

JOSE ARCÉ:

This is Jose Arcé speaking for the record. I welcome all the participants on this call today. We are going to start our new LACRALO monthly teleconference following the meeting held in Toronto. There is plenty to do; plenty to cover so we will try to summarize all the topics on this teleconference and be updated regarding action items. So, Gisella, if you could kindly proceed with the roll call.

GISELLA GRUBER:

Yes thank you, Jose. This is Gisella. Welcome to everyone on today's LACRALO meeting on Monday the 29<sup>th</sup> of October. On the Spanish channel we have Jose Arcé, Philippe Boland, Juan Manuel Rojas, Sylvia Herlein Leite, Javier José Pallero, Natalia Enciso, Humberto Carrasco, Antonio Medina Gomez, Fatima Cambroner, Aida Noblia.

On the English channel we have Roosevelt King, Dev Anand Teelucksingh, Niran Beharry, Vladimir Radunovic, Carlton Samuels, Vanda Scartezini. Vanda Scartezini has joined us as well. I hope I have not left anyone off the roll call. If so, please do say your name now.

I don't hear anyone speaking up. We have apologies from Olivier Crépin-Leblond. From staff we have Matt Ashtiani, Silvia Vivanco, Heidi Ullrich and myself, Gisella Gruber-White. Our interpreters today are Sabrina and Veronica and I would like to wish Sabrina a very Happy Birthday and thank you for joining us on her birthday for our call. I would like to also please remind everyone to say their names when speaking, not only for transcript purposes but also for the interpreters

---

*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.*

---

to state the name of the person who is speaking on the other channel.  
Thank you very much and over to you, Jose.

JOSE ARCÉ:

This is Jose Arcé speaking. Thank you, Gisella. Happy Birthday, Sabrina. We all wish you the best. You can read all the messages wishing you the best and thank you for always being there and for your wonderful job. Silvia, would you like to take the floor to cover the action items please? The interpreter is waiting for Silvia to reply.

Jose Arcé speaking. I'm sure that Silvia can hear us but while we work out the audio issues with Silvia's line, then we can proceed with Vladimir's presentation and then cover the action items later on. I don't know if Natalia Enciso or Fatima Cambronero would like to introduce Vladimir. Since you were the mothers so to speak of this capacity building program maybe you can introduce Vladimir so that he can proceed with his presentation.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO:

This is Fatima Cambronero speaking, Jose. I am asking Gisella if they have dialed out to Vladimir. I don't know if they have dialed out to him. If you could dial out to him I would appreciate it. I can give Silvia Vivanco his number again.

JOSE ARCÉ:

Jose Arcé speaking. If Silvia Vivanco is on the call, can we confirm.

---

SILVIA VIVANCO: This is Silvia Vivanco. Hello. We have given his number to Adigo so we will check with Adigo whether they have called or dialed out to Vladimir. Just give me a second please.

JOSE ARCÉ: Jose Arcé speaking. In the meantime I think I can hear Silvia but very faintly. I don't know if Silvia is on the Adobe Connect or if Adigo has dialed out to you, Silvia, but you know, we can hear you very faintly. Jose Arcé speaking. Silvia, would you like Adigo to dial out to you again? Can you type your number on the AC room? Jose Arcé speaking.

I will use this time while Vladimir gets connected while we work out Silvia's audio issues to let you know that some time ago we held an internet governance event for the Latin American and the Caribbean Region. The event was held in Columbia in Bogota and we were able to participate.

In fact, many of the participants on this call – Alfredo, Philippe, Fatima, Natalia, Carlton Samuels, myself – and please let me know if I am forgetting someone. But indeed this was a very successful and fruitful meeting and after the meeting some participants decided to attend the Global IGF in Baku so Fatima, Natalia, Carlton Samuels will be attending the IGF in Baku.

That is a different environment for internet policies and governance and that is really relevant to our region so that we can learn what is going on on the global level at the Global IGF and learn about our global internet governance.

---

Jose Arcé speaking. I hear a beeping tone or sound. I don't know if the issue is with my line but anyway, Dev will participate in the IGF. Thank you, Natalia, for that. [Ben Tra] will also be there.

Jose Arcé speaking again. I see that many of you have not muted your lines so those of you on the Spanish channel, if you could kindly mute your line, your phone so that we do not have interferences, I would appreciate it. Thank you. We receive plenty of background noise and that does not help the interpretation. Thank you.

Okay, Jose Arcé speaking again. Fatima, I see that Vladimir is already on the English channel so if Gisella, if you give me the okay, we can proceed with Vladimir's presentation, then we will proceed.

GISELLA GRUBER: Sorry, Sabrina, we have Vladimir on the English channel.

JOSE ARCÉ: Jose Arcé speaking. Thank you, Gisella. So Fatima, Natalia, would you like to take the floor now?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima Cambronero speaking. Can you hear me?

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: And this is Sylvia Herlein Leite speaking. Can you hear me?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Fatima speaking. Yes, Sylvia, yes we can hear you now.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: Sylvia speaking. Okay. I will mute my line. Thank you.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Fatima speaking now. I will introduce our guest speaker. This is Vladimir Radunovic. He coordinates the E-Diplomacy Programs in the Diplo Foundation and he's going to speak about the internet governance and the multi-stakeholder model. He will be participating in the international telecommunications conferences and he will specifically focus on the way in which this could affect the multi-stakeholder model.

We thank him for joining us today and we kindly ask all of you to mute your lines and computers while he is giving his presentation. We now give the floor to Vladimir. Thank you, Vladimir.

VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: Thank you everyone for joining. I'm very happy to see that many people, some familiar faces. I'm not quite sure of the names. It's quite late here in Belgrade at this moment but I'm quite happy when I see a good group of people and it's always a pleasure to talk on these [articulations] and thanks again for inviting me.

