SINGAPORE – Cross-Community Working Group on Internet Governance at NETmundial
Monday, March 24, 2014 – 13:30 to 15:00
ICANN – Singapore, Singapore

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Everybody, we're going to be starting in a couple of minutes. We're just organizing the room a little bit and we'll then start. Matt, are you going to be dealing with remote participation? Okay. Thank you.

Okay. Well, good afternoon, everybody. It's quite a full room. I'm quite pleased with this. Welcome to the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet governance session that is going to take us through an hour and a half this afternoon to take the input from the ICANN community here, and people are following us remotely to try and see if we can add to the statement that was drafted by the Cross-Community Working Group for the NETmundial Brazil contribution.

We have an agenda which is just going to first take us through the actual statement, the actual contribution itself, briefly explain it.

I think that there is a link to it from the agenda. If there isn't, then it will probably be put in the Adobe Connect chat, if you wish to have it on your computer.

We also will then, after going through the statement, be opening the floor. We'll have a few questions to the community. They're all very open questions, but really, they're here to generate the dialogue and the discussion.

The group is here to listen to you; we're not here to talk to you.

So you really are encouraged to be the people that will be building this and building the future of the work of this working group.

With me, next to me, there's Rafik Dammak. He's the co-facilitator of this working group. And we have members of the working group scattered not only on the stage, but also scattered throughout the audience.

Could I ask the members of the working group to stand up, please, so we can see about who's around?

Okay. So the whole working group has got 41 members, and of course not all of them managed to make it to Singapore, but I gather some will be following us remotely as well, but you've seen a core set of people that are here.

We will be asking the questions and collecting your input. We have actually four microphones, I believe, so that there's always one that's close to you, and we just hope that there's going to be a good dialogue with the working group.

Rafik, anything that you wish to add to this?

RAFIK DAMMAK: I guess to thank that everybody make it to attend our -- this session, and I think we really expect a lot of feedback from the community, so it's -- this is kind of a new experience to have a real cross-community working group. Even it was in -- we did it in -- I'll say we needed to act quickly because of the deadline, but we made it, and I think that's kind of a good experience that we can replicate in many other issues that interest

the whole community and to work across the community, and that's -- I think that's what we expect from the bottom-up model.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you, Rafik. Olivier Crepin-Leblond speaking.

So a little bit of history of how this whole Cross-Community Working Group came about.

Originally, if you remember, in Buenos Aires there were a set of early sessions and discussions with the NETmundial -- at the time it was just called "the Brazil meeting" -- that was going to be announced and that was going to take a few months later.

The at-large advisory committee and the noncommercial stakeholders group met a couple of days later and had a discussion and thought, "Well, maybe we can put together a working group between ourselves to see if we can start work on this and put together our forces, if there is any need for contributions, or effectively what will happen. Maybe we could put together some discussion papers or something.

Very quickly, a number of other advisory committees -- well, SOs, ACs, and stakeholder groups joined in, which was very good to see. I think that the effort gelled very quickly.

The only thing, though, is of course it happened so fast and we had so little time until the time when the deadline for contributions was announced that the working group had to somehow work at a very fast pace and not spend months and months in putting together a charter.

That, of course, introduces problems because when you have a charter, There are a whole number of boundaries which are set. But there -- all the time we would have spent on a charter would have been time lost in actually putting together a statement or a contribution, and as you know, finding consensus in a very wide, diverse group is sometimes difficult, so the charter was worked on, put to the side for the time being, and that's of course going to be the next thing that we will be working on in order to officialize the working group. But the charter was put to the side and the work was basically focused on building that statement.

Of course the NETmundial meeting was announced with a very open -- very open agenda, one being the principles of Internet governance and one being the roadmap of Internet governance, and one of the things that I guess the working group understood right away was that because we are an ICANN working group, it's a little bit difficult for us to start focusing on wider principles of Internet governance since we are somehow regulated by the mandate, the bylaws -- mandate of the ICANN bylaws. It has to be related somehow to ICANN.

Now, this might well change in the future. That's really something which we will have to see. And of course there needs to be some feedback from the audience as well as to -- from all of you here as to what the working group should do, but we'll touch on this a little bit later.

What I wanted to do, I guess first -- and we had an earlier meeting late last week to try and see, first thing, to look at the working group's

statement itself and explain the key points that are involved and that we managed to convey in that contribution.

Can we -- is it possible to switch over to the -- to the statement?

Okay. I have the green light from my co-facilitator to continue, so as we're on a roll, so the statement effectively was filed at the very last minute because as in any kind of consensus-building, there are a lot of different points of view and sometimes you end up in arguments that delay the drafting down to the last dot.

Thankfully, we made use of the tools that were provided, both by ICANN but also by other organizations outside of ICANN, including a well-known on-line document system where many people from around the world -- since we are all scattered around the world, we've never had a face-to-face meeting -- all around the world managed to type in the document simultaneously, and we managed to put something together that was agreed by the members of the working group itself.

There was no chance to relay it back to our respective supporting organizations and advisory committees, and we are hoping that within the next week and until the NETmundial meeting takes place, there will be this feedback from the respective advisory committees, stakeholder groups, and supporting organizations.

This, I guess, is probably the first step into engaging the -- everyone and the different stakeholder groups, and if we can actually end up with some kind of ratification or support from the ICANN community, that would certainly strengthen the messages that we are sending forward.

There's nothing earth-shattering about the statement itself. Why? Because we couldn't go into any depth into some of the points that were explained in there due to the fact that it's when the -- in the details that sometimes you start finding discourse between participants.

The general points which are -- which are put there, though, were agreed on by everyone and I think that will be supported by the majority of the community. And without further ado, I introduce you to -- then to look at the first part, which is to do with Internet principles.

Just a few declarations.

And the declarations are, I think, quite consensual.

The ICANN multistakeholder bottom-up consensus-based model best serves the Internet community.

I think that this is something which we've all shared and that we felt there was much support about.

What we did in that chapter was to also say that we're dealing here in ICANN with a specific type of multistakeholder system. We've got our own brand of multistakeholderism.

