

---

LONDON – ATLAS II Plenary - Session 2  
Saturday, June 21, 2014 – 11:00 to 13:00  
ICANN – London, England

ANNOUNCER: This is ATLAS II Plenary Session 2, beginning at 11:00 AM, UTC+1.

CHERYL LANGDON-ORR: Ladies and gentleman, I'm not using my parade ground noise, but I can make the volume louder, and I hope that anyone that is outside of the room is coming in now. This session is about to begin. For technology reasons, for some bizarre and peculiar reason, some of the QR-code reading, that the volunteers were going to do to mark you in, it's not operating properly. At the moment, only Carlos has a piece of equipment that can mark you in. Don't mob him, but before you leave for lunch, make sure he's captured your data. That's your responsibility.

In a perfect world you'd find the technology will have been mastered. Gunela, can you stop cuddling people and come and make yourself known? Mercy and Gunela, come into the center. These two girls at least – and there will be other volunteers – will be the team that will be able to capture your data later, but we have to get their equipment working. At this stage, before you get to lunch, get your data captured by Carlos. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Cheryl. Let's start the session. People will be coming back in, as we have sent a few bloodhounds out there to hunt them and find them. I know it was a short break. I guess the recording

---

*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.*

---

is on. Welcome to the second Plenary Session of this exciting morning. I hope it's exciting for you. We're going to be going through a small presentation of the Internet and Internet governance worldwide discussions, and why it's important for end users to get involved in those worldwide discussion.

Net Mundial and all of the recent discussions that recently have started, have placed an emphasis on a multistakeholder model that involved the private sector, governments, civil society, end users and the technical community, all talking in one room, talking to each other and reaching consensus. We're going to go through a few of these more recent developments, which I hope you'll find helpful in the discussions you'll have this afternoon in the Thematic Working Groups.

Let's go to the first slide please. The Internet. That's why we're all here. It's a technology that was developed a very long time ago, back in the 60s. It never really was something that... No one ever forecasted that there was going to be three billion Internet users. Every month I have to put the number up. The technical specifications are dealt with by the Internet Engineering Task Force. They had a meeting in London just a few months ago, in this very hotel actually.

They work to continue the Internet's technical development. It's a multistakeholder process, so it was open to everyone to participate in – mostly technical people, I guess. We actually have some IETF people among us, and among some of the other delegations here in the hotel, and throughout the week. It's a distributed system. It's a network of networks. There's no single owner of the Internet and that's sometimes

---

very difficult for people to understand. How can there be no single owner? How can it all be coordinated together?

That's because we've got several organizations that deal with this in a multistakeholder fashion. The Domain Naming System, which is primarily the responsibility of ICANN, IANA, all of the organizations that you've heard from this morning. It's a hierarchy of name servers with a central root. It's one basic server that's then mirrored around the world a few hundreds of times, for your computer to be able to translate a domain name – when you put the address in an email or on a website – into a number, which is the number at which the server is located.

As some of you might know, we're running out of a certain class of number called IPv4 addresses. We're now going through this new IPv6. They're much longer, much bigger addresses. This whole DNS system is distributed around the world. What's important there is the multistakeholder aspect to it. Next slide please. The Internet wouldn't be the Internet without end users.

Back in the day when it was being built, there were many other networks that were around – many private networks. Slowly, due to the fact that users could be basically proposing any type of service that they wanted to have on the net, it became this network of networks, with any type of traffic allowed, ideally with no filtering, so the end users have a choice of what they want. It became a champion for innovation, as a result. Many, many companies, start-ups, were created with just a handful of people.

Great ideas. Put it on the net. It then grew from that point onwards. You can imagine a service. You can design it. You don't need to obtain a

---

license to offer it on the net. You don't need to apply for permission from anyone to provide your service out there. The smallest startup ended up being very successful. Next slide please.

We mentioned multistakeholder. That's a key part of the Internet. It's been running for 40 years in this multistakeholder governance environment. That's a case of having governments, businesses, civil society, the technical community, individual users and indeed any other stakeholder not covered by the above – that might include your pet, that might include all sorts of beings, and of course we welcome people from other planets as well. That multistakeholder environment is open to everyone. Next please.

That's a very interesting slide that the Internet Society had a few years ago, and I think that we've kept. It's the Internet model, and with a number of organizations and stakeholders that take part in its different processes, if we go to the next slide we'll just focus on a couple of these. The first one is the standards. We mentioned earlier the IETF. That's not the only organization dealing with the technical standards.

They deal with the protocols for computers to talk to each other. There are other standard bodies out there, including the Worldwide Web Consortium. That deals primarily with the browser compatibility, so you can use whatever browser you want, and your webpages are going to display in a pretty similar fashion; whether it's on a computer or a portable device, these days. Bearing in mind, the highest growth of the Internet today is on portable devices.

There are Internet Society-affiliated organizations. In there, there's also the ITU, the International Telecommunication Union. Their telecoms

---

part is also dealing with another layer of the whole model, and that's primarily the cables and the interfaces, etcetera, that your computers and your devices run on. That's open standards development. These standards are not proprietary to any of the organizations in there. Next.

We have multistakeholder policy. That's why we're here. Governments and the regional organizations, multi-lateral institutions, the Internet Society and other policy discussion forums, like the Internet Governance Forum, all discuss policy. The big difference with ICANN is that here we don't just discuss policy. Decisions are made. The decisions will affect the three billion Internet users out there.

This is an operational multistakeholder model that we're part of. That's really where the challenge is, because as soon as you can make decisions, then things become very serious. Next.

Multistakeholder naming is what ICANN deals with. You've seen earlier that we've got ICANN, we've got the regional Internet registries, that deal with the numbers. We have IANA, as we spoke earlier, the IANA contract. We have the generic top-level domains – .com, .net, .org – and there are hundreds of new gTLDs that are being created at this very moment. Then there are the country code top-level domains – .uk, .fr, .de, .au, etcetera. All of these have policy processes that are multistakeholder in nature.

Even ccTLDs have their own policies, national policies, but many of them adopt multistakeholder bottom-up input in there as well. Next slide please. The multistakeholder model in ICANN was traditionally shown as the Board of Directors in the center and everyone pointing to the Board of Directors. You'll notice At-Large has one seat on the Board of

---

Directors. That's seat number 15, currently held by Sebastian Bachollet, whom you met earlier. The other parts of ICANN have also got seats on there: the Address Supporting Organization, the Generic Name Supporting Organization, the Country Code Name Support Organization.

Then the Nominating Committee, which is chaired this year by Cheryl Langdon-Orr is supplying eight people in total, for the Board. They're being selected by the NomCom. I ask you if you're interested, in positions both on the Board, but also in the ccNSO, the gNSO and the ALAC, this year's cycle is too late to apply for, but next year's cycle will start in a few months' time with the next Chair, the Chair Elect, who will take over. It'll be a good opportunity for any of you who are interested, in those positions I mentioned, to apply.