---

Before I start I just wanted to make a short note that I received a good link from Natalia a couple of minutes ago, a link that says (inaudible) for anti-federal internet surveillance. And that's probably one of the interesting examples of the whole subjectible (inaudible) when it comes to internet governance. There are so many different fora where the IG issues are being discussed and in many of them there's no link among them and then it happens and you can have a message like this coming from the U.N.

So I see the noise is huge. Can you hear me, just to be sure? Okay excellent. Thanks.

So let me... I did prepare a couple of slides but I'm not going to talk too much. I hope I'll keep it short and make more space for discussions. You can probably turn to the slides and I'll try to do this right. Next slide please.

One of the major issues when it comes to internet governance – I'm sure many of you know from the IG side (inaudible) is basically the problem is that (inaudible) the multi-stakeholder model and in the stakeholder global fora. I'm not sure if you can see the picture illustration on the PowerPoint, it seems like it's missing, but it doesn't really matter if it is.

Basically internet governance is one big building under construction now. I'm sure some of you have seen it. It is the building that started with the infrastructure issues, and you can see all these acronyms and abbreviations related to TCPIP and sockets and HTML and root zone servers and so on. There is all this ground to be filled in but it has been

---

produced by engineers, by the community when the internet started working.

And then on this layer, on this basic ground of infrastructure, a couple of other layers can be [added onto here] including the legal aspect, including the cyber (inaudible), cyber law and so on; the digital divider or the development aspects, the economic aspects like taxation, money and so on and also cultural aspects like privacy, identity and all the other issues.

If you take a look at this illustration you can see a number of different places and different stakeholders in a way and you can see the HIPAA guy who is protecting the infrastructure and then you can see the old lady which is watching what is happening. There is a bunch of institutions and stakeholders involved and that have been involved from the early beginnings.

So basically the problem or the challenge with the internet governance is it's multi-disciplinary across the environment and it's multi-stakeholder global fora. Now we'll turn to the next slide.

Why is it important that the internet (inaudible) multi-stakeholdering? When we talk about the benefits of a competent Internet Governance, you'll notice that the governance requires cooperation and we usually use this illustration of the blind men and the elephant which is a story I think comes from India or Pakistan; some people say it comes from Pakistan.

---

It is a story of blind men (inaudible). The first one is saying it is (inaudible); the second one (inaudible) here; the third one touching the ear says “ I don’t know if this is a fly or not”; the fourth one touching the leg of the elephant says (inaudible) and then the other one says it’s a wall and a rope. And basically if we want to (inaudible) elephant that they cannot enter the whole picture of the elephant without being together, discussing it together.

And this big elephant...

INTERPRETER: Gisella, this is Veronica speaking - one of the interpreters. Vladimir, this is Veronica, one of the interpreters. Sorry for interrupting you but your audio is very hard and we cannot interpret you; we cannot hear you very well. So while Adigo solves this problem could you please wait some minutes?

VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: Sure, no problem.

INTERPRETER: Thank you very much.

JOSE ARCÉ: This is Jose Arcé speaking. The people from the staff are telling me that they are calling Vladimir again so let’s see. This is Jose Arcé speaking.

---

While we wait for Vladimir to be connected again, I'm also reviewing the following items on the agenda.

We have the follow up for the General Assembly so I will take my time, quite a lot of time to discuss with you the following steps. Sylvia, would you like to comment on point number 6 which is LACRALO Working Groups? Would you like to speak about them, to speak about the status of the working groups so that we can go on?

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE:

This is Sylvia Herlein Leite. Can you hear me? This is Sylvia Herlein Leite for the record. So we can now speak about the LACRALO Working Groups. We are really very happy and ALAC tier is also very happy when we submitted the working reports in Toronto because these working groups are very well organized.

All groups have scheduled their meetings every 15 days so they have their own dates. So I invite you all who are not part of these working groups or who would like to participate in some of the groups to participate in any of these groups because, as you know, the meetings are open and we are really working very hard.

We are reviewing the issues and we are very well organized so this is also known to all the community and the secretaries of the other RALOs in Toronto. I have offered them an (inaudible). The idea of having monthly teleconferences was very welcome and the fact of having LACRALO Working Groups is also a very good idea.

---

We are the only RALO who has these working groups and the idea is to share the idea of that appeared in Costa Rica to the other RALOs. Now I'm going to post on the AC room the links for the working groups. I know most of you know these links but I know that the participants today are part of one of the working groups. This is all I have to say in regard to item 6 of the agenda.

JOSE ARCÉ:

This is Jose Arcé speaking. Thank you very much, Sylvia, for your update. I see that Gisella is telling us that Vladimir is already available so Vladimir please, you have the floor.

VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC:

Thank you. I hope that the sound is fixed better now. You know how even this wave of technology the sound has to travel all the way from Europe to the Latin Americas.

Back to the elephant. The nice one then proceeded to say of course we all have to cooperate – the telecommunications, the business IT, the community in general, but for all of us in LACRALO I think it's quite obvious, right, that the (inaudible). But it's not (inaudible). Now the good thing if we're talking about now how the internet currently functions is that the multi-stakeholder is in fact the current model because in the old days when the internet started working, it was the IT that was the technical community and then users and then the businesses which were basically agreeing on the models of the functionality of the internet.

---

The one key aspect of the internet which is so-called end-to-end principle which means that we can develop new applications; we can develop new services on the internet without necessarily asking anyone if we can do that. And that's how Google emerged; that's how Twitter emerged and how all the... Skype and all the new services emerged.