There are other multistakeholder systems out there. The RIRs are one multistakeholder system. The IGF is another brand of a multistakeholder system and perhaps slightly differently arranged, but certainly it recognizes that there's more than one multistakeholder way of doing things.

Then in 2.2, the Cross-Community Working Group supports an Internet with a single root.

This is something which I think ICANN has been very strong on supporting, and we felt that this needed to be -- to be put in the contribution, since we are aware that many other contributions might support multiple roots and that's been one of the key big discussions for many, many years.

Certainly even before ICANN was born.

The Cross-Community Working Group supports a unique Internet. That, again, is something which we are feeling very strongly about. The Internet being a network of networks, if we have multiple Internets, then it's not an Internet anymore. It somehow breaks down.

The Cross-Community Working Group supports best practices that enhance Internet security. Obviously, that is taken from one of the mandates of ICANN to provide a stable and reliable Internet domain name system, and so in that chapter -- in that small paragraph, actually, we mentioned the use of the DNSSEC.

Then the Cross-Community Working Group supports transparency in Internet governance decisions. In discussions. Sorry. And that's, of course, something that we feel very strongly about. As you know, you're very well aware ICANN meetings are all open for everyone to participate, and that goes in line also with the Internet being open for everyone to use.

And then we've got another part, and that's the future evolution of the Internet governance ecosystem.

So the roadmap contributions, a lot of the other contributions that were made by other groups actually managed to focus on where the Internet

needed to go, and unfortunately I think rather than just focusing on the Internet, there was a lot of focus on ICANN. About 75 or 78% of the contributions focused on ICANN, the IANA function, on all of this, and it's clear that in this community there still isn't consensus because the discussion hasn't started yet. It's just started the meeting we had this morning.

So we're looking at a number of contributions where we decided we would look at the principles and which way we would need to reach consensus in the future, rather than actually looking at the end goal.

The evolution of ICANN.

Well, so we gave a number of principles on there, including that the evolution needs to be driven by the ICANN community. The evolution should support the participation of a broader range of actors from all sectors, especially those from developing regions. Transparency and accountability are a key to all actions by the ICANN board, the ICANN staff, and the ICANN community as well.

Globalization plans for ICANN must be developed with stakeholder support and take into account impact on stakeholders. And we mean, really, all stakeholders here.

Negotiations with the U.S. Department of Commerce on the future of ICANN should take into account input received from the community.

Of course at the time when this statement was drafted and then filed as a contribution to NETmundial, we had not received the letter from the U.S. Department of Commerce, and therefore the word "negotiations" came into the sentence.

I'm not quite sure whether there's any negotiation required now. There probably will be for some of the points, but at least this thing has already started.

And then next, in 3.2, evolution of ICANN, the globalization of ICANN, this was one of the topics which, as we know, is now really firmly on the table, and again, all we did was to just provide the guidelines as to how we think this should be dealt with as far as the community is concerned and who effectively should be looking at the problems in the process itself.

International frameworks for ICANN's accountability, just a very small chapter, finally.

And that's to deal with the Affirmation of Commitments, as we are aware, and it says in there that any globalization of ICANN would require the creation of a new framework for ICANN's accountability.

They all sound like very obvious points, but trust me, reading some of the contributions going to the NETmundial meeting, you suddenly find out that there are a lot of erroneous contributions. You'll find contributions that are not actually accurate, and one of the things that we were quite careful about -- or should I say very careful about -- was accuracy.

So at least whilst this might not be ground-breaking in any way, this actually is an accurate contribution.

And one of the things we wanted to also add to this was a part -- a second part, which is in effect an appendix providing a reliable

explanation as to what is a multistakeholder model, what is a multilateral model, of course always in the ICANN context.

And then providing an example of what the different parts of ICANN are.

So explanation as to what the Address Supporting Organization is, the Generic Name Supporting Organization, the Country Code Name Supporting Organization. And this was triggered by some contributions that we read that appeared to be somehow misled by their understanding, their own understanding, of the ICANN component organizations.

One contribution, for example, asked that the GAC would need to become multistakeholder, and that -- that somehow doesn't quite fit with the function of the GAC, and that's some of the discussions and the things that we saw.

So that's the contribution in itself. I guess really from here, what we're asking is, what did we miss in that -- in that contribution. What could we add. What are the messages that we need to send to NETmundial.

None of us know yet whether we will be traveling to Brazil or not. Some of us have received an invitation, but there's always the concern of funding and so on, but we hope that there will be at least a small number of people that will be able to push this contribution in Brazil and to defend it and to engage in the negotiations and discussions that take place over there.

Rafik?

EN

RAFIK DAMMAK: Thanks, Olivier, to explain about the statement.

I guess now we are moving to the third item of the agenda, which is really about the community input, and we have several questions -- Ergys?

Just please put the question.

So we have -- it's split in three parts.

The first is to say the topic is about the document itself, and to see how the -- also the ICANN community will be involved with the NETmundial, and so it's to cover that part and to get the feedback.

So we are proposing several questions, I mean, to help you in the way that you -- to respond and to -- also to give us, I mean, some idea what you think is missing in the contribution.

Probably we didn't cover everything, so that's the time to just write -- direct us to what you think is missing.

And then the second topic is, I think it's just maybe about NETmundial and then beyond NETmundial, I think, because this working group is focusing on Internet governance issues, and for this year I think we have a lot of events that may interest us as a community, and so also we have other questions trying to trigger, I mean, your interest.

And the final part is really open question, so it's up to you to bring what you think that we need. I mean, it may be a question to ask, but probably to the other members of the community, and so you have, in

the three parts, enough room to give your input, to ask the community, to ask the working group.

Do we have the question on -- yeah, okay.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, Rafik. It's Olivier speaking. I can see on the screen -- I think you can see them behind. If we can scroll up a little bit and just have from Question 1 to 7 please.

Now, you're not bound to, of course, answer the questions but these are meant to stimulate your mind into anything, "Ahhh, maybe there's something that's been forgotten."

The first one, I guess, is one that's actually made to any of the supporting organizations or the SOs or ACs. It's a bit small, yeah. That is very small.