The Ombudsman, on the side, relates to the Chair. He will pass by. A very useful person. He deals with any conflicts. He's also a mediator, if you have some mediation required for some of the discussions. Of course we've got President and CEO. The numbers for the ICANN staff have actually increased greatly since ICANN has had to do so much more in the past few years. Now, we're going to do something that we love doing, which is to get rid of the Board of Directors. Next slide please.

Zap. They're all out. Good. Now we can talk. That's really where the policy work takes place. The Board is just there to ratify the policy work, get the input from all the organizations that are part of ICANN. They're not there to make policy. That policy is discussed in those component organizations, and most of the component organizations you see there are multistakeholder in nature. One that is not multistakeholder in

---

nature is the Government Advisory Committee, the GAC, because of course that's composed of governments.

They have their own part in ICANN. They have a high-level meeting taking place on Monday, and I'd invite you, if you are interested to see GAC Members talk to each other and participate... I know they have an open session as well where you can ask questions. You'd be really encouraged to go and meet with governments. They're not bad. They're nice people. They come here. They talk. They don't impose their points of view on anyone else, because they're part of the overall ICANN multistakeholder model. They just have another seat at the table, just like the other ACs.

That's the overall model. As you can see – At-Large, Internet users, very important. We have a voice. We're able to comment on everything taking place at ICANN. Next. ICANN functions. Very important. ICANN doesn't deal with the content on website. ICANN doesn't deal with freedom of speech issues, with some of the broader Internet governance issues that are out there. The primary functions of ICANN are to deal with the names, the addresses, the look-up between the names and address – the translation between the two.

There are hundreds of billions of look-ups that take place every day, for every Internet user that surfs the net or sends emails and so on. Of course, there are the country code top-level domains that are all part of ICANN. You've got the ICANN policy that's in the center of everything, the look-up and the technical work that ICANN does, and then the protocols and parameters that are all part of this overall system. That of

---

course includes the use of the protocols that the IETF has designed for computers to talk to each other. Next slide please.

There's a massive roadmap here that you're not expected to see. That's the sort of thing that's taking place at the moment, the work that's been taking place. You'll notice many of the people sitting around the table, myself included, have got very dark patches under our eyes. That's because we don't really know what day it is, what time of the day it is, whether it's day or night. We know we're on planet earth, but we're constantly traveling between one thing and another.

There's an enormous amount of work that's taking place there. I hand over to our Chief Traveler Extraordinaire, Nigel Hickson, who was recently VP for Global Stakeholder Engagement for Europe, and has now moved to VP for IGO. Perhaps not "ego" but Nigel, I had the floor over to you.

NIGEL HICKSON:

Thanks very much indeed. Welcome to London. It's the first time I've said that, well, at this conference. London's my hometown, so it's fantastic to have an ICANN meeting here. Well, I thought it would be fantastic to have an ICANN meeting here, and then it takes rather a lot of work. It's really great to be here, and it's great that the sun's shining. We ordered that specially. It won't last a week so make the most of it. It'll probably last about two days.

Olivier, thank you very much for inviting me along this morning. As you said, my name's Nigel Hickson. I work in the Geneva office. I particularly work on Internet governance issues in relation to the UN, to the ITU, and



---

to various other international organizations. The idea is to talk a bit about Internet governance and what's going on. Olivier and I decided to put this roadmap up, because it's interesting in not so much in the detail. Some of the detail is past, some of the detail is even wrong now, because things change so much.

What it does, if you look at the slides together – and I'm sure you'll have these in your pack, or whatever – it shows a continuum. It shows a road. It shows a route from back in 2012 right through to 2015 on Internet governance. You might say, "Internet governance, why does it need a road? It's something that's there, it's something that's being discussed." Well, the roadmap is useful because there's a set of negotiations, there's a set of discussions, there's a whole panoply of the overview of Internet governance taking place during these few years.

Can you move the slides along, is that possible? Great. Essentially, let me frame the discussions on Internet governance in this way. Very briefly, Internet governance is about the governance of the Internet. I know that sounds trite, but it's in two ways. Internet governance is governance of the Internet, which is the stuff that we're involved in in ICANN, in the RIRs, in the IETF and the standards bodies. It's the nuts and bolts. It's the guts of the Internet. It's the numbers. It's the names. It's the technical infrastructure. It's what we get excited about in ICANN, and just a few other people get excited about it as well.

Then there's governance on the Internet. Internet governance covers both areas, and governance on the Internet is things like privacy, surveillance, child protection, cyber security, data protection, fraud – all these issues. You might say, "What's that got to do with us?" but it's all

---

Internet governance and it all gets discussed in a continuum of discussions. It's particularly pertinent at the moment, because some of you will recall that on the Internet governance agenda back in 2003 and 2005, there was this World Summit on the Information Society.

This Summit, if you like, addressed how the Internet should be governed. There were lots of compromises. The IGF was set up, etcetera, and something called the Tunis Agenda was developed and was published. The Tunis Agenda has this definition on Internet governance, and it's the Tunis Agenda that's being reviewed. It's ten years on, so it's being reviewed by the United Nations in 2015. That in itself has kicked off a number of discussions on Internet governance.

If we can leave the roadmap for now, because rather than go through individual items, I picked a few out that I think are relevant. If we can go to the next slide? It goes on and on. It does stop! One more? Okay. What I'm going to do is briefly pick out a few things on that roadmap, so you can look back at the roadmap and see a number of these different discussions, a number of these different forums, are taking place. We've characterized this as "Internet governance, post-WCIT".

Some of you will recall that in 2012 the International Telecommunications Union held a Summit, a Conference... What is WCIT? I was going to explain. WCIT was the World Conference on International Telecommunications. It was an ITU Conference to review something called the International Telecommunication Regulations, which had been drawn up in 1988. This is not relevant to us. What the Conference did was to debate the whole subject of the internet, because as I said, there's a dichotomy on the governance of the Internet,

---

between those countries, those bodies, that feel the Internet should be governed by the ITU or by the UN or some other governmental organization.

The belief that most of us have is that the Internet should be governed in a multistakeholder way, in which we do it and the RIRs do it, etcetera. This debate on Internet governance came to the fore at the WCIT in December. Since then, there's been a number of other events that have discussed Internet governance. After the WCIT, where this debate took place on Internet governance, we had the World Telecommunications Policy Forum, another ITU conference, in May 2013.