They didn't have to ask anyone whether – apart from going along with the (inaudible) – they didn't have to ask anyone if they can do something. There was no regulatory [pressure]; there was no one who should say, "Okay, you are eligible to do that or you're not."

So the current model in a way is a multi-stakeholder model. The problem that the governments would say – and I'm sure many users – is that the internet is not what it used to be. It's not a game anymore. We are very much dependent on it. We see government services; we bank and do many other things on communications like this. And we do see more and more problems. Cyber crime is one of these which are particular problems.

So some say that this unregulated space is becoming an anarchy and the others would say no, no this is the open internet, and that's where the (inaudible) starts. But what happens when the governments come in? Because the internet has become as important as it is today and it's no longer about games and a small community involved in it, of course the governments realize that they need to get into that and to start discussing it.

And the internet governance has become high on the political agenda. It brings great (inaudible) so some governments wish to protect their

---

own citizens. It also brings governance. Some governments feel the internet is their own power and both of these are (inaudible) traditional so-called for governments.

We can ask if the governments are legitimate representatives and so on and probably they are if you believe in democracy and so on and so forth. But they are getting more and more involved in internet governance policy. Unfortunately if that's a fact they are the latecomers because they effectively came into the process only to be involved with ICANN and later on when WSIS, the World Summit on Information Society started in 2003.

And most of the governments – and we can see them there discussing in mini-forums – the IGF is only one – ICANN is another one – the ITGA and so on, there's many fora but the governments are not really the policymakers; the governments do not really understand all of the aspects, especially not the technical aspects of the internet governance.

On the other hand the technicians and the technical community is not always the same in the political aspects of the process and why the process takes so long, why the safety (inaudible), why the grey suits and white shirts and ties are needed and so on. There is a lot of mixed communication about that.

And you should take a look at someone if you have a chance to be at the WSIS, the World Summit on the Information Society in 2013 in Geneva, you can note the different ways of dressing of the civil society on one hand and of the governments on the other hand. And you can see

---

basically the open source community – they wear shorts and T-shirts and you can see how the governments officials are dressed and so on.

And this deception of civil society from the provision of the government and vice versa, if it's still somewhat present, there's some misunderstandings there, the misperceptions that civil society will observe that someone who's not serious; and on the other hand civil society will sometimes see government as the [Army] and they want to keep everything in order and probably the truth is somewhere in between.

There is a great deal of making these perceptions more realistic and encouraging communication between the professional culture and that's not easy. We can see in the IGF as well even without coming close. Of course if there is any question or any comment at any point, jump in and ask it.

So now we are moving to the processes and the multi-stakeholder processes when it comes to internet governance. You know well the ICANN process; you are involved in that. It was probably one of the first internet governance policy processes that was, it was even not a multi-stakeholder at the beginning because at that time it involved mostly a technical community and then evolved into a non-commercial constituency, you have the business and IDNs, the government as well.

We can say ICANN at this point is one of the multi-stakeholder processes. Good or not as good as we hoped but it is multi-stakeholder interest.

On the other hand we had the United Nations process which was connected to the International Telecommunications Union – the ITU – which basically initiated the World Summit on Information Society in 2003. It was the first attempt to make an open forum. We knew the UN was a multi-stakeholder one.

And again, for those of you who had a chance to be in Geneva first on the UN side, you remember it was mostly the makeup of the multi-stakeholder. At that time the CEO of ICANN was also one of the person that was invited to Geneva but all the discussions and negotiations were basically behind the closed doors for the diplomats, for the politicians and representatives of states only.

And even the CEO of ICANN would not allow them into the room and that was quite a shocking thing to see. And at the same time there were big fora around. There was what is now the IGF Village, some kind of fair around with all the institutions, the end user institutions, numbering resources, (inaudible) and so on. So there was a face of multi-stakeholder in the reflection [although it was not working].

And then the governments realized that they cannot really bring in meaningful decisions because they didn't know anything about internet at that time. So in 2005 in Tunisia the WSIS was (inaudible) and there you could see the words of the civil society, of business in the negotiating room. And they were really part of the process. They did not vote, they did not have final say in the WSIS agenda but they did impact the process and did impact the negotiations. They were welcome in the negotiations as well.

---

Now the IGF came out as a result of the WSIS, completely the multi-stakeholder fora but it does not have any binding decisions. They do not have any decisions at all. It is a (inaudible) multi-stakeholder discussion, policy discussion forum.

It currently has the Multi-Stakeholder Advisory Group which consists of various stakeholders representing all the stakeholders, (inaudible) people and they change certain terms every two years and so on. So there has been the preparation for the annual meeting but there are no final decisions.

We have multi-stakeholder [stakes] in all these process, in ICANN, in IGF and WSA. WSA by the way is continuing and is organized every year by the ITU (inaudible). So these three processes do have multi-stakeholder components but you can take a closer look – there is a global enrolment of governments in each of these three processes. They're just not these three; there are many others. These three are probably the most relevant for us.

In ICANN – and you could see, those of you that have been involved can see the pressure of the Government Advisory Committee, trying to clarify their role but as it is an Advisory Committee it is the recommendations or it is just the comments or opinions and so on, and what is their level of their influence within ICANN and to the ICANN Board actually?

Now, if we want the multi-stakeholder fora that means we also need to have the governments as stakeholders and they also have to have an important say – in equal amounts we need to have them. The

---

Government Advisory Committee and the changes in (inaudible) are an example of what's happening at ICANN. In the IGF, because of the previous agenda which set out the IGF forum, the time has come to evaluate the IGF (inaudible), and the Eco SOC, which is the Economic Council of the UN has been (inaudible) the Working Group for Scientific Knowledge and Development within it that basically should evaluate the IGF's future. The Eco SOC is such and the [CVSE] Working Group or the [CVSE] Committee is also a government body. It's not a multi-stakeholder body.