Maybe -- can you zoom into it, somehow?

They're trying to do that.

If there are any SO, ACs, or SGs that have already prepared some feedback on this -- I'm not quite sure whether there has been any time for anyone to work on this -- then we very much welcome this to be either read to the record or if you want to email it to the working group, you're very welcome to do so.

We've got a number of people standing in the audience with a microphone, and rather than people queueing up at a mic, we thought it would be better for us to do a little bit of running around and things,

because on the one hand, it's actually better than having people wait for 15 minutes and then totally forget what they were going to say, and then afterwards, of course, it's less worrying when you can just think of something, put your hand up, and get things going.

So we've already got one, and so Marilyn's put her hand up. And the people with the mics should be able -- and we've got one over there. So let's start with the one over on the -- the furthest one.

MICHELE NEYLON: Hi. Good afternoon. It's Michele Neylon, chair of the registrar stakeholder group.

And speaking, I suppose, as chair of the registrar stakeholder group, as a group I suspect we will probably comment on this but not straight away, and I will try to see if I can get our members to comment potentially individually. As an actual SG, we might not be able to do so.

With respect to this entire initiative between -- with the cross-community group, I think just it's more of a reflection, I suppose, or an observation. It's been quite amusing because at times we've found very, very diverse interests coming together against a kind of -- an almost common enemy or a common goal. So I think that this is the kind of thing that there should be more of instead of this kind of silo-type scenario that we end up having a lot of the time.

You know, I think a lot of people forget that most people who participate in ICANN and in other Internet governance initiatives do believe in a multistakeholder model and do share many common goals,

but they tend to forget that because of shortsighted -- shortsighted, rather kind of extraneous and rather abstract goals.

I mean, there are certain things that we can all agree on. There's probably lots of things we won't agree on, but why -- where alcohol comes into the equation, and after a bit of alcohol, it's all so much better. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Michele, as long as you take the tab.

MICHELE NEYLON: (off microphone).

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: The ALAC has no funding for this unfortunately and neither does the working group.

George?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you, yes. Can you hear me? George Sadowsky, member of the board speaking on behalf of only myself.

Two things. First of all, I appreciate that this was done in a relative hurry. The whole NETmundial process is accelerated from what we normally -- from what we normally expect.

And so there are clearly things that now in retrospect you could improve, you could add, and that's fine.

But this is closed now. You've submitted it, and it's part of the submission. Yet, you're asking essentially for additions and corrections and all the rest. That's fine. But you must have some idea of how you're going to use this in the future. If it was only for Brazil, we wouldn't be here discussing it.

The secondary I'd like -- I think Maria should comment on this. It doesn't take much calculation to know if there are 700 or 800 people there and there are 510 minutes of possible talking that we're not going to be able to do a lot of discussion there.

So question is: How can -- how can statements like this be made more visible than others, perhaps? How can we bring this to the forefront? How can we make sure these are considered as opposed to just being in a cluster of things that are similar?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you very much, George. Olivier speaking. I'm not quite sure we are going to provide you with immediate answers to these questions. They are very valid, indeed.

With regards to how this work -- how is this working group going to use the contribution, as I mentioned earlier, it is hoped that we will be able to offer some fuller contribution when face-to-face in Brazil. I'm not quite sure how the contributions are going to be used by the Brazil -- by the NETmundial committee, whether they're going to be all put in one page and square brackets are going to be put around sentences or whether it's going to be a case of summarizing all the contributions into one and then perhaps discussing the separate paragraphs and so on, by

which we could take in from the additional information we have here to be able to put forward the point that was given here.

Your second question is one where we, of course, would like to have the widest amount of distribution and get the most input possible.

I'm afraid we haven't really discussed this very much. One of the things, of course, is to keep an email address open after the end of this meeting to be able to collect more input. Another one would be to launch a public comment period. I'm not quite sure how that would relate to the ICANN process since the working group itself does not have a charter and usually public comment periods are launched by advisory committees or supporting organizations.

But that's obviously something we're going to be have to work out pretty quickly if we want to be in time for the NETmundial meeting.

Louie? Okay. No, there isn't.

Okay. Bertrand and then we've got the other corner. Bertrand de La Chapelle.

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: I'm Bertrand de La Chapelle. I'm the director of the Internet and Jurisdiction Project. First of all, congrats for not having spent the initial time drafting a charter. I'm always surprised at the amount of time it requires because usually people try to solve the issue when they draft the charter. So it's probably good that you just jumped into doing the work.

Not applicable everywhere, of course, but here it was appropriate.

The second thing is it is always delicate -- I encourage people to broaden the scope of what they're doing, but I wonder whether it is necessary for a group that is within ICANN but has the merit of being cross-community to limit itself to comments regarding ICANN and its evolution.

The NETmundial meeting is not going to be only about ICANN, I hope. It is about the evolution. If I make the full comment, there is the principles on one hand but, on the other hand, there's the roadmap for further evolution of the multistakeholder Internet governance ecosystem.

Each word in this long sentence means something, but the evolution of the ecosystem is not only the evolution of the existing organizations, it is also how will we collectively develop new mechanisms, new frameworks that will produce regimes, that will produce arrangements, that will produce governance networks for issues that are not within the remit of ICANN, that are not within the remit of the governance of the Internet, as I always make the distinction.

And so one of the benefits of a discussion among people who participate in ICANN is also to see how much of the way ICANN works but also other organizations work in organizing working groups, governance networks, stakeholder discussions can be transposed in another environment.

And in a nutshell, the question behind this is how much can the multistakeholder model that has worked perfectly, or rather well, for, quote-unquote, technical issues or governance of the Internet, how much can it be transposed as is or with modifications for issues related

to privacy, freedom of expression, conflict of norms, et cetera? I think it would be in addition to the scope of your discussion that would be useful.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you, Bertrand.

Just to let you all know, we'll take the input in. And the working group has a face-to-face session on Wednesday and that's when we'll then be -- well, we have rapporteurs that are straight throughout the room taking notes. And then we will be comparing notes and seeing what we can do with it.

Let's go over to the back with Jonathan Zuck.