This actually had a focus on Internet governance and we agreed some policy recommendations on Internet governance, which included the need to discuss Internet governance in a multistakeholder way. For us, this was quite a positive development. It recognized that not everything was right, that not everything was rosy in the garden, but that we needed to discuss Internet governance in a multistakeholder way, and that we needed to address the concerns, and the concerns of governments, specifically in the developing world, on Internet governance issues.

One of the main issues that came out of that WCIT in December 2012 in Dubai, was governments saying that they had issues – whether it was on spam, cyber security, fraud, child protection – and how they were going to get these issues resolved. Where could they get advice? Where could they get policy guidance on these issues? Next slide please. The World Telecommunications Policy Forum addressed Internet governance, and then of course after May 2013 we had June.

---

This time last year, what was on the front of our newspapers, certainly in many of our countries? Snowden. Surveillance. Lack of privacy. Governments spying on their citizens. This whole issue of surveillance came to the forefront, and many of us were faced with a dilemma, weren't we? We say to an extent it's got nothing to do with ICANN. Clearly it had nothing to do with the technical nature on the Internet, although technical vulnerabilities were used, to an extent. It had nothing to do with us, but it raised the whole issue of Internet governance onto another level, because the surveillance recommendations made people think.

They thought, "What is going on, on the Internet? Who governs the Internet? How is the governance of the Internet taken forward?" Many of you will also recall that there was a speech by the President of Brazil, Mrs. Rousseff, in New York in September 2013, in which she challenged the United Nations. She said, "We can't go on like this. We need a new model for the Internet. The Internet is too important. The Internet has grown up. The Internet has become an adult and the Internet needs adults to work with it." As a result of that speech and various negotiations that followed that speech, Brazil decided to hold this Net Mundial Conference in April 2014.

Many of you were there. This was a multistakeholder meeting of global participants to discuss the multistakeholder model. That's what's written there. It resulted in a statement on Internet governance principles. These Internet governance principles were the principles by which, if you like, governments, civil society and business should abide, and a roadmap for the future evolution of Internet governance. Next slide please.

---

Why was this important? Well, we thought this was quite an important occasion because it was post-Snowden. A meeting of global stakeholders to discuss Internet governance. It was probably a unique occasion. Brazil organized this meeting in a truly multistakeholder way. They had Committees made up of multistakeholders. It attracted 110 countries, and it debated an output document of which there were many inputs before the discussion, and many inputs and comments during the discussion in São Paulo.

It was a truly democratic experience, being at Net Mundial. Governments, civil society, business, were there altogether. In some way it was different from what we do in ICANN. I'm no expert of what we do in ICANN, but the unique thing about Net Mundial is everyone stood. You know how we do the Public Forum at ICANN and we all stand behind microphones? It was the same at Net Mundial. All they did at Net Mundial that was different, because they had so many people that wanted to talk, was they had one microphone here for civil society and business, and they had one microphone over here for government.

It was quite strange actually. People queued up for government and people queued up for civil society, but they got confused and they got in the wrong queues. It was incredible to see everyone standing up, speaking together. The result of that conference, the Net Mundial, was important in that it co-defined principles on Internet governance and it set out the need for Internet governance to be discussed with all participants. Internet governance wasn't the purview of just governments or just business or just civil society. It was everyone working together.

---

It was different. It was very different. The widespread endorsement of the final document was very important. Now, the final document wasn't to everyone's liking. It talked about freedom of expression. It talked about the open Internet, which for some governments, understandably, politically, is difficult for them, but it had widespread endorsement by nearly everyone there. Next.

As I said, the impact of Net Mundial is still being felt, and I think it will be a significant factor as we move forward. Just now to look at a couple of events that are still to take place. The WTDC was the World Telecommunications Development Conference. That took place just after Net Mundial. That in itself was an ITU's four-yearly conference to look at development measures. Again, it didn't touch much on ICANN's work. It touched a bit on IPv6, but again it showed that by all parties coming together – and it was a very open conference, with governments, with business, with civil society – one can make a difference on the developmental front.

The IGF. The Internet Governance Forum takes place in September in Istanbul. The IGF, many of you will know about it. It's important because it is the only truly global meeting of all stakeholders, on an annual basis, on all sorts of topics to do with Internet governance. This year it's going to be particularly important, because it's going to try and take up some of the process that we had in Net Mundial in Brazil, and it's going to try and have some sessions where there are actual conclusions – where some sort of documentation of the policy discussions is drawn up.

---

Equally important, the Mandate for the IGF has to be renewed by the United Nations in 2015, and thus the importance of the discussion in September. Okay. Next slide. Thanks. To finish then, two more events on this continuing process, which are important. ITU holds its plenipotentiary, the plenipotentiary conference every four years, so it's in 2014. It's in Busan in South Korea, at the end of October and November. It's the time where the ITU comes together; the Membership of the ITU, which is primarily the 196 countries joined by the sector members, which are business and academics, etcetera.

The plenipotentiary is mainly an opportunity for the governments to come together, to re-elect their leaders. At this conference the Secretary General, Hamadoun Touré steps down. He's done his eight years. He's going to be replaced by a new Secretary General. There will also be elections for the Deputy Secretary General, and the Head of the Telecommunications Standardization Board. The elections take place. It's the time when the ITU adopts its Strategic Plan for the next four years, and looks at lots of other process issues as well.

It's also an opportunity where the ITU can amend its constitution and convention, which is important because it's the ITU constitution that's the bedrock for what the ITU does, and it's an opportunity for the ITU to renew their resolutions. The constitution, if you like, says what the ITU does in terms of its nature – like ICANN has a constitution – and the resolutions are what, if you like, the Membership wants the ITU to do.

The resolution says that the Secretary General should go out and paint a building, or the resolutions say the Secretary General should do this, or the staff should do this. It's the resolutions, and the resolutions on

---

Internet governance – and some of them I’ve noted up there – will be renewed in 2014, later this year. Internet governance will be one of those discussions, and hence the importance of this conference.

We’re hoping that what this conference will do will lance the boil that was created to an extent at the WCIT, where there was this fight, this divergence, between countries, where there was a vote on whether governance should be something for the people or something for the governments. Not exactly of that nature, but there was this dichotomy in WCIT in 2012 and what we’re hoping is that in Busan later this year, there will be a structured debate.

We hop it will be recognized that ICANN has a role, that the ITU has a role, that the IETF has a role, that ISOC has a fundamental role in terms of the Internet, that the RIRs have a role – that we all have roles to play. We need to cooperate. We’ve got vital work to do to reach the next so many billion users, as Fadi Chehadé would tell you, much more eloquently than I can. We all have a role to play and we must cooperate. We’re hoping that in Busan the resolutions will reflect that cooperation. It will reflect what role we play. Perhaps I’m an optimist.