Now the CVSE Working Group that was founded in the CVSE to evaluate the IGF and come up with its recommendations for what the future of the IGF should look like at the end was a multi-stakeholder controlled body. It did have the representatives of the civil society, of the business, international organizations; and even though they did not have the voting power they did impact a lot the drafting of the final recommendations of the CVSE Working Group and the future of related governments.

So there's an interesting example where the governments in fact again discussed about the future of a multi-stakeholder fora like the IGF, but then the IGF did make an impact to change the future of the CVSE, of the UN body to become more multi-stakeholder friendly. And then on the third slide we have the WCIT, the World Conference on International Telecommunications and then there we're discussing the updates of the international telecommunications relations, which is a basic mandate of the ITU in the world.

---

So this is again a government forum (inaudible). The government forum within the ITU is discussing the future of telecommunications and maybe the internet as well. Let's put a bit of focus on the ITU WICT. So the World Conference on International Telecommunications which is taking place in Dubai, and that's the host part of this two days' (inaudible) is basically a revision of the International Telecommunication Regulations which is a treaty, a global treaty done in 1988 the last time, which reflects the world of telecommunications and the global rules regarding telecommunications – in a way, kind of a mandate of the ITU and what the ITU should be discussing.

The ITU has 193 member states and it is absolutely a multi-stakeholder organization. It does have public comments and working groups which are multi-stakeholder friendly. Some of the decisions, especially about [comments] and so on are brought by these governments and by multi-stakeholder [groups] whenever possible. Now, what's happening in Dubai is basically the update or the upgrade of the ITR, and you can see that it's more than 10 years after. So (inaudible) now and the ITR did not reflect this at all. This is the first time now that one of the founding documents of the ITU is mainly being updated to include the internet as well.

What does that mean? If you go through the documents of the amendments to the ITR – and the ITR is, by the way, a 10-pages. 15-pages document, (inaudible) general – but now there is a bunch of (inaudible) coming from the governments and they're mostly addressing these couple or few questions. The first one is the definitions, and the definition of "telecommunications" when it comes to the ITR is the key. And there are many attempts to put the ICTs – the information

---

---

communication technologies – within the telecommunications, the international telecommunications.

There are many (inaudible) ways of doing that including mentioning a cross-section of data traffic, which means not only transferring the data but also processing which then implies the internet as well and all the [senses] that come over the top in the content layer. There are many mentions of numbering, which means the ICANN function in a way, and who are the tenants of the ITR? Is it only the member states? So should only the member states be in a way charged to implement the ITR once it is voted, or should it be also related to the [inter agencies] of the state or recognized by those agencies which used to be telcos but now can also be ISPs, the content providers, anyone that deals with the internet.

So the first one is definitions and it's obviously the crucial part. The second part is the public. So is it only about member states? And it is also about telcos, and you can see recognized in square brackets this used to be the definition previously: "recognized operating agents" would mean telcos, telecom companies. Now there are attempts to re-recognize and keep only operating agencies, which means any kind of institution, private or business venture – the internet service providers, the content providers, the service providers – anyone can be in a way coupled with the International Telecommunications (inaudible).

Then there is a question of what organizations? Should it be obliging to the governments or should it be obliging also to the operating agencies meaning in the business entities on the internet as well? Should the ITU or the other ITU recommendations in sum become obligations, binding

---

treaties, binding documents to the governments or not? Then we have a lot of changes, or rather a lot of suggested changes about the commercial agreements which would also [enroll] the governments to interfere possibly with the commercial agreements between telcos, internet service providers, content providers, users at the end and how the commercial agreements will be made. Currently, the business model of the internet is quite liberal, it's quite open and anyone can make any kind of commercial agreement – the telcos and content providers can contract between themselves. The (inaudible) model which is currently functional, how the telecoms work now, they basically have made it a kind of commercial agreement between themselves.

Now whether the International Telecommunications Regulations will change that and force the governments or give the right to the governments to impose such commercial agreements or the way the commercial agreements are going to be made on the internet, that's one of the questions. Lastly and there are many other things, the (inaudible) how is the traffic going to be [paid] in the future? Will it stay the same way, through a [billing] or is it going to be a different way? Should we pay more by the users or, which is more likely, more by the content providers like Google, Facebook and the others? There are many, many proposals about that and there are quite a number of consequences that especially developing countries should discuss about – what models might be convenient and what models might be, let me say [frightened] or even endangering the open internet as we know it for the moment?

What is going to happen over there? The meeting in Dubai is set to [happen] in December. There will be two weeks of negotiations on the document, and there are a lot of [diplomatic] moves over there. The governments are the only ones who have the say over there. Even though the ITU said the documents will be mostly open, the discussions will be mostly open to the other stakeholders as well, effectively the other stakeholders will not be allowed to participate in negotiations in Dubai.

As some of the state delegations, especially the ones from the developed countries – and I know about the UK, they have about 40, I think even more than 40 people within that delegation. Many of them come from the civil society and business sector so they will be part of the delegations. In a way the countries underwent to have a multi-stakeholderism there by extending their delegations over there to a multi-stakeholder level. Not many countries will do that unfortunately and those civil society and business organizations that do not have good contacts with their governments or their [global] or whatever will not have a say in that.

And what can we expect out of that? This is a treaty, a global treaty which means that it has to be signed by all the governments and it has to be ratified in most of the countries where the legal system is like that – it has to be ratified by the Parliament. Usually the ITU does not go into voting. The sessions where there is a big division, a big polarization as it is now between developed countries and developing countries it is not likely that there'll be voting. It is likely that there will be a lot of negotiations and it is likely that the new ITR will be [more general], will remain [more general].

---

---

It is quite possible, and you can see that I'm not going to go into details but it's interesting to the fact that the proposals – you can see that even the US and the European Union proposed some amendments which probably give us a note that they might negotiate to allow ICTs, the internet to come under the telecoms, under the definition of the telecoms, telecommunications now. It's not likely; they say they're not going to do that. They say they don't want any change and that the ITR should not go into the internet but it remains to be seen.

Now we see that this is not a multi-stakeholder forum when we see that the other stakeholder groups are not [participating] unless they are part of their country's delegation, but it is not only the WCIT which will decide. There is nothing so big that will probably happen on this (inaudible). We'll have another document probably, maybe not even, and there is a lot of time that will be spent until the states will sign it, the states will ratify it. Many states will have (inaudible) – you can see the document. A lot of the (inaudible) governments on why they support it or not support, but this is a trend which is becoming quite important. And the ITU is having one of the primary roles in this, and what is following after the WCIT is the next part of the WSIS which is the World Summit on the Information Society +10 which is going to be an extra [revision].

It's not a binding contract. It's going to be an open forum (inaudible). Then we have the World Telecommunications ITU Policy Forum which is another ITU event which is going to take place in May, 2013, in Geneva which is another important policy fora where probably other stakeholders as well will have some say but the governments will have the dominant say. Then we have the World Telecommunications

---

---

Development Conference which is a conference held every four years. It's going to take place in 2014, probably (inaudible) so that's another conference where the governments will dominantly be shaping the future of telecommunications and internet if it [does come] under it. Then we have the Planning Potentiary Conference in (inaudible) also in 2014 and more and more. So there is a trend basically of this government push towards a new telecommunications framework.

Regardless of whether all the countries will or some countries will not sign the WCIT and the final ITR revision this year, even if any number of countries sign it – even if it comes to voting and then the majority of countries vote the new version – the other countries will not sign it. Because it's a treaty they don't have to and the ITU does not have any [compulsion] mechanism. The other countries will also suffer or will feel the difference because the internet is global, and the end-to-end networking, the basic principle we mentioned can work only if it works everywhere around the world. If some countries impose different regimes and some countries do not, if you want to communicate with these countries that have different regimes you'll probably have to accommodate. So that is quite a big difference.

And to wrap up all that, (inaudible). Is the multi-stakeholder model going to disappear because of all of that? I would note it this way: the governments in internet governance, the governments is not the regulation [because] the governments do not usually fully understand when it comes to the internet. It's not only the regulation. Not everything on the internet has to be regulated. There are policies, there are cooperations for safeguarding different issues that are sufficient

---

sometimes. In [child] protection here, there can be a lot about protection without hard regulations.

And then when it comes to decisions and when the decisions are needed we need to be clear on the rules. The governments are there to decide whether we like it or not; they are [looking for a way to come into our] democracy, but what we need to do is to build up the multi-stakeholder model not only on a global level but also in a regional and national level so that any kind of decision made by governments and policy decision makers will be based on the multi-stakeholder discussions and collaborations and will in fact have multi-stakeholder inputs into that.

So there is a kind of government [domination] of the IGF and ICANN, and on the other hand there may be a trend of multi-stakeholder-ization with the UN system as we can see through the CVSE, maybe we will see it through the WSIS. I think your role as a community, even though you're in a way linked to ICANN, but still as a community I think your role and our role in civil society and business and nongovernment stakeholders is to push for the multi-stakeholder model in all the layers respecting and understanding what the role of the government is in this, what their protocols are and trying to make them understand why they cannot decide on that without other stakeholders.

I will stop here. I think I took quite some time to go over all the problems. I see that there are a lot of comments. Unfortunately my Spanish is much worse than my French so I'm not going to... If anyone wants to summarize the questions or run them to me by voice or Skype I will be happy to answer. I'll stop here, thank you.

JOSE ARCÉ: Jose Arcé speaking now. Maybe you want to raise your hands in order to ask for the floor? I see Fatima raising her hand.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima speaking, Jose. Can you hear me?

JOSE ARCÉ: Jose speaking, yes of course. Go ahead, Fatima.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Fatima speaking. Thank you, thank you Vladimir first of all for this presentation, for your explanations. I believe your presentation is very interesting and we were chatting about the issues now being discussed. Personally I think your presentation was very clear. I have plenty of questions but in the interest of time I will focus on a specific proposal that has to do with European or Europe telecom operators. Do you think that this proposal could accept or include the multi-stakeholder model in the way we do? Thank you.

VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: Fatima, thanks for this question. It is probably one of the softest discussions in the WCIT preparation now, and the funny thing is that it came as a proposal of the [ETNO] which is the Association of Telecom Operators of Europe which do not have the rights to support anything in the WCIT because they're not governments. So without a government

that would take this proposal to the WCIT this proposal cannot go through. At the moment they do not have, at least they have not revealed if they have a sponsor for that proposal but it might happen that some of the government [sessions] from the Middle East and Africa might support it and go ahead with the proposal. The US was very clearly against it and the European Union is quite clear that they do not want to change anything in the current ITR so that it goes over the internet. It should stay related to telecoms.

Now, what is it about? I'll send you the link to a short blog I wrote about this proposal so that you can take a look for more details, but in a nutshell there are two components of that proposal. One component is related to net neutrality and the [ETNO] is now proposing that they should be allowed – they as a telecom operator – should be allowed to make any kind of commercial agreement with content providers, Google, Facebook, whoever, and they call them “over the top” providers, OTPs.

So they should be allowed to make any kind of commercial agreement, meaning that they could offer to Google that Google needs to pay an additional sum if they want a better quality for their users. Facebook can be asked to do the same: “Okay, you want a better quality? You have to pay for that; otherwise [you’ll be with the others],” effectively meaning that there will be two tiers. You’ll have the economic tier for (inaudible) that cannot afford to pay and then you’ll have a slower outreach to the users, and then you’ll have a faster internet or a business internet that will work where Facebook and the others would pay more to (inaudible) their customers with a faster connection, which

---

---

in terms of the [natural delegate] principle would say all service should be treated equally on the internet without commercial benefits.

That's one component. The other component is the way the internet will be paid, what the (inaudible) economic model would be, and it says that the sending party should be paying for the traffic. What does that mean? Currently the telecom organizations, when you call abroad you are the one paying so the money goes to the telco you're calling. So if you're calling from Latin America to Africa the money goes to Africa. The proposal is quite dissimilar, saying that everyone who distributes the content – so (inaudible) – should be the one paying for that content to go to the (inaudible), which means Google and Facebook and anyone else, and even you if you are uploading anything, should be the one to pay for the content to go further – which means that effectively parts of the funds from Google, from big companies mostly located in the US, will go to Africa, to developing worlds and will probably end up in their telcos theoretically unless the big companies like Google and the others say “We do not find any benefit in sending the traffic to Africa because we have to pay, so we're not going to do that.”

And then we have the fragmentation of the internet and again net neutrality problems, so there are a lot of disputes about that. For the moment this proposal is not realistic. I believe that it's not realistic to go to such a form. There is a great vessel about the tariffs and the way the economic models will be built and the developing world is quite angry or it's not satisfied with the current model, which makes the tier one, the business telecom operators – most of them at least historically being in the US, now they are multinational corporations – exchanging the traffic without paying each other, so it's a compensation (inaudible)

---

end model. But then the applicant is going to have to pay upstream to the European telcos, and then they pay to the US telcos – so basically the Africans or the Caribbean Islands or the Korean islands are those that are subsidizing the internet [even though they're small], and it means that those that are having the least and the worst connection are basically paying the most, which is not a [fair] model.

So there is a lot of [problems] with that end. I'm not sure if this [ETNO] proposal helps it but it certainly feels (inaudible). And I think the great news is that there will be (inaudible) about the economic model of the internet and this [will change]. I don't expect anything big to happen at the Dubai meeting but I expect the trend of discussing this goes further in the next [year]. I hope I managed to respond to your question.

JOSE ARCÉ: Jose Arcé speaking. Juan, would you like to have the floor?

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Juan speaking, Juan Manuel. I want to apologize because I have to leave the call so I apologize before leaving. Thank you.

JOSE ARCÉ: Jose Arcé speaking. Is there any other question on the English channel? I don't see anybody raising their hand on the AC room. Go ahead, Natalia.

NATALIA ENCISO: Natalia speaking. I have two questions.

JOSE ARCÉ: Go ahead.

INTERPRETER: This is the interpreter on the English channel. Natalia, you can go on with your questions. I will convey that message to the speakers on the Spanish channel. Hold on please.

NATALIA ENCISO: So Natalia speaking. I have two questions. Since governments have more and more participation in the internet governance, how can we strike a balance between them and the other multi-stakeholders. And secondly, what would be the positive consequences of amending the ITR in terms of internet users? Thank you.

VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: Thank you for the questions. The first one – how can we help? I think we should help in a couple of levels and I mentioned that on a global level I think we should also have non-government stakeholders. It is becoming where the government does that all the time and we have to be aware of that and we have to be aware of the fact that even now sometimes we don't (inaudible) and we don't like the fact that they're in charge of [things] and decisions, that this is just [an impediment]. We should be aware of that and let them in.

On the other hand we should do our best to raise our capacities (inaudible) to raise their awareness of how complex the internet is, how complex internet governance is, that we do not need to regulate

---

everything because the internet is as it is today because of the end-to-end networking and because of the (inaudible). We should try to raise capacity and build capacity (inaudible), also with other stakeholders that span the (inaudible) picture of all the aspects – infrastructure, media and social culture aspect, economic aspect and so on, in the process. And lastly we should try I think to raise awareness of importance of the multi-stakeholder meetings where the policies are begun.

I think you then realize that they do not know enough about the internet and they realize from the economic perspectives, at least talking about the governments and civil societies which are democratic more or less where the governments do not really have a high interest in monopolizing the internet, control the content and so on for their political benefit.

In civil society I think we can [choose] on the economic level and the level of development in society and explain why the open internet means something that can help in the development of society and then why the multi-stakeholder model is important for the [global] internet, and push on the national level to the global level. So that's a very, very important part.

And then of course on the global level if we can change the UN system to at least modify the ITU so it becomes more relevant and show the success of the stakeholders and show the success of the multi-stakeholders and the ICANN as well of course, that's gonna be quite a success. And the question was what – should I repeat something? I see the line is not good... Okay let me know if I am to repeat anything.

---

The second question was basically on how the ITU generally impacts end users. It will impact the way the business models are; it will impact the way the (inaudible) on the internet. It can impact the openness of the internet, that's probably one of the biggest things. Because if ITU takes over the law of being the type of security take on a global level, and they force a treaty some governments may (inaudible) it and go for content, go for censorship and so on. And we might effectively have a fragmented internet where some content will be available, some not.

We'll probably have problems in that locality and not going to be able to create whatever we want – new content, a new server. So it can impact heavily the end users. I don't think it will, at least not after the Dubai meeting itself. It will take long time. The whole process is quite long but we should stay tuned and be alert on the most important thing, that we are alerted and raising our voice wherever and whenever we can. Thank you.

JOSE ARCÉ:

Jose Arcé speaking. We have run out of time so, Vladimir, on behalf of LACRALO, we really want to thank you for joining us, for your presentation, for taking our questions, so we thank you for your support to our capacity building program in the Latin American and Caribbean Region and thank you. We really thank you and appreciate your help. Thanks.

Jose Arcé speaking for the record. We now continue with the agenda for today. We will move on to item 4 that is following up of the Costa Rica General Assembly that was an outstanding issue before Toronto. I

told you then that after the meeting in Toronto we could continue with this topic. Let me update you on the current status and the next steps.

After some consultation, after consulting certain people, after drafting a series of questions and circulating them or sending them to ICANN's Legal Department and after obtaining the replies to these questions, we were able to come up with some proposals for us to proceed or review the General Assembly. I have summarized these proposals in a document.

I'm sure that after this teleconference takes place those two documents will be uploaded onto the Wiki. One of them will have a summary of the GA in Costa Rica plus the adopted agenda and the second document will have all the follow up of the General Assembly.

It contains an introduction that includes all the steps taken to date plus three proposals that I will be briefly describing to you shortly. And then we have common aspects among these three proposals. Once the material is available on the LACRALO Wiki in both languages, the idea is for us to debate these proposals within a two-week time frame.

After this time frame and once we choose one of the proposals, we will immediately resume the GA so that we can bring it to a close. Let me now tell you what the proposals are about regarding the follow-up of the GA.

The first proposal is to continue with the GA, that is, by doing all the proceedings or holding all necessary actions and proceedings in real time, that is, by means of using Adigo and other tools. This of course

brings advantages and disadvantages when it comes to discussing the agenda, etc.

The other option is to work *via* email, not in real time. I thought about an email exchange list devoted to this purpose so that we can bring the GA to a close and observe the last article of our Rules of Procedure regarding voting when we work with this methodology.

And finally we have a proposal that is a combination of proposal 1 and 2. We can work in real time and we can work according to the second proposal that is not in real time, depending on the items or points. Maybe some issues that do not need to be dealt with in real time can be dealt with maybe within a week's time frame, for example.

So this is in a nutshell the content of the documents that we will be uploading. Of course the documents will be far more detailed and I expect that tomorrow or the day after they will be available on the Wiki. I don't know if there are any questions or comments at this point in time regarding the GA and the next steps regarding this follow up.

So this is Jose Arcé speaking again. Seeing no one raising their hand, so I hope that after reading the documents that will be sent by email, I hope to obtain feedback so as to be able to keep on working and set the pace for the GA.

The next topic on the agenda...

---

SILVIA VIVANCO: Jose, this is Silvia Vivanco speaking. Sorry for interrupting you but I see that Antonio Medina and Fatima would like you to repeat the steps to follow.

JOSE ARCÉ: This is Jose Arcé speaking. Okay, so the steps to follow are the following. Regarding the GA – I will be circulating after the end of this teleconference the documents the ICANN staff for them to post it on the Wiki and once these documents are posted on the Wiki, we will discuss them during two weeks.

They will be translated. You will be able to provide feedback. That is to say to provide feedback so as to keep on working because the Chair and the Secretary were asking us to have different people, the Legal Department, certain issues. So the step that is still pending in terms of the proposals is to see the feedback from the region so as to decide the following steps.

So we need the feedback of the region; we need the opinion of the region because our rules are not clearly defined in terms of the continuation of the GA if it is that we are not holding a face-to-face GA. So within the next few weeks we will be discussing which of these modalities we will be using and then we will start with the GA so as to be able to finish with the agenda and that's it.

This is Jose Arcé speaking. I don't know if... Antonio and Fatima, are those steps clear for you now? This is Jose Arcé speaking. I see Antonio has posted a question in the AC room. So this is a special case so the answer is yes, Antonio, this is a special case. That's why we have taken

---

so long to solve this issue. We need to discuss this topic because we need to end with this issue by the end of the month within the ICANN Bylaws – that’s why.

Is there any other comment or question regarding the next step? Otherwise, we can move on with the agenda.

SILVIA VIVANCO: This is Silvia. Dev has his hand up.

JOSE ARCÉ: Okay, Dev, go on.

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Are you hearing me? This is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Okay, thank you. This is Dev Anand Teelucksingh. Sorry. Thank you. This is Dev Anand speaking. I thought I got disconnected when Jose gave his explanation.

My question is this though – are we going to await the results from the LACRALO Working Groups before trying to resume the General Assembly? That’s my question. Thank you.

JOSE ARCÉ: Sorry, Dev. This is Jose Arcé speaking. I could not hear your question because I had a problem with my audio.

---

SILVIA VIVANCO: This is Silvia Vivanco speaking. Are we going to wait for the results of the Working Groups so as to go on with the GA?

JOSE ARCÉ: So this is Jose Arcé speaking. Thank you very much, Silvia. Dev, responding to your question – that is not a definite or already solved issue. Nothing is clear yet so I think that most of the people that have expressed their opinion wanted to put an end to the GA.

Many of them said there would not be a data impact and many other people suggested a suspension of the GA. So I think we can discuss the issue again once you read the proposals and decide which proposal we should use. And I think, Dev, I think you say that we should wait for the response of the Working Groups. So now you will have the opportunity to post your opinion regarding the response of the GA and if we don't want to wait for the response of the Working Groups.

This is Jose Arcé speaking. Is there any other question? I am on the AC room but I cannot see any hands up. I don't know if there's a delay with my computer.

SILVIA VIVANCO: This is Silvia. Dev has his hand up.

JOSE ARCÉ: Okay, Dev, go on please.

---

DEV ANAND TEELUCKSINGH: Thank you. Dev Anand Teelucksingh again. Just one quick thing – one important thing for the GA to resume is that we need an accurate summary of the minutes of the GA until the GA was suspended at the end of the... at the Costa Rica meeting. So we need to have that detailed summary before we decide how we're going to proceed with the GA. That's all. Thanks.

JOSE ARCÉ: This is Jose Arcé speaking. Dev, I know you have an audio problem but the first thing I said is that the first document will be posted. It's a summary of the GA in Costa Rica and the final agenda drafted by Humberto Carrasco. So of course that document will be available I think tomorrow or the day after tomorrow.

SYLVIA HERLEIN LEITE: This is Sylvia Herlein Leite. There is no other hand up so we might proceed with the agenda and with point 5 on the agenda. So this is Sylvia Herlein Leite speaking. I would like to give you a brief summary of our meeting in Toronto. We have a lot of things to tell you; many things happened and in a nutshell, they were all positive things.

To start with, we had a presentation of the interaction of Fadi Chehadé, the new CEO and of course you will be able to see that presentation in the ICANN website. When you enter the ICANN website, you will see that this presentation was divided into three different parts. This presentation is called *A Map to the Future* and if I can say it or express it in my own words, he has made a revolution in terms of the ICANN

---

structure because there is some modification in these departments and communication among these departments.

He has also announced the creation of a new website called *My ICANN* and this is a site which is not replacing the main ICANN website, but I have posted the link on the AC room. This site will help and make it easier for us to find the information because we're always complaining about the fact that it is difficult to understand what is happening in ICANN.

So this is very important because it has the proper structure. We will be able to see all the meetings and to follow up all the facts within ICANN. We will be able to see news from At-Large and the news that we receive by the staff. So it's very easy... The information is very well organized. We can choose the topics that are interesting for us and we can receive updated information.

There is a calendar if you go to the upper part of the page. You can choose the topics and you can synchronize this with our own calendar which is a Gmail calendar. One of the news of this page, *My ICANN*, is something that we have been requesting for a long time.

Many people in the ALSes complain about the fact that they receive or they have many emails and that they do not know what to do with that amount of information. So with this *My ICANN* new page, we can request information regarding our points of interest and we can choose if that information may be delivered to us in a summary on a daily basis or on a weekly basis.

I hope that you can get a general idea so I invite you to visit this link. It is very easy to navigate and you can choose all the information that you need. I think it's a very fantastic tool. The presentation was really very interesting.

Regarding another important issue which is the meeting we had with all the leaders, the At-Large leaders – the Chairs and Secretaries – and I will post the link for you to see all the recordings in Spanish and in English and in French as well of all the discussions carried out in that meeting.

So please pay attention to these; listen to the recordings because we were exchanging information and that we know our needs, we know that we are not alone; we are not the only ones who have problems and we are not the only ones who are obtaining tools or getting things.

So I think that meeting was really, really interesting. I know that I am speaking quite hard but I know that we are running out of time. So the agenda for that meeting was also very interesting and please allow me to post a link on the AC room so you can listen to the recordings.

Another important issue is that we had the meeting with the Latin American Group. This was a meeting organized by Rodrigo de la Parra. He was not able to be present in the meeting but it was really interesting to have him participating remotely.

In that meeting we spoke about a new strategy for the region. We were lucky to have Fadi Chehadé, the new CEO participating with us and I think we are one of the privileged regions in this new future of ICANN, together with the African Region. So the Latin American and African

Regions are having new tools and new opportunity to catch the new ICANN CEO's attention and to obtain help.

And there is a new proposal Rodrigo de la Parra published this new strategy on the ICANN blog and since it was in English, I published that information in our Wiki and taken into account the wonderful translation tool that we have, you will be able to read that information in Spanish.

And I have also prepared a link related to the introduction made by some of the people participating in that meeting – Fadi Chehadé was one of them – and Olga Magruda – she is the new female member of the ICANN Board and she comes from the Latin American Region. So this was something really important. And in the last link I published or posted, you will be able to hear her speech.

And finally, we had a meeting on Thursday at the summary of all the activities in Toronto meeting with all the Chairs and Secretaries. I had the privilege to represent Jose because as you know, he was not able to attend the Toronto meeting due to family problems.

And in that meeting I had the privilege of reporting that we were working very well in our region. We know we have problems but all of them have a knowledge to our work and our training courses or capacity building sessions.

I have many things to say but basically these are the most important points to cover. I posted the links for you to read and to have an overview. I don't know if there are any questions or comments. Otherwise, this is the end of my summary. Thank you very much.

JOSE ARCÉ: This is Jose speaking. I don't know if Fatima has a comment. Fatima, go ahead.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: This is Fatima speaking. This is a short comment. First of all I would like to thank Sylvia for the report and all the information she sent us during the Toronto meeting because we got clear information.

And in terms of remote participation of those who were not able to attend the Toronto meeting, I would like to comment on that. I was participating in many of the regions and unfortunately I was not able to see many members of our region participating in that meeting.

So I think we have a very important tool which is remote participation. We have simultaneous interpretation and it's really a pity we are not making the best of that tool for our region in order to have all the information that Sylvia gave us.

So this is a very short comment but please, let's try to use these tools because we are asking for these tools and then when we have the tools, we are not using them.

JOSE ARCÉ: This is Jose Arcé speaking. Thank you, Fatima. Thank you, interpreters. Thank you, staff, for participating in this call. We have finished with the agenda topics so this is the end of this monthly teleconference. Thank you very much for participating and let's keep in touch by email, Skype or by any other means. Thank you very much and good-bye.

[End of Transcript]