JONATHAN ZUCK: Hi, Jonathan Zuck from ACT but speaking for myself. I think we are entering into so many discussions all at once, it is going to be very important for us to establish a vocabulary that we all use over and over and over again, almost to the point of dogma and almost to the point of mantra. And I see some couplings that have surfaced that I think are probably very necessary.

One is we probably shouldn't ever mention "multistakeholder" without mentioning "bottom-up multistakeholder process." And really having an understanding of what that process means allows that word not to be co-opted to mean something else. I also don't think we should ever mention "transparency" without mentioning "accountability" because

"transparency" on its own is noting but the entertainment we associate with reality television.

And so the type of transparency becomes critical as well. If it is not functional transparency that serves the ultimate goal of accountability, then it is of no use to us. So it doesn't stand alone as a goal. So, again, I don't think we should ever talk about transparency except in the context of accountability because that's how we will judge transparency.

Another thing that I think is going to continue to become an issue that we're going to have to address is the degree to which there is a distinction between ICANN the institution and ICANN the community. And we can't necessarily use those terms interchangeably as well and need to make sure that we're very specific in those contexts, especially since we are now trying to figure out how the institution becomes accountable to the community. They cannot be considered to be the same word.

I just wanted to get some of those definitions out there and make sure they are part of everything we do so we all say things the same way, in a unified way, and in a consistent way over and over and over again. Thanks.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Jonathan. Actually on your last point regarding ICANN the institution versus ICANN the community, the working group did start work on this. But there was no consensus in the short amount of time that we had. So there's still going to be discussion on that.

Certainly, it's obvious that to different people in different parts of the organization it means something slightly different. And sometimes to different individuals within the same organization, it means something different. So that's very much welcome.

There's a question at the front. I'm not sure -- there's quite a few questions at the front. I don't know where the mics are.

So we start with Gonzalo.

GONZALO NAVARRO: Thank you very much. Gonzalo Navarro, member of the board. I would like to reinforce the idea of having a public comment period about the contributions that you are making. Many of you guys in the last panel we had about the IANA evolution process stated that all the community is not all here, I mean inside these walls or in this very room.

And I think it is very important to bring the opportunity to others to contribute or even to support or express this agreement about what the community is saying.

So no matter if we don't have a charter or there is no procedural way to trigger that at this moment, we have to think about it and have to do it soon. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Gonzalo.

Just one comment regarding a public comment period, as you know, the standard length of a public comment period is 21 days plus 21 days. That makes it 42 days.

The NETmundial takes place on the 23rd of next month. So that's less than 42 days away. So we're going to have to work something out as well there. It sounds really as though we're doing things a bit -- a bit chaotically.

But then Fadi Chehade this morning did mention we did have some pretty serious times ahead of us. So maybe chaos might be one of the -- organized chaos may be one of the things that we need to deal with on this short notice specifically in this respect.

George?

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Gonzalo brought up a very good point. I think that we shouldn't treat NETmundial as the end of this discussion. It is really the beginning. And so the public comment period would be very useful in terms of your extending this document and refining it for future activity.

Milton?

MILTON MUELLER: Okay. So on a whole, I thought the statement was pretty good for something that has been put together so quickly. Just a few comments about it where I would pick out things that I might have done differently.

I think your description of ICANN as a multistakeholder institution seems to have been made with rose-colored glasses on in a sense that it presents an idealized version of how a multistakeholder institution is supposed to function. And it sort of implies that ICANN is like that now. So that might be something that you could moderate your language a little bit about.

With respect to the root, the single root, we -- in some discussions on the 1net list, I got into one way to bridge the gap between people who might believe in multiple roots and those believing in the single root was to talk about a globally unified root. That is to say, there could be multiple roots but they are made compatible with each other so that uniqueness is maintained.

It's probably not a terribly important issue actually at this moment but as a general principle, something to keep in mind.

With respect to the roadmap, you're asking us: What is our group's position on these issues?

I just wanted to inform you that the Noncommercial Stakeholders Group has passed a statement on the Commerce Department announcement and the IANA transition, which is very compatible with what you've said here. I think Rafik can send a link to that to the list because it is a Google Doc, not necessarily endorsing any specific vendor.

[Laughter]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: You just did, Milton.

MILTON MUELLER: I didn't endorse any vendor. That's just where it is. It is a fact. It's there. It is on Google Drive.

[Laughter]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: How much was that worth?

[Laughter]

MILTON MUELLER: Ka-ching.

Google loves me so much, I'm sure.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Three times.

[Laughter]

MILTON MUELLER: Anyway, we did do a good statement about that. And I think we would like to see what other stakeholder groups are saying. This is one of the potential problems with your statement, is that it obviously was written before the Commerce Department announcement. Not much you can do about that now. But you might want to look at our statement as to how we reacted to that.

Alan?

ALAN GREENBERG: Alan Greenberg. Back on the public comment issue for a second, given how fast we moved on the NTIA statement and given how important this overall issue has been described by the chair, the board, and the CEO, hopefully, ICANN internal procedures and bureaucracy can be quickly put out of the way if we really wanted to put this out for public comment quickly. I'd hate to think our own procedures would delay it for three weeks as they otherwise might.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Any more comments? So I take it everything and anything that ever had to be said about bottom-up multistakeholder system and everything else is included in that statement? Oh, it isn't.

Okay, Marilyn Cade.

MARILYN CADE: I note my name is Marilyn Cade. I know a lot of people in this room think I'm acting as the mic person just so I have my own mic, but I promise that's not the case.

I am going to make a statement. But I am really going to ask you guys to think about what you can say. We need to hear from you.

I did want to make a statement about why from my point of view as one of the participants, why it wasn't possible to address all -- what I would call all three tracks. One, obviously, the NTIA statement announcement

came after. But I think we were also -- within the cross-community working group, we were very focused on trying to have a statement to go in that could come from the community into NETmundial because many people coming to NETmundial will not actually know about the ICANN community.

And so we were filling a void. Now, we need to hear more from you about whether, you know, we did a good job on it. And I hope you'll keep giving us comments.