The alternative of course is that the resolutions will call for the ITU to do things, or they’ll call for the UN to do things. If the resolutions call for that it’ll be a disaster, because it will split the ITU. It will split the UN, in terms of Internet governance, and again we’ll be back into this endless, meaningless debate. Finally, after the plenipotentiary... Next slide? I’m going to finish on the WSIS Review, where I started, to an extent.

As I said, the World Summit on the Information Society, in 2005 said that the Tunis Agenda, or the action lines under the Tunis Agenda, had to be



---

reviewed by 2015. There's been two review conferences. UNESCO held a review conference for their action lines, and UNESCO have action lines on multilingualism, on linguistic issues, on cultural issues, on human rights, etcetera. They had a conference in 2013, and only last week, or the week before, ITU hosted a WSIS Conference in Geneva, looking at a whole host of other action lines.

We adopted documents of that Conference, very positive documents, looking at the WSIS action lines. Those outputs from those conferences are going to be discussed in the UN General Assembly, probably in a conference in December 2015, where the UN will look at what's come out of the WSIS Agenda and hopefully endorse that we've made progress on a number of things, we've made progress on accessibility, we've made progress on broadband access, but there's more work to do in a whole host of other areas.

It's important though, because some countries have indicated that they'd like to use this Review of what happened in 2003 and in 2005 as a platform for a discussion on the governance of the internet again – in other words, a discussion on whether the Tunis Agenda itself, which set out this multistakeholder approach, should be effectively torn up again. Again, this is something that we'd think is probably not the best use of our time.

I'll finish there. I think there's one more slide that Olivier will probably want to talk to. If we can go to the next slide? There we are. Olivier will talk to this slide. Thank you very much for listening. I've got to disappear for a minute, he says, to address a staff meeting, but I'll be back for the discussion later on. Thank you. [Applause]

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much, Nigel. We have one question on the chat, before you go, regarding the statements on privacy of the Net Mundial declaration. What does it add beyond the UN Resolution of the last December?

NIGEL HICKSON: That's a good discussion. The UN Resolution of last December, where it said treatment online and treatment offline should be equal, and there was the Resolution from Brazil and Germany. I don't think what came out of Net Mundial, in terms of principles, took that significantly further, although I could be challenged on that. I think what's significant about the principles that came out of Net Mundial is that they were debated on and agreed in this multistakeholder setting.

They're not just the principles that were adopted by the UN General Assembly – and I'm not saying there's anything wrong with those – but I think it was significant that these principles were adopted by Net Mundial. Equally significant, and something I should have mentioned, but no doubt you'll hear it this week, is that those principles that were adopted in Brazil in April, were also then re-endorsed by the high-level panel on Internet governance that ICANN hosted, Chaired by President Ilves of Estonia.

That Panel reported in May. It effectively said, "We were going to come up with our own principles, but the ones in Brazil were so good that we'll use those instead." I think that yes, it was important.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Okay, thank you very much Nigel. We'll let you go to your meeting and come back pretty quickly. We're going to start a little dialogue here, a discussion. You've all been sitting here listening and doing your emails and whatever else sometimes. We're well aware of that. We're listening on every single computer in this room. Just kidding! I know that several people who went to Net Mundial are in the room.

The last slide was just the reiteration of what I said earlier – why is it important for Internet users? Certainly the debate on surveillance is something that's raised a lot of eyes and a lot of hands up, at the time. As far as the ICANN context is concerned, this organization doesn't deal with surveillance matters, as such. As I said earlier, it doesn't deal with content, but the policies that are decided in these fora and in the ICANN forums and what we do here, will affect all the Internet users out there.

The users really need to have a voice in that. I cannot imagine someone not having a voice into their future. These are very, very serious issues. If we lose the multistakeholder system of governance for the Internet, we potentially lose democracy. I know it might seem totally crazy to say that, but really, giving control of a network to one government or organization, that is not taking any interest in listening to Internet users and to the component parts of the Internet, including the companies that provide the services, etcetera, is a real danger.

Bottom-up is the order of the day. Again, we need to keep the Internet user-centric. If we lose the user-centricity of the Internet, we lose the Internet. It's as simple as that. I thought maybe firstly, just to start on the discussion on this, we could maybe have a few of the people that

---

have actually gone to Net Mundial, or even others, to put their hands up.

We need a roving mic. If staff could start putting their gym shoes on and running around? I don't know how many mics we have. We should have more than one. We've got two? Great. One will be thrown around from person to person and the other one will be carried. I've seen already there was Fouad and there was Garth. Fouad Bajwa first and then Garth, and then Alan. We have a queue already.

FOUAD BAJWA:

Thank you Olivier. I'm Fouad Bajwa from APRALO and Pakistan. Although I wasn't a participant within the Net Mundial, I was definitely a good follower of what was happening in the various One Net and IGC discussions. One thing that I've noted is that though you would not have full participation from the [opening 00:52:00] countries, like ours, one thing that does affect our countries, and which I've seen on an ongoing basis, with regards to Internet public policy and governance, is that even ideas can impact the situation of surveillance and other issues in our countries.

Already, the way that surveillance happens in our part of the world, it's not just one or two websites, or one or two IP addresses or domain names. These are blanket bans. These may be on terminology, like "undesirable", "unwanted" and "blasphemous" content, and that can be literally anything. These are very broad terms, and they can be loaded with any kind of content. There's a huge uncertainty that the Internet brings to our part of the world, and governments are not open to that change.

---

That is one of the primary challenges that we face with regards to Internet governance. The second most important thing remains, and you hear this across the IGF community, and the ICANN community, and that's capacity building and awareness. One of the only keys to open a door of understanding is how the Internet is important and how it impacts them. If you look, at the end of the day, it is the government-controlled channels that the Internet is being access through, in our countries. Those gateways are managed by the countries.

Even small concepts like Internet exchange points are surveillance by the government. You literally need permission from them. One of the future challenges that we see is a struggle – a continual struggle to bring the relevant people who actually impact the policy development within developing countries, to these [peoples 00:53:52]. Whatever it takes. It doesn't just matter about ICANN's specific role within the Internet ecosystem, but it also impacts the way these countries understand ICANN.

I think with the globalization of ICANN, the transition of the IANA stewardship role, there's an important aspect of capacity building and engagement, which cannot be overlooked. There has to be a lot of investment in that, and our community has to continue that role, that we are the champions of the discussions and the interventions, with regard to the Internet user aspect in our countries.

We should somehow be used by ICANN – either be strategized or used as arms or ambassador within our countries – and somehow bring these debates, with a renewed vision, to IGF and future Net Mundials. Thank you.

---

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Fouad. Next is Garth Graham.

GARTH GRAHAM: Hello. My name is Garth Graham, and I represent Telecommunities Canada. I'm provoked by that last slide that points out the essential nature of the Internet as user-centric, and I'd like to pose a question. If in fact that's true, then why is it that identity on the Internet is not user-centric, and can it be made to be user-centric as a standard? My assumption in that is that if my voice, the track of myself, across the world, is owned by me, regardless of who is tracking me, then I have a far greater trust in the fact that my story is being properly told.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Garth. I haven't got an answer for you. Maybe someone has? Do you have an answer? Okay, Carlos Aguirre? We'll have Carlos, then Tijani, and then Alan Greenberg is in the queue. I see a lot of hands now. I should be above everyone, controlling the world! Of course not, that's not the way it works! Carlos, you have the floor.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Thank you Olivier. I'm going to speak in Spanish. Thank you. I think Net Mundial was an excellent first step to start discussing many issues. A lot was said about mass surveillance, intellectual property. A lot was said about freedom of expression, freedom of speech, and I think it's absolutely interesting. I support all those issues, as I said in Net

---

Mundial. I believe there's something which is key, which is absolutely important, as Fouad said.

It's the issue of capacity building. We need more leaders. We need a commitment. We need engagement. We need those leaders who are not here who have to be built. As Olivier said, that discussion is a discussion that all of us have to hold. We all have to be in there. I think this is the core. What do we have to define and how can we make things better. We have to build those capacities because in Net Mundial in São Paulo, we were only 800 of us. 800 people present, accounting for one-tenth of a million of the world population.

We need more people there. We need more people involved in this. This is why I believe – and this is my last remark – that capacity building is fundamental here. Thank you.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much Carlos. That's very well heard. I hope that we will have at least another 100, 110 more people that will be taking part in this in the next global forum. We've got a lot of cards here. At the moment I've got Tijani Ben Jemaa, Alan Greenberg, and then I'm going to have to ask staff to look at the names right behind, because I can't really see. Tijani, and then we'll work out who's afterwards.

**TIJANI BEN JEMAA:** Thank you. I wanted just to explain the difference between the surveillance and the Internet governance. There is a lot of confusion about that. As Olivier said, surveillance doesn't have anything to do with Internet governance. Surveillance is about your bank giving access to its

---

government, to your bank account. This is surveillance. Internet governance is absolutely different. It is about who has the oversight of the Internet; one government, an intergovernmental body, or a cross-community, multistakeholder body. This is the difference. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Tijani. Next is Johnny Laureano. Is that correct?

JOHNNY LAUREANO: Yes. Good morning. I'm going to speak in Spanish. For those of us who attended Net Mundial in Brazil, I'd like to tell those of you who did not attend that meeting, that something very important was achieved. It's related to the title of today's meeting – updating about the world discussion about the future of Internet governance and the multistakeholder model. When we speak of multistakeholders, we speak of the different interests that the governments, private companies and of course civil society may have.

This means that all of us who are here have our interests, and that's why we're here, representing our interests. At Net Mundial, the following was achieved. The civil society, who used to be represented, since that we're all [inaudible 01:01:03] Information Society in Tunisia in 2005, eight or nine years ago, there were only three stakeholders – governments, private companies and civil society. Only three stakeholders. Civil society today includes all of us here in this room.

Civil society, since Net Mundial, is no longer civil society. In Net Mundial it was clearly said – and this is included in Net Mundial's statement – that today, civil society is represented by four segments; the academia,



---

the technical community, civil society, and the representatives of Internet users. By representatives of Internet users we mean exactly the following: users and Internet users. This is very clear, and we should make a distinction and move forward.

We have to update our knowledge. We have to update what we've been doing up until now. In the future, there will be new news according to the new structures, so that we'll be able to have clearly defined Internet governance, built on the opinions of the academia. Carlos Aguirre's presentation was very good at Net Mundial.

The visions of many technical people were quite right, as well as the opinion of civil society, and of course my opinion, as a representative of a group of users in Peru, and Members of the Latin American Federation of Internet Users, obviously we want to create a new Internet governance model. That's why we're here. Let's all work hard, so that we'll be able to achieve this. Let's build an Internet that may be governed from this vision, with these four groups represented.

Thank you ladies and gentlemen for giving me this opportunity. I think this is a very big opportunity for all of us. Thank you.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much indeed. We have a queue. Next in the queue is Alan Greenberg.

**ALAN GREENBERG:** Thank you very much. Olivier, you asked at the beginning, "Why is this important?" and I think it's really a key question. There are a number of

---

organizations in the world that have real, day-to-day, true impact on users. They range from the United Nations, World Court, ITU, World Intellectual Property Organization, all of which, in ways we often don't understand, control much of our lives. WIPO you may think of as an abstract organization, but the rules that are agreed there govern what drugs are available in developing countries. All sorts of really critical things.

All have a real impact on users. All were created pretty much uniquely by governments and companies that were involved, whether they're telecommunication companies or drug companies. This is perhaps arguably the only such endeavor that's going to have a significant impact on real users, and we're at the table. Not well, not strongly, not always fairly, but we have a voice. We're not likely to be excluded in the future. It's our challenge to make sure we use that voice effectively and impact the output.

We'd better not blow it, is what it comes down to. There's never been a case that I'm aware of, in the past, where we've had the opportunity to impact things that are going to continue to impact us directly in our day-to-day lives. We need to take this seriously. Thank you.

**OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:** Thank you very much Alan. Next is Sergio Salinas Porto. Evan was next? Okay. Fair enough. We'll put Evan immediately afterwards. Sergio, you have the floor. Sorry Evan.

---

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Good morning everyone. I'm Sergio Salinas Porto. I'm from Internauta Argentina, LACRALO. I'm going to speak in Spanish. We have discussed this several times, in different meetings with Internet users' organizations. What Johnny said is quite true. I support him, as a Member of the Latin American Federation of Internet Users, but I think he also expresses what we're doing in our countries to different consumers. I'd like to add something.

In this room, a lot has been said about the spying role of governments. I think we're mature enough to give a term of that, to name this. There's only one government that's been proved to be doing this; spying on other governments' citizens, and there's a name: United States of America. We have to give a name to these things, because otherwise we'll never move forward, and we'll say the things that the governments have to do are being challenged.

The governments are not being challenged. What we're challenging is the fact that a government, in one country, has intruded into other countries. That's it.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Sergio. I think it's recognized that everyone is pretty much spying on everyone else as well. Okay, perhaps one government has certainly been pointed at, but it looks as though the information is being shared everywhere, and everyone spies on everybody else. Of course, it's one of these open secret type things. It's a [cabal 01:07:51], yes, exactly. We're being spied on, and of course we'll probably have feedback from them very soon! Let's have Evan Leibovitch next.

---

By the way, there's always a joke – if you have any problems with your laptop or files and so on, you can ask these guys to send you a backup and it'll all be fine.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Thanks very much Olivier. I was very happy to be one of the people at Net Mundial, speaking, and I was very impressed with what I saw there. As you know, I was at the mic. I was very happy to be speaking, in fact, on behalf of end users, and working to get end user issues mentioned in the Net Mundial documents. I was unhappy, unfortunately, to be the only person doing so. We need a lot more of this.

I want to emphasize what Carlos said earlier about capacity building. In order for bottom-up to work properly, end users need to be informed about the issues, need to be informed about it in language that can be understood on the outside of the ICANN bubble. This is absolutely critical.

One of the other things that impressed me at Net Mundial was the use of the external Internet hubs, and the fact that you could have people that were halfway around the world, speaking in rooms, computer clubs, or whatever, with a webcam on them. They received the same amount of attention as the people that were standing at the mics in São Paulo. I found that extremely impressive, and I'd like to see the extent to which we can bring that into ICANN meetings.

This is a very, very good contribution. It helps break outside the bubble, outside the elites, and try and bring this into the kind of accessibility that is claimed that everybody wants, but rarely actually happens. Between

---

that, again, I want to stress we need education. We need people to understand. You folks in the room, you're on the front lines of this, so please listen to what you can. Challenge when you hear acronyms or things that are difficult to get by.

Try, and to the extent you can, come away without trying to penetrate the lingo and the culture that you see here. Don't be scared to ask questions, and please make the best of what you can. There are some lessons to be learnt for Net Mundial, and I see some of them coming out here. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Evan. Next is Thomas Lowenhaupt.

TOM LOWENHAUPT: Hi, Tom Lowerhaupt here. I'm from Connecting .NYC. We're a public interest organization advocating for the development of the .NYC top-level domain, as a public interest resource. I submitted a paper to the Net Mundial entitled "Cities, Citizens and City TLDs". What I would like to think of, as we go forward, is that in the past we had – and still have – a situation there's an industry that's quite aware of the power of a TLD, that's approaching cities, and cities are not nearly as aware as they should be of what this TLD can do for civil society, for the operation of government, for creating [unclear 01:11:16] for those on the wrong side of the digital divide.

I'd like to suggest that when... There are going to be 300 cities that have a million or more population, that are going to be looking for an example of the 35 who are now achieving their TLDs. I'd like to suggest that the

---

At-Large have a role in those new cities as they come along. That cities have to demonstrate, before they can get a TLD, that there's informed consent on the part of the people in those cities, and that part of that informed consent would come in the form of an At-Large structure in every one of the cities.

If you don't have an At-Large structure that's actively engaged with the citizens, that's providing [unclear 01:12:01] for residents of cities, your city is not prepared to have a TLD yet. I'd like to see this body consider that. I think most of us here probably live in cities, and most of us live in cities that do not have, or will not have, TLDs in the near future, but in three or four years, many or most cities will be applying for them.

We need to incorporate, in our TLDs, planning for how they work with other technologies, like GIS. How they integrate with the society, and in a variety of ways make greater cities, not sell domain names. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Thomas. Next we have Fatima Cambroneró.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Thanks Olivier. This is Fatima Cambroneró, ALAC Member of LACRALO. I'll speak in Spanish. I'm going to talk not about the Net Mundial meeting itself, because we have referred to this in many other spaces, and we'll also refer to this in Thematic Session 3, so I invite you to discuss this issue there. Now, with respect to what I can see as a consequence of Net Mundial: a national level, for example, in my country, in Argentina, after this meeting, for many colleagues in the region had an important marketing impact in making everyone want to

---

know what Internet governance is about and participate in Internet governance issues.

The repercussion is had in some national areas was that now governments do want to get involved in these issues. They are dealing with these issues, and they're inviting the other stakeholders to talk at least, to have a dialogue area. At least in my country, it's not really very clear whether [this week 01:13:43] will be a decision making area, or whether the other stakeholders will be able to get involved in this decision making, but we can take those decisions.

From our perspective, the perspective of organizations who represent end users, this is a positive impact. Now, another consequence is what's been raised here is the need to build capacity; that it's essential, because people want to get involved and they don't know how to do it. I will disagree with my colleagues. I do agree that we need to get more involved. I am a lot more involved now in initiatives related to these issues, but sometimes it's not necessary to invest money or resources.

Sometimes we can do this by presenting volunteers, by using the tools we have. In LACRALO, in our Latin American and Caribbean region, we started a Capacity Building Program with monthly calls. That's worked. It's allowed more people, more LACRALO Members, to hear about the issues we're discussing, and deepen these a little more. These can be copied with an online tool, and I want to call upon the leaders of the community.

Many times we invited them to get involved in these Capacity Building Programs, and most of them have got involved, but some of them have not really done this. Also, the Mentoring Program I'm involved with, if

---

we want more leaders, then currently it's the one [who want to 01:15:23] function as a model for future generations. This is a call for more involvement by those who are already involved. Thank you very much.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Fatima. What we're seeing here is a call for more involvement, of course, in our Capacity Building Working Group and sessions, but also we've heard earlier, from Tom Lowenhaupt, more involvement of ALSes actively engaged with citizens, and with local authorities. There is certainly a push these days for Internet users not only to go and collaborate with the process that we have here, but also speak to their local governments, and sometimes to their national governments.

There was a discussion that took place yesterday about involvement of Internet Society Chapters, with their local governments in the run-up to all of the discussions that are coming up in the future. So we see much capacity building, definitely, is required. There were a few questions on the chat. There's one that I was going to ask Alejandro Pisanty to answer. I don't know whether... I'm sorry to put you on the spot, but I know yesterday, or the day yesterday, we spoke...

Xavier Rodriguez on the chat asks me why the ICANN Board, years ago, reduced the number of representatives of the At-Large on the Board. I know we discussed this, and you were around at the time, and we know of the direct suffrage thing. Maybe you could give us a short, quick background to how this whole reorganization of ICANN took place?



ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

You are right, Olivier. This is Alejandro Pisanty speaking for the record. Well, I'm speaking for everybody. I'm stating my name for the record. You should know that this phrase, "Speaking for the record," has caused some extremely fun confusions in some communities. People actually addressing in the community as "the records". We've had to explain, in a very detailed way, that you're actually speaking to the people and for the people, and when you're saluting the records you're actually saluting magnetic tape, or some bits in a CD or elsewhere.

Yes, Olivier, you are right. You are sorry to put me on the spot. I will soon prove that. ICANN's history in relationship to the representation of users is extremely rich and complex. The premise of user representation and user participation was there from the start, in the very first design by [Ira Marasena 01:18:27] and the Department of Commerce, and the very first negotiations of how to build up a new organization to take the place of Jon Postel in managing IANA.

It was thought at the time, and it is still widely believed, that the management of this resource, of this function, has to take place in a very well-informed way, in a technically and in a policy-orientated, well-informed way, and it has to take place with the interested parties, with those who have money, honor, prestige, or fame to lose, or with anything else at "stake". That's where the name "stakeholders" comes from.

The general users have to be part of the decision-making, and we have to remember that the decision-making here – this will explain the rest of it – is reducing the possibility of arbitrary decisions made in changing

---

records in the root zone of the DNS. Instead of having some staff in IANA being able to do whatever they want with the names, you create all this huge policy apparatus, only to reduce the chance that they would put in a new gTLD, or change the incumbent of the manager of a ccTLD.

Users come into this equation, as well as the registries, registrars, the trademark interests, business interests, and so forth. That's where the names... Of course, we also have the addresses, but we repeatedly see that the focus of most general users and organizations are on the names, so I'll use more of the names in the following, very briefly. By the year 2000, approximately, 1999 or 2000, in the very first meetings of ICANN, there was an initial Board, which was handpicked. Then there was the first election, in 1999, from the gNSO and other organizations.

There was a very intense negotiation to bring in user representation. The intent was to sit nine elected Directors beside the nine Directors that were elected by the organizations like the gNSO and the ASO. Then there was a very intense negotiation to start doing five Directors, one per region, on a direct election. That direct election we ran, I was part of the team that designed and ran it.

This election was run by region, in a very open way. Anyone who registered with an email address could become a voter, and there was a snail-mail confirmation of their actual existence. This was still a very weak confirmation, or a very weak authentication of the people being there. The votes took place by regions. It had significant phenomena that from an election theory and an election organization point of view, it signaled serious risks.

---

The main risk was a risk of capture by specific interests. You could have a company order all its employees to register. You have global companies with several tens of thousands of employees. You can have 50,000 voters voting for the same person, in an organized way, without any knowledge of the stuff – without reading the election platform, without looking at anything, just following instructions. Or, you could have this happening in a country.

In fact, it happened that one country and one company were basically were competing, one against the other, in the Asia Pacific region. You could have a ccTLD manager send emails to all of its registrants and make a promotion that, “This is the time our country has to take its place under the sun in the governance of the Internet,” as well as the propaganda there. In others, it was nationalist propaganda.

So you broke the basic the basic [tenant 01:22:20] of elections, which is that you have a well-defined electorate, and you count how the opinion of this electorate, or the choices of this electorate, are split among the candidates. Instead, everybody brings their own candidates. In a country like Mexico, or in other developing countries, or in India, that’s the usual way that incumbent parties, a party in power, brings in the peasants on trucks, drives them to the polling station, they vote for the party, and they get the sandwich, a Coke or a beer.

That’s what was very openly a risk in the election at that time. That’s what was changed in a major process of reform. What we did then was to first reorganize the At-Large participation. What we see now is based on a concept of a web of trust, where we know who is speaking, and with whom we are speaking. If an organization has five members, we

---

know its five people. They are technically-orientated, we know who they are.

We have to re-agenda this trust among us, and we are slowly building up from here, from the bottom-up, the number of representatives that will be elected to the Board. I'm not on the Board. I'm not taking part in these decisions, but a long-term program is [unclear 01:23:33] positive, informed contributions come from the At-Large, then I'm pretty confident that we'll see more and more elected Directors.

In the meantime, the community, broadly, gets into the Board, without direct representation, but with the consideration of not only interests – especially monetary or economic interest – but through the NomCom. That will need some reviewing in the long-term, in order to make sure that this leavening – yeast, the thing you put into the flour so that it becomes a spongy, soft cake instead of a hard cookie – that's what is supposed to happen with the NomCom.

You bring in people who are not just fighting, "I want more protection for the trademark. I want more liberty in creating new names." You put in some people who are supposed to look more for the general interests. I will end on that note. What we need looking forward first, of course, is to be concerned about more direct representation, or more representation to these organized structures of the At-Large, but mostly what should concern us is not only interests.

I heard, several times, people speak about civil society interests. I think there's one more important thing, which is the technical community, part of the academic community, parts of the business and everybody else, should not only look at interests, but there are a few principles,

---

which we should hold dear. Principles, which are the core design of the Internet, the core design of the DNS and the IP allocation system – like openness, stability, resilience, these things.

These are principles that are important for all us, and we should build an informed and trustworthy function of stewardship, of trusteeship, of being not masters of the domain, but making sure that some of us – or ICANN as a whole – is looking for the general good above the individual, competing interests of every party. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alejandro for this historical perspective, and the reasons why we are where we are now. Next is Jean-Jacques Subrenat.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you Olivier. I'd like to hark back to what Fouad Bajwa brought up. I think it was very important. He said that one of the real challenges for the future is the attitude of governments. I think we have to come back to this for just a while. Why are governments in disarray for some of them? Two reasons. One is that some of them, at the birth of the Internet, didn't really understand the importance of this new system?

Quite logically, now, and that's the second point, they are trying to catch up. Of course, it's much more convenient, when you're in government, to vote for or to set in place, an intergovernmental arrangement rather than the multistakeholder model. I'd like to commend you, Olivier, and all those who invented this session this morning, because many of you were not in Net Mundial in São Paulo.

---

Even if we followed it at a distance, it was very useful to have, on the charts, the whole line-up of what has to happen, since WSIS, until today, and what is coming in the coming months. Coming back to what Fouad Bajwa said earlier, I'd like to point out that the future is not written. It really depends on you and on each of us. There is no guarantee that the multistakeholder model, because it's simply well designed, intelligent or democratic, will win in the end. There's no such thing.

It depends on our work. I think that because of the return of governments in ICANN and in the general Internet governance set-up, there will be a tendency to increase the role of governments, who all claim that they represent the global public interest. At the same time though, there will be quite a natural tendency also for them to want to control the system. Of course, we know that has been made clear since the Snowden revelations in June last year. It's just one year now.

What's important is that we take stock of the fact that it's the awareness that can make a difference. It's not statements only, it's really the awareness. This Summit, I think, is really contributing to that. Governments come in all colors and sizes. Some of them are more repressive than others, and we have to be very observant of that and very careful. In this sense, I'd like to point out something I wrote in an article somewhere.

The convergence, which I see appearing between some oppressive governments and some democratic governments, who in the name of fighting against terrorism or anything else, are in fact restraining, more and more, public liberties and civil rights. This convergence between a

---

very large country in Asia, and a country such as the United States, is in itself a danger.

It's this risk of violent convergence, not on principles, but simply on practicality of controlling the Internet user world. That, I think, is one of the greatest challenges we're faced with today. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you for those very wise words Jean-Jacques. Just a bracket on the discussion, for the record, just to come back to this quickly, you'll notice that we're saying "for the record" because we are on record. This is a public meeting that is recorded, transcribed, interpreted into other languages. It is recorded in the three languages. It is also transcribed in the three languages, and you'll notice these cameras that are also around.

I was just reminded that we didn't actually say that at the beginning of the session. Whatever you're going to say is going to be on the record and is going to be on the Internet afterwards, as all of the information and all of the proceeds that take place at ICANN are recorded and put up afterwards for everybody to be able to consult. This is a part of transparency – being able to do things openly, in an open fashion. I thought it was important to mention that.

Going back to the list, I still have Leon Sanchez and Gunela Astbrink. First, Leon Sanchez. You've been patient, Leon, so thank you.

---

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Olivier. I'm Leon Sanchez. I'm going to speak in Spanish. What we saw in Net Mundial, as many of our colleagues have said, was quite relevant, and I think we should point out the following: the re-affirmation of many fears we were aware of, but were reaffirmed there. They're fears about the existence of groups of governments that try to control the governance of the Internet.

Some countries are trying to force an agreement, a mechanism, so that the governments will have a greater wait on decision-making within Internet governance. As Alejandro Pisanty said, rather than interests, we should think of principles, and within these principles, obviously, aligned with the interests of the civil society, academia, technical community, business community, etcetera, we should think of how we want to shape the future of this multistakeholder model.

The supervision and transition of the IANA function is only one part of this Internet governance model. It is key, but it's not the only thing. There is much more. As such, I think we have to get involved as the At-Large community, as a community of users, and we have to take over the responsibility we have towards those millions of users who we say we represent. I say, "We say we represent," because we've not been democratically appointed.

I think we have to show this commitment so as to show this representation role we're playing. I invite you to participate in these Thematic Groups. Thematic Group 1 that I will be facilitating will precisely focus on the future of the multistakeholder model. I think we have a lot of work to do. As all of us participate, we will be able to generate a very productive document. Thank you very much.



OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: You've touched on something there, saying about representation. Of course, it's very difficult to represent anyone if you haven't been elected by everyone that you're supposed to represent. Certainly though, this community and you all, that are sitting here, can act in what you think are the best interests of Internet users out there. You all are Internet users. I'm sure you discuss these issues with friends, colleagues, with people back home, with your community, with your At-Large structure, and you are able to then formulate what the feeling is in your part of the world.

That's really the strength of the model. Representation – representing three billion people is something that I think is pretty much unachievable, except if we have a brand new world order with some new technology or something, but I wouldn't want to be in that sort of position. New technology – I see Cheryl smiling on the new technology. No. Maybe not. The model we have at the moment is one of effectively trying to act in the best interests.

Again, it's very difficult to define the public interest, as such, but certainly the interest of Internet users can best be defended by Internet users themselves. I've closed the queue, because we are running out of time in this discussion. A very interesting discussion, I hope, for all of you. We still have Gunela Astbrink, Alberto Soto and Vanda Scartezini. Gunela? I'm going to ask for the interventions to be a little bit shorter please.

---

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you Olivier. I am Alberto Soto. The last speakers always have to speak briefly. I'll try to be brief.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Sorry, Alberto, it's Gunela Astbrink first and then you'll be afterwards. Ladies first!

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Thank you Olivier. I'll be specifically talking about my experiences of Net Mundial. That started before I went to São Paulo. I contributed a document, one of our 188 documents, as a draft. That was based on accessibility for people with disability to the Internet, and based on a document I drafted for ISOC on that topic. The comments that people could put in during the process, before Sao Paulo, was also very important. It was another model of inclusiveness.

Another way that Net Mundial was inclusive was the actual website. It was accessible, based on international web accessibility guidelines, and also very attractive and usable. That is a really good model to consider for ICANN, and I hope, sincerely, that ICANN will be working on those types of accessibility questions in future. Certainly, when it comes to ICANN, we do now have an At-Large Accessibility Task Force, chaired by Cheryl Langdon-Orr.

We will be working with the ICANN community to ensure that accessibility becomes part of a culture. Just a little plug – I will be talking about web accessibility at the ccNSO meeting on Tuesday afternoon at 4:45, if anyone else is interested. Going back to Net Mundial, I did do an intervention from the floor, and as we've already heard, the idea of the

---

mics, and everyone, including government, standing up and queuing, I thought was a very inclusive way of having the debate.

Unfortunately, when I was queuing, it went from two minutes to 30 seconds, so there wasn't that much time. The other point I'd like to make is the relative openness of the drafting. Anyone could go into the room where the Drafting Committee was working and listen in to the process of how they were working, with all the comments from the floor, to present the final document. Unfortunately, at the end, that did not work. That, one would hope, in future, is something we could address in these types of meetings.

The impact of that Net Mundial stakeholder document at the end, I think we've already heard. This document is being referred to in a lot of other contexts, and having that document where there were so many stakeholders together, we can then use that document in a number of ways. To me, that was an important impact of Net Mundial. Thanks.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Gunela. Next is Alberto Soto. Alberto, you have the floor. I'm not going to give just 30 seconds, of course. I think that would be very unfair. Please keep your interventions short. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO: Thank you Olivier. Alberto Soto for the record. I'm going to talk with the contact with the end user, which is our leitmotif. Within LACRALO almost half of the countries are covered by ALSes. The other half is missing. I hope that in the next few days we will approve something that will be completed when we cover all countries. This is a policy of

---

state. As a Chair of LACRALO, I was lucky to participate in meetings in three countries – Bolivia, Haiti and Dominican Republic.

There were four events and discussions with end users to capture new ALSes. The experience was highly satisfactory. Why? Because end users in some organizations think that ICANN has a responsibility over what happened with Snowden. The question is, why did ICANN allow that? This came up in the three countries, in the four meetings. I felt I had to explain security of an information system with a real case. Once I'm done with the explanation of that case, it was clear an Internet service provider [had/that 01:40:17] developed services for banks.

I explained the security from a technical point of view, and finally I said, "What did Snowden do here?" or, "What did the ICANN do here?" Snowden did not touch WHOIS. He did not touch DNSs. He didn't do anything, so whose responsibility is it? When I finished with my explanation I was told it was the person in charge of the information system. I said, "Who is responsible for the access to the information system in different countries?" and they told me, "The governments."

Unfortunately, I had never heard this be explained in this way in the ICANN. Never. We have to be clear about our goal. The idea is to train people, so we have to have the capacity to do things. This is our goal.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much Alberto. Finally, Vanda Scartezini.

---

VANDA SCARTEZINI:

Vanda Scartezini from LACRALO. First of all, as a Brazilian I would like to thank so many good words about Net Mundial. Thank you for all that were there. Alberto, what I see that is a very good issue related to Net Mundial is the capacity to demonstrