innovation and mobile. Otherwise we would be here discussing mobile governance.

I think multistakeholder process or approach, does not necessarily mean that there is no outcome or there is an outcome. It's separate approach. And within this community, we pride ourselves in being multistakeholder and providing outcomes. I think with respect to IGF, it was, the objective to be what you take out, like an extra point.

So you come there, you debate, and you see good things in people's suggestions, and you advise or inform yourself. That was the definition. So if you want an IGF to have oversight, then go define that IGF. The current definition is for us to come and share expertise, experience and learn from each other, and then we form ourselves, revise ourselves, and hence that's the reason why it's workshop based.

If it was intended to be something else, presumably the right mechanisms would have been created for that purpose. My last observation is that, at the beginning of a process, you don't begin to ask, can I have more time? Once you do that, that means you are accepting the status quo.

I think as a teacher, I suggest that we try our very best to work towards the goal as fast as we can. And at that point, if it turns out that you are 70% away, 90% away, and you need a little more time to fine tune

things, everybody will appreciate it. But if you start now and say, “I need more time.” You’ve given up. [Applause]

BRUNO LANVIN: Thank you Nii. Please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [Inaudible]. First of all, I think one of the reasons NetMundial, there are several reasons, but one of the reasons NetMundial was so successful was because of its format and also because it called for input to very specific questions before NetMundial. So it meant that it focused the discussions at the actual meeting.

In some ways, I think that the very short timeline helped the meeting as well. Because it sort of forced everyone to get their act together and to respond to specific issues. If there had been a longer timeline, we could have easily, I think, been stuck in discussing things for a much longer time. It also meant, of course, that those who could participate in NetMundial could contribute their input by submitting material, which I think was very valuable.

But of course, you could also say that the downside to that is that if you’re not involved in that process, it’s also a barrier to entry and that there are upsides and downsides to that. I think Michele said something about that, some of you do this for a living, and most of us just want the Internet to work, something like that.

And there is, I think there is real challenge in finding that balance. I agree with Avri’s comments about not losing momentum, and not

letting, that there is some risk without, in our, with our good intentions to be inclusive and open, that you let discussions get hijacked, because that's quite easily done in this process.

And I served on the mag for a few years, and we had so many discussions there about how we could not limit the amount of workshops at the ITF, because that would not be inclusive. But of course, that allows for a lot of noise in the discussion. So I think, I would just like to point out that the challenge of not losing momentum, and actually building on what we have and moving forward, but we also don't want to risk creating this layer of Internet governance experts who speak on behalf of the whole community, and who are not connected with the rest of the community.

And we need to find ways of actually allowing people in the rest of the community to come into the Internet governance sphere. I think that's a risk of separating those two worlds. And I would be interested in any reflections you have on that. Thank you.

BRUNO LANVIN:

[Applause] Thank you very much. It reminds me of a definition I recently read on an expert, the expert is the person who can perfectly document and explain all the mistakes they've made so far.

YOUNG EUM LEE:

Yes, this is Young Eum Lee from dot KR, but ccNSO Counsel, but I'm speaking on my own behalf. I'd first like to start with a very positive note. I think we are off to a great start. The coordination group with,

which is so inclusive and letting all of these groups choose their own representatives, I think that's a very great start.

And this is how we should start, because that, the current group actually reflects what is going on currently. The current situation. And as opposed to the IGF, when Avri said that it was so difficult for the IGF to come up with a result or a conclusion. I think ICANN can do that better, because it has a structure.

It is very structured, and these groups that are structured are used to trying to come up with some kind of a result. However, we should also, I think we should also note that this current group only represents the current situation, the ISTAR groups, basically.

And although there was a lot of talk about IGF, the importance of the IGF at NetMundial, their members, the members of the IGF are not, so far, included. And so, Fadi said yesterday during the ccNSO Counsel and Board meeting, that it is a very open group. And I think the group should start, but it should realize that it is just that, that the coordination group. And that whoever else to include, what other groups to include, what other entities to include should still be very open, but yes we do have a timeframe.

And I think there is a very important timeframe, there is a goal and because we have a goal, as the people before me have mention, I don't think we can expect to be able to discuss as much as we can, or try to come up with a perfect solution that satisfies everyone. I don't think that would be possible.

When NetMundial was being processed, a lot of people were dissatisfied with the process, during the process, but in the end, we were able to come up with a consensus document. Because of the force that was pushing it forward, with a goal, and because we had the timeframe and the goal, yes we should be very open, and try to include other entities as well, but we should not try to be perfect in any way. Thank you.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you. We have, what? Three people behind the mic? So I'm going to close the queue now to stick to the time table.

MARTIN:

Good morning. Martin [inaudible] speaking as a committed individual. I very much agree with the speaker beforehand, in particular with the aspect of including group open process. There is a lot of good things happening at the moment, that's desperately needed, as we all know.

I thought it would be great to see how other processes like, for instance, the strategy panel, the independent strategy panel, has been reporting, how that continues, the knowledge that has been developed and the standing that has been developed there, how this has taken onboard. For instance, by having saw most of the people from the panel being here.

I don't think any of them is at the table. The other thing is for instance, also obviously the build group. And I'm not saying, I'm not blaming anybody for them not being here, but wouldn't it be great if all of these processes that you believe in, to strides towards a future we want really

get it together and seek to work together as well, rather than everybody saying the same thing that they have been saying all of the time and moving on in their own ways. Thank you.

BRUNO LANVIN: Thank you. Please.

GARTH GRAHAM: Garth Graham, Telecommunities Canada. A minute ago, Olivier said something about seeking the replacement. And I would like to make the case that the replacement is already there, but invisible. Last time at the ALAC drinking of wine and beer, Fadi Chehadé said, “Multistakeholder is the most fragile model. It depends on each in a balance of power. That’s a feature, not a fault.

It’s the fragile unity that makes us one family.” But I would point out that, in fact, distributed systems and ecosystems are not fragile at all, they are extremely resilient in terms of balancing themselves at the edge of chaos. And a few days before in the context of accountability, Olivier said, “You cannot have a rule if nobody is going to enforce that rule.”

Yes you can. It depends on your definition of governance. And in the governance of self-organizing systems, the elements or rules are embedded in every element of the system, or in every person who is in the social system, and it self-organizes, and that is extremely resilient. It is not, we do not live in a world that is broken up into business, government, and Civil Society any longer.

The ultimate stakeholder, the ultimate beneficiary to use the development term, is the individual. And the, that's why the Internet mirror their sense of autonomy. They are already there. Thank you.

BRUNO LANVIN: Thank you.

VICTOR MARTINEZ: Good morning. My name is Victor Martinez, I work for the Mexican government and I'm speaking in my personal view. Considering the scenario after [inaudible] NetMundial and the announcement to open the transition process of the IANA functions. I believe it's quite important to continue work in best multistakeholder platform in this [inaudible] in Internet governance issues. That is the idea in this society, to improve this forum in order to continue the discussion in the best place, where technology and policy should have an appropriate space in the agenda.

In conclusion, my question for the panelists is, how we can contribute to improve the IGF and guarantee [inaudible] in the decisions, of an advantage of some stakeholders over the others. Thank you.

BRUNO LANVIN: Thank you for that question. So since I closed the queue, no, no, no. The last speaker just to give us a very brief questions please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Yeah this is more [inaudible], this is more logistical heads up. Tomorrow, in the same room, from 1:30, there will be a session on the transition of the NTIA stewardship of the IANA function, which I think is a little, will be a little bit more practical trying to think about [inaudible]...

BRUNO LANVIN: Thank you. Bertrand.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Thank you. I'm Bertrand de la Chapelle. I just want to throw in the discussion a question that we will not solve here, but that it is becoming more and more pregnant in my mind now, which is what happens to the multistakeholder model when there is no consensus but a decision has to be made?

It is a provocative question, but I do not have an answer. It is something that is becoming very important because in traditional international organizations, in traditional international decisions, there can be procedures, we can have agreement to find a higher principle to solve tensions.

In the multistakeholder model, it is difficult to obtain consensus, and when there is an alignment of incentives, to take a word that has been often used, there is a desire to find the pragmatic solutions, but when there are real tensions and real possibilities to block, is there anything in the multistakeholder model that could allow to go beyond those tensions and resolve them?

Or is it something that the multistakeholder should not try to do? I.e. is there something that can be above the different interests of the parties when there is no consensus? And I don't have an answer, I just want to throw this because it's becoming [pregnant].

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you Bertrand. And I think the last two questions we just heard are the perfect summary of our discussion. That is on one hand, we heard nice discussion guys, but we have to look at the practical things and we're going to have a meeting looking at precisely one aspect.

And then we have the other end of the spectrum, as Bertrand mentioned, you know, looking at the very bottom line of what consensus is and how it can be built in a multistakeholder environment. How do we make decisions in the absence of consensus and how can we move beyond?

And I know that Bertrand is not having any hope that we're going to address this question today, in a minute and a half, but it certainly worth flagging it. So let me turn back to the panel to address any of the points that we've heard through these questions.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

I really like the three suggestions that the Professor from Canada used, and one of them was we need to last minutes to see what we agreed on. Let me throw these two things also in convergence of what Bertrand said. One is that, NetMundial, IGF, ICANN processes, the transition plan, etc. we seem to be arriving, or the trending topic is using the multistakeholder model to produce outcomes.

I don't think we're yet ready to take positions, but at least to produce outcomes, and that is sort of the lesson by NetMundial. And we also seem to moving out from process discussions, and now more into the substance. We need to come up with a transition plan for the IANA oversight.

We need to come up with ways to implement the NetMundial roadmap. We need to produce ways to improve the IGF, as our Mexican said, so here are some very concrete outcomes that are requested to the community, to be produced and seem to agree that they will be produced on a multistakeholder fashion.

FIONNA ALEXANDER:

Yeah, I think maybe just to answer the question, the colleague from Mexico, in terms of the IGF. The best way to help with the IGF is to get involved and participate, whether that's showing up and being on panels, or volunteering to be on the mag, or finding a way to contribute to the financial stability of the system, that's the best way.

But I think maybe just to touch on what Bertrand was saying and another question you asked earlier on which is, what do you see as the biggest hurdle to the system going forward? And I think what seems more and more apparent to me is that there has got to be an acceptance to those that participate in the multistakeholder model, and an agreement that in this model, you don't always get exactly everything that you want, all the time.

And I think that's something that is sort of a fundamental, that people need to come into this and understand and accept.

BRUNO LANVIN: Thank you.

AMBASSADOR: Thank you. Also reacting to some of the things that were said, and I don't want to be misinterpreted in saying that we need to spend some time in organizing the process. That does not imply that we are, from the start, accepting that this timeframe is not adequate. On the contrary we have September 2015 as a target date, and we think that indeed one of the factors that led to NetMundial actually give an outcome, was the tight timeframe we have.

I think that led people to exert the maximum extent possible, the flexibility they could, in order to make sure that, of course, in regard to something that were redlines for some, there was some discussion, but to exert maximum flexibility, I think... But I think having these deadlines is something realistic and we are modeling to work in that regard.

As regarding the transition period we are entering in, I see, I can understand there are different approaches, different perspectives depending on, from where you look at, at the situation. From a diplomatic point of view, from a governmental point of view, and maybe being over simplifying the situation, being over simplistic, I have to say it is, from our perspective, much more a contractual discussion, legal discussion.

Of course, we are not ignoring the technical aspects but it is more of a legal nature, or how to replace the contractual relationship we have today with one that will be responsive to the global community. This is

not something easy, I think there is no example in international relations on that.

And that a global multistakeholder would get together and define a contract, and related to what Bertrand was saying, that will address decision making, that will address accountability, that will address dispute settlement. When we are working in an intergovernmental format, it is we know what are the rules. But in a multistakeholder, this is something you have to, as we move forward, as we did in NetMundial, we would have to be inventing, and being innovative, about this.

And the challenge is to do this in a way that will be seen as a legitimate way of doing things by all stakeholders involved to the maximum extent possible. I full agree with those, probably in the end, some will not be satisfied, some will dissociate from the outcome, but the effort is to bring everyone onboard to the maximum extent possible. Thank you.

BRUNO LANVIN:

Thank you Mr. Ambassador. I would also like to turn back to the first question that was asked saying, that at the end of each of our meetings it will be important to register what has been achieved, to see whether this can be steps to the latest consensus. So I'm not going to escape this responsibility, I was going to use the traditional formula of moderators who said, the debate was too rich for me to attempt to summarize it, and then immediately get into trying to do it.

So let me just, instead of a summary, highlight three of things that struck me in this discussion today. I think in the background, it was very

clear and it was mentioned in different wordings by all of our participants starting with Anne Bouverot, to start with. And the Internet is the biggest wealth creation machine that has been invented so far. Okay?

And what we are discussing when we look at Internet governance is two things. One is how we can keep this machine working? And the second is, how can we make the wealth create, distributed as fairly as possible? These are two major objectives and two massive objectives. And then, considering what has been said about, around this panel, and what we heard from the questions from the floor.

I'm tempted to summarize the elements under three headings which I will call A, B, C. The A is for the aspiration. Okay? Once we have this element in the back of our mind, what is our aspiration? Our aspiration is to maximize the outcome. That we accept that the multistakeholder model is the one we want to use.

It's not in itself, it's the tool to [inaudible], but it's the best we have identified so far, and we want to give it all the chances of success. That may need some wheel spinning, as Avri told us. We have to accept that. Build a consensus can take time, but as, and [inaudible] getting it tried is critically important, because it will condition the sustainability of the outcome.

The steps taken are encouraging. As Nii Quaynor mentioned, we should not ask for more time before we start. We should ask for more time if it's needed when we see that the possibility of success is near, but keeping the time pressure is also an important element in stimulating our own creativity, innovativeness, to identify solutions.

The B, so A is for aspiration, B is for business. What is the business we are in? What keeps u busy? And not just private enterprise definition of business. Our business is to make sure the Internet keeps working and that it delivers, okay? And we have all the keywords: open, resilient, etc. So we all know transparent. We know all of this.

In that context, we have to combine two things, which are the moment and the momentum. This is a critical year, this is a critical time. The moment is now. We should not lose any of the momentum that has been gathered at NetMundial and all the places. IGF is a set of milestones in that process.

Turkey is where we should meet next, around these issues. Let's not lose the momentum. And there are various ways of losing the momentum. One of them is to make people feel, those who are contributing generally that they're not heard, they're marginalized, they are not part of the process.

So whatever could be done through our respective constituencies to keep emphasizing, to keep the passion, to keep the energy, is critically important for preserving the momentum. And the C is both for collective, creative, and concrete. What we heard around this table is not abstract ideas, it's about very difficult complex issues that need to be addressed in a business side, in a concrete, in the practical, pragmatic fashion.

And I would add in an opportunistic fashion. We have to be ready to seize the opportunities. And what we've heard is that, of course, the time as our committee is not [inaudible], there will be difficulties in

building consensus, and just understanding what the other parties are decoding, what the other parties are saying.

But the steps taken and the success registered so far tell us that, somewhere it's possible. It's a very high level of ambition, but it's a feasible, reasonable type of ambition. And last but not least, I would say that although this meeting is not over, for me beyond the discussions we are having, I will leave, I know I will leave ICANN 50 with a strong memory of the opening session.

In that opening session we heard a choir from Wales, okay? And that choir for me was the perfect image of what we're trying to do at ICANN and other places. We are constantly reminded that you don't need to sing in unison to sing in harmony. And clearly, if it's done with passion, if it's done with a sense of purpose, it can be beautiful.

So thank you all in the room, around this panel, and let's keep the momentum in the steps ahead of us.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]