But I like the comment that we've heard so far that maybe we could ask for an expedited public comment, thinking that after all, NETmundial is not the end of a process. It is an important step on the road.

So I like that. But I would really urge all of you to keep the microphone away from me and take it.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Marilyn.

And, certainly, there has been a precedent with regards to an expedited public comment period. I think the board on one occasion asked a question in a shorter amount of time than an initial comment and then a reply period, so there might be some movement on this.

Just reading through some of the questions in there, I wonder, we haven't had much from anyone telling us, basically, what does the ICANN community advise that ICANN's participation should be at the Brazil meeting? I think it would be interesting to hear from the community what you think the participation of ICANN should be.

We've heard all sorts of rumors, that ICANN -- it was actually an ICANN meeting, that then it was not and ICANN had nothing to do with it, and then ICANN was hosting it and then ICANN was not. Well, anyway, it would be interesting to find out what this community thinks ICANN's involvement should be there.

Louie, you got -- John Curran.

JOHN CURRAN:

John Curran, President and CEO of ARIN. I'm actually answering a prior question so sorry. It is following up on the comments of Mr. Zuck, I believe.

It would be nice if this is going to be an ongoing group and document talking about Internet governance and not just on the focus of NETmundial. It would be good when you use the term "accountable," accountability is not only to someone like the Internet community but it is also accountability for something. You're accountable for accomplishing something or for holding to certain principles. You're not just accountable in general.

And so it would be helpful when using the term of saying, "We're accountable to this group or this body" to say what you actually mean that accountability is. Do you mean you hold to certain principles or some other statement.

Because where -- a lot of this are throwing this word around pretty frequently. It really doesn't matter who you're accountable to if you don't have agreement on what you're accountable for.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: I'm accountable for nothing to everyone.

[Laughter]

So...

We have more -- it is funny. Everyone is pointing to everyone else, so it is very difficult to find out.

Okay, Chuck Gomes.

CHUCK GOMES: Thanks. First of all, I think your question -- latest question, question on what should ICANN's participation be in NETmundial needs some clarification. We constantly struggle with this. When you say "ICANN," do you mean the ICANN community or the ICANN staff? I guess my first question to you before I respond is: Did you intend one or the other?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Both.

CHUCK GOMES: Both, okay. I'll respond to both with my own personal assessment.

ICANN the community, they should participate. Obviously, none of us as a community member can represent the whole community but we certainly can represent ourselves and the groups that we may represent.

With regard to ICANN staff, I think they have to be very cautious because ICANN is a community. It is not just staff. It is not just the organization. It is not just the corporation.

So to the extent that there are factual -- there's factual information that needs to be clarified, that's really appropriate to make sure the facts are straight and that people are operating with the accurate assumptions.

To the extent that they're representing any personal views or personal ambitions for the corporation or whatever, I think some caution is in order there unless there has been consensus in the community to support that.

>>   We have Sam.

SAM LANFRANCO: Sam Lanfranco from NPOC but I'm speaking as a social scientist and economist.

One way to think about ICANN getting to NETmundial is to have the image of a lake and a stone. Arriving at NETmundial is like a stone hitting the water. ICANN wants to hit it with a certain amount of clarity to minimize uncertainty and so forth. But once it hits the water, it is going back into the air and two things are happening. Ripples are going to radiate out from NETmundial.

What's important is to watch those ripples, see what happened, learn the lessons because ICANN is in the air again. It lands in London a few months later. It's in the air. Ripples go out. It is in the air again. It

EN

bounces off of Turkey a little later on. It keeps going. It is an ongoing process, and there is no point in time at which somebody says, It has crystallized. It is in the bottle. We know what it is.

So it is this continuous process. And what a bottom-up multistakeholder model is, is going to take probably a hundred years to get to a major milestone.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you, Sam. I guess the milestones are passing by at such a rate that it's just an ongoing milestone, I guess. George, you wanted to -- we have a mic here. Great.

GEORGE SADOWSKY: Thank you. George Sadowsky again. Chuck said much of what I wanted to say, but there's -- there's another aspect to this, and that is that while we have our 510 minutes in the plenary session, there are going to be a lot of hallway conversations and a lot of informal meetings. And I would hope that a fair number of the members of the community would be there because we need to have our views shared. It's going to be a lot easier in some respects to share them one-on-one or one in few groups than in a crowded and rushed plenary.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. We have Patrik.

PATRIK FALTSTROM: Patrik Faltstrom chair of SSAC. Just like Michele, I need to express some concerns. Of course, I also have been able to participate fully based on -- based on full -- based on the result of the consensus-based process, the processes that we are using inside SSAC. That said, we are working on, given that this working group has been getting such a sort of important place in the whole ICANN structure, we have started to try to look at a simpler way of reaching consensus where we can participate more fully. We are not there yet.

I hope that change process can go fast enough to be able to actually be able to participate. But I think all of us should acknowledge that we -- inside ICANN community -- I'm trying to use my words carefully -- we do have in each one of the stakeholder groups a consensus-based process that evolved over time that we believe in, but I claim personally that we don't have a multistakeholder process on how to bring these things together. The result from each one of the consensus-based processes. We have these cross-community working groups just like this one where sort of everyone is participating and we don't really know how to do an efficient multistakeholder process in those groups.

So I'm struggling personally trying to find a way of reusing, potentially, part of the consensus-based processes we still have which unfortunately are sort of silo-based while we would like to have here and there topic-based discussions. Many of you in this room have heard me talking in the corridors with others of you on how to try to merge these two because I think we don't really have time and it would be stupid to restart. But I think this is sort of part of this problem we have. And this, of course, had to do with the previous session about IANA and how to find multistakeholder processes. But it sort of ties in to this discussion

we have with Internet governance, and of course everything is sort of mixed together which makes things difficult.

>>   Thanks, Patrick. I think we have -- we have a question from remote participate.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: But before, in responding to -- this is Olivier speaking. Just before responding to Patrik, who was not paying attention anymore -- no, he's not. Okay, well, we move on then.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Hello, this is Matt Ashtiani for the transcript record. We have a remote participant comment from Michael Graham.

Michael writes: It may be useful for this work group, as well as for other groups, such as constituencies, ACs and SOs within ICANN, to develop a set of generally understood definitions of terms. I note that the GNSO's policy and implementation working group acknowledged that the variety of definitions actually became the subject of deliberations, rather than their language. The PIWG, therefore, developed a set of working definitions of specific terms accompanied by definitions that we agreed to adopt for our discussions, with the understanding that our final report might incorporate different definitions. Perhaps ICANN needs a Johnson to set down definitions of our language.

BECKY BURR: Hi, Becky Burr. I just want to respond to Patrik Faltstrom's comments on the cross-community working group.   There is actually a cross-community working group on cross-community working groups.

[Laughter]

The GNSO council and the ccNSO council will vote on the charter this week at the meetings.   Anybody who's interested and we are particularly looking for input from people who have participated in these kinds of things and have experience to bring to it, talk to either me or John Berard.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yes, thank you very much. I was going to mention this, Becky. And it is strange, isn't it, how are you -- I mean, what are your guidelines for working a cross-community working group on cross-community working groups. It's a bit recursive. Next. Greg Shatan.

GREG SHATAN: Greg Shatan from the intellectual property constituency but speaking for myself. One of the things that has struck me that I think the ICANN community can write to NETmundial is a better understanding of how a multistakeholder model works in the wild.   I've been participating modestly in the 1net group from time to time and one of the things that I find there is a skepticism from some corridors, even hostility, to what might be called multistakeholderism. I'm not sure that it is an "ism," but here we live the multistakeholder process. And one of the things that struck me as a member of this working group was that while we may disagree when it comes down to specific issues of policy or practice or

where we should go, we all agreed that the multistakeholder model works. Not perfectly, but it works.

And that we are all, to an extent, ambassadors for the multistakeholder model itself. And that there are people who believe that the multistakeholder model should not be part of Internet governance going forward, that it shouldn't be replicated, that it should somehow not be used. I think that it's important for those who will be in Sao Paulo to go forth and talk about how this works and about the checks and balances and about the -- kind of the way that if you do believe in the multistakeholder model you do act in a certain way and that you aim toward consensus and that building consensus is a difficult mental process, that once you get used to doing it, it's not so difficult, but it's still a process.

And I don't think that people who have not participated in the multistakeholder process really understand how that works and how ultimately people who come in with good faith, they may come in with interests, everyone has a position they're coming from, but we do work together. And I think that if people actually saw the multistakeholder model, while it is, as I think it was said in one of the other meetings, slow and messy, but it is still a process that in the end works and works for the constituents. And I think that needs to be explained, whether it's in the hallways or it's in the plenary session, the multistakeholder model isn't going to speak for itself. It's the stakeholders that will speak for the multistakeholder model. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Greg, and certainly from what you've said I guess you have to live the multistakeholder model -- the operational multistakeholder model to understand somehow how it works. It's a bit like reading how to ride a bicycle. You'll never learn to cycle by reading about it. So any more questions or comments? Yes. At the back. Marilyn. Go totally to the back, there's someone, please. Or -- yeah. Any other?

RAPHEAL AZRIN: My name is Rapheal Azrin on behalf of myself. I'm from Zyraz Technology in Singapore. Okay. The thing is I've looked -- this is the first time I'm attending this ICANN meeting, okay, pardon me for budging in.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Welcome.

RAPHEAL AZRIN: Being a multistakeholder thing, what about those people who are not in the multistakeholder, what about those people who are in the micro community. Example, corporations who are not that big enough to even apply for being an ICANN member, who are -- just maybe sell 10, 20 domains a year for corporate members and all those stuff. Those people in terms of volume into some number of people are more (indiscernible) than how many of you guys here? If you're talking about numbers itself, those guys outnumber you maybe five to one compared to -- in terms of money. Of course, big companies, giants, governments, they have big monies and all that stuff. But these people must also be

represented and also their views be taken into account. For example, just now I was talking to a registrar site about price increase. I said, why don't we actually go directly with you guys and sell -- buy your domains or sell your domains to (indiscernible) registrars. But unfortunately he says, it's ICANN's regulations that you guys must be an ICANN registrar in order to sell the domains, for example dot (indiscernible) dot (indiscernible) TLDs, which I feel is not fair because the requirements of being a member is still maybe too much for them. Maybe this one is -- you know, they just want to get cheap and run it efficiently because the new generation is all running on team operator model, as cheap as possible and as much money as possible to the community.

And I -- being an example, a few of the ISPs in Singapore are operating under that kind of model. You see new ISPs coming out with $5 million worth of (indiscernible) and being a big company. But compared to a big -- you know, at the end of the day is that monies and cents comes into play. So that's -- I would like the Board to consider what are the fate and the membership for those small micro stakeholder users. Thank you.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Rapheal. As much as we'd love to be the Board, we're not the Board. But we have some members of the Board who are here who will be listening. Next, Jimson. Thank you.

JIMSON OLUFUYE: My name is Jimson Olufuye. I'm a member of the business constituency, vice chair. Well, I just want to say this to support the

multistakeholder model. I had the privilege to be a member of the CSTD working group on IGF improvement, you know, back about two years ago and I was quite stunned in the room when one of the senior officials of United Nations said oh, it's so good to hear the voices of many people, you know, many sectors, different groups, that it brings a beautiful flavor that's really nice. So really, the multistakeholder model is good. It's the way to go. But I want to really suggest perhaps if you go further to come up with some form of metrics that could show or underscore that okay, by so-and-so standard it is up to re -- bottom-up multistakeholder, bottom-up, you know, inclusive multistakeholder model of our expectation. So maybe some form of metrics, that is -- is that possible? That is all my question.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Yeah, thank you. I'm not sure this -- this working group can make any recommendations with regards to this because we have to collect input specifically for the Brazil meeting. But it's a worthwhile contribution, and I'm sure the community will be addressing this at some point. Do we have Bertrand?

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: Yeah, Bertrand de la Chapelle again.   Just a brief comment on the question, what happens after the NETmundial meeting? If there are 510 minutes, the discussion will not be NETmundial about the substance of the solutions. It will be a little bit, but this is not what is going to be decided. What will be decided there is the process moving forward. On principles maybe there will be an agreement, I don't know. But on the roadmap it basically -- I see basically two legs for this roadmap. One will

be on how the process for the IANA discussion will evolve and one of the objectives will necessarily be at NETmundial to find some sort of endorsement, not formal but agreement, general consensus, that the process moving forward -- that ICANN will be presented at the facilitator is the right one and accepted as being the process. And the second leg is, as I was saying earlier, about how to develop an extended framework to address issues that are not covered today by the technical governance. And on this topic we are relatively early stages.

So I would hope that the discussion in NETmundial on this second I mention focuses on what the process will be after NETmundial to discuss this. And if we do believe in the multistakeholder approach, the process to discuss this framework needs to be multistakeholder as well. And therefore, there needs to be an ongoing dialogue in parallel with the question of the IANA evolution and the question will then become who is the facilitator for this one. Who will be taking the lead? Who after NETmundial will be actually saying we will convene, we will organize, we will be the neutral facilitator? I think that's an important element to take into account in your input. And to understand that this is what is going to be discussed at NETmundial, not solving the problem once and for all.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Bertrand. Just a quick follow-up on this. Do you think then it's -- just to be clear on this -- it's for the participants at NETmundial to ask themselves this question?

BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE: I believe it should be part of the questions that the organizers of NETmundial ask the participants and that the participants should contribute on the roadmap in particular. And I made a contribution to the site as if you -- if you want to look on behalf of the Internet & Jurisdiction Project but part of the notion of roadmap is milestones and how the different topics are going to be discussed afterwards in the IGF, in other meetings, and heading towards the WSIS+10, whatever the format of this thing is going to be in 2015 is part of the discussion of NETmundial. What is the process to develop the international framework.

ERIK HUIZER: Hello, my name is Erik Huizer. I'm a member of the strategy panel on ICANN's role in the Internet governance ecosystem. And a couple of things. I'd like to support the statement of one of the previous speakers that I think one of the best things we can take away from the NETmundial Brazil meeting would be support for the multistakeholder model. Because as obvious as that might be in this community, it's certainly not outside of this community.

As input, you're asking what other additional input the ICANN community participants should receive to better participate. I'd recommend, of course, our report of the panel which you already referred to earlier and specifically to -- to the principles we document in there, being reciprocity, respect, robustness, reasonableness, and reality. I think if we can discuss these principles as a basis of a multistakeholder model for Internet governance that would be great if we succeed in discussing that in Brazil. Thank you.

MARILYN CADE: My name is Marilyn Cade and I'm going to provide a piece of information and ask the audience to respond to it.

I listened to what Bertrand de la Chapelle had to say, and I think it would be helpful to just inform people that during the recent multistakeholder advisory committee meeting of the Internet Governance Forum, the MAG developed a statement that was then forwarded to the Under Secretary of the U.N. for submission in to NETmundial, and it has been submitted, which calls on the -- which notes that the Internet Governance Forum will happen in Turkey this fall, and invites the organizers of NETmundial and others, such as WSIS+10 and others who are engaged in this debate, to come to Turkey and to participate in a session, a main session, that is being organized there.

So I want to just go back to that and ask this room.

because we need the ICANN community's input, if -- do we look at NETmundial as one in a series of events and activities important, but recognize that there are other activities that are going on as well, and then come together, plan to come together, as many from the ICANN community do, at the IGF?

Is that something that the ICANN stakeholders are expecting?

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Any response?

>>   (off microphone.)

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Humming.   I thought about humming earlier, but I thought about humming just on one question at the end of this, so...

At the moment, we've got dead silence.

>>   (off microphone.)

MARILYN CADE: Bertrand, it's Marilyn again. I'm actually going to suggest that from the days of launching ICANN, we had a slightly different transition -- tradition. It was applauding and booing.

Fortunately, we gave up the booing.

[Laughter]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Well, do you want to launch this?

MARILYN CADE: So I'd just ask a question. Does the community at ICANN think that we should be looking forward to come together at the IGF with others and continue to talk about the output of NETmundial and other activities in relation to Internet governance?

And I would prefer that we applaud.

[Applause]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So how do you know if there's anyone that doesn't want to do so?

[Laughter]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Do you have to hum if you're against it, so then you measure the applause against the hum?

[Laughter]

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Marilia?

MARILIA MACIEL: Hi, this is Marilia. I'm a member of the working group.

I'd like to make a follow-up question to Bertrand and then to Marilyn. The follow-up question is: We have the working group on enhanced cooperation that is trying to discuss what would be this new mechanism for the broader Internet governance, and they had meetings so far, and the last meeting that was supposed to be the last one, they could not reach an agreement on how to do it.

And so what basically you propose is that we find multistakeholder ways to move the discussion forward at Brazil, which I agree, but how do you see that we're going to untie some deadlocks that are preventing the working group on enhanced cooperation that is multistakeholder to move forward?

EN

And I'd like to support the suggestion that was made by Marilyn. I think we need to discuss this in the IGF. But do you envision a deadline and maybe the WSIS+10 could be a deadline to the discussion? That we could develop an agenda until the WSIS+10?

MARILYN CADE: So do you want me -- I'll respond quickly and then --

"WSIS+10" may be -- it's Marilyn speaking.

"WSIS+10" may be a kind of a codeword to some of you, so real quickly, there is a World Summit on the Information Society plus 10 evaluation process going on, and it's going on in a number of places, but there is a scheduled event that has been agreed to that will take place, a high-level event that will take place in June of this year in Geneva.

It is part of the evaluation of the follow-up to the WSIS.

So I -- Marilia, I just need to be sure I understand your question.

Would it be that perhaps we also ought to be proposing to have a presence and input into that high-level event, or were you thinking about something beyond that?

MARILIA MACIEL: I think we should map on the agenda what are the events related to the WSIS evaluation and among us we have a deadline to reach an agreement or at least to have some clear proposal about this discussion, because I'm totally for -- I'm totally for continuing the discussion but I think that have to have a clear roadmap and a clear deadline to say,

"Okay, this is the point that we will arrive with something," because we have already started discussing in many different forums and we have to make sure that there is not so much duplication of efforts and that we have a clear deadline to reach an agreement.

MARILYN CADE: And I also have a speaker over here.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: And that's probably going to be the last speaker on this topic.

KERRY BARRETT: Hi. Kerry Barrett from the Organization of American States, but I'm speaking on behalf of me, not the OAS.

I think one thing that ICANN has to focus on -- and even as Marilyn says, moving forward with all the other meetings -- is governance for persons who are afraid of the multistakeholder approach means that a decision has to be made. Oftentimes when you have this multistakeholder approach that has worked for ICANN, it works because there was a decision-maker.

Now, if governance is handed over to someone, I think as you go into the meetings in Brazil and going forward, persons who have not been persuaded need to understand how will decisions be made.

The criteria given by the U.S. government in terms of stability, security, those two factors in terms of your governance model has to be determined, because if no one makes a decision, the Internet becomes

unstable because you'll have constant dialogue like this going on while governance has to occur. And from my profession, governance is critical and a decision has to be made as to how that discussion will be led.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Okay. Thank you very much for this. We'll take it into account as well.

We've reached near to the end of this session, actually. It's gone really fast.

There was a second part of questions which were going to relate specifically to the cross-community working group itself, asking whether the -- what should be the next priority of the Cross-Community Working Group, how the working group and the ICANN community could support stakeholder -- multistakeholder cooperation and dialogue in other key settings, and which actions should ICANN avoid on its task of driving the public consultation on the IANA functions issues, sort of a question that was tagged on after Question 10.

As you know, this is the start of a process. I think we've heard from several people that there is an interest in continuing this discussion, so I think we'll be meeting -- the working group itself will be meeting on Wednesday -- Wednesday morning, I think -- face-to-face and will be taking in all of the input that it has received over here, and from there, it will be, I think -- and this is just pure speculation -- be trying to sort out some email address for people to continue sending their contributions in.

I don't know if this can be arranged quickly.

Ergys, can you do the magic and create an email address for the working group to receive public contributions?

Okay. In the meantime, and of course, if it decides to and is able to produce a public comment period, a shortened public comment period, that would be of great help.

Rafik, you wanted to take us it to the rapporteurs, perhaps?

RAFIK DAMMAK: But just to -- we will ask Marilia and Leon to share with us, I mean, the summary of -- a quick summary of this discussion.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Rafik. This is Leon Sanchez.

Well, some of the highlights, because of course there were many important things said in the forum, but one of them is, is it necessary to center the group's activity on NETmundial or should it be expanded to a broader scope and other activities.

It would be convenient and desirable to link the multistakeholder model concept to a bottom-up concept, too, and transparency to accountability. It would be nice if this is an ongoing group and doesn't dissolve after NETmundial, and the document should state accountability for what and in front of whom.

And staff should be very cautious because ICANN as a community, they have to make sure that facts are straight and accurate in NETmundial, and what happens to those that are out of the multistakeholder model

environment and how do we assure that these people are, in fact, represented in the Internet governance ecosystem.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Leon. Our second rapporteur, Young Eum Lee.

YOUNG EUM LEE: Yes. This is Young Eum Lee, dot kr, in the group as a representative -- well, as a member of the ccNSO, but I actually participated in this group a bit later than the Brazil meeting. And seeing what this group has been doing or the process that this has -- this group has been going through actually has enlightened me as to what actually the multistakeholder model is.

Who gave us the authority? Nobody. We are just a bunch of groups -- I mean, a bunch of individuals from various groups in the community and we talked about ICANN as a structure and ICANN as a community, but do we actually represent the community? No, I don't think so.

How can we represent the community?

This is the mechanism. We listen to the people, we -- I mean, many people have said that we should look at other models -- the NCUC model, the business constituency model -- and that's what we should be doing.

But we also know that there are silos within ICANN that are actually working on some detailed principles and guidelines. How are we different from that? I -- we are all -- I think we're all representing ICANN.

And as for the future, not just NETmundial but IGF or whatever, many of us have been going, not -- going not just to ICANN, but to IGF and some to IETF.

I mean, the community members of ICANN actually make a lot of -- a good proportion of the other groups in other meetings as well.

And so I would just like to point out that -- so how -- how can we say that we are a cross-constituency working group if we come out with a proposal or a statement that most of the members of the community can agree on? And I think that's what we're trying to do.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Young Eum Lee, and of course that's one of the questions that we all ask ourselves before going to sleep at night. At least those of us that don't collapse at night.

But, yeah, certainly it's something we all have to ask ourselves: Are we representative of the wider Internet world, the wider Internet community.

Well, we certainly have enough people in the room here. Do we have any further -- another rapporteur? Marilia?

MARILIA MACIEL: Yeah. Very quickly, I think that it's important to highlight that most of the people here show the appreciation for the document and for the work carried out by the group and I think that a sign of that is that people have asked how to move forward and make this document

better and more visible during NETmundial, so it's a sign of appreciation.

An important comment that was made is that maybe the group could be a little bit more outward-looking and see how much the way that ICANN organizes itself and develops the bottom-up multistakeholder model could be transposed to other environments. I think it was a very good suggestion.

Regarding the document itself, someone commented that the vocabulary, it's very important that we have a unified vocabulary. We try to do that with the definitions and I think that we can continue to improve that and, for instance, define what is ICANN the organization and ICANN the communities, it's an important distinction. Regarding still -- regarding the document, someone -- many people suggested that we put the document under public comment, an expedited public comment. I think it was a good suggestion as well.

And regarding NETmundial, I think that the main takeaway is that NETmundial should not be the point of arrival of anything. It's just a step in the process and we may continue to discuss these topics in London and Turkey and in other events as well.

OLIVIER CREPIN-LEBLOND: So I think it's about time for us all to go to the next session or for a quick break, so thanks very much to all of you for coming here and bringing your input.

As we said, we're listening more. If you have any further input for us, please email us or you'll hear from us very soon.

Thanks to all of you and on behalf of the Cross-Community Working Group on Internet governance, goodbye.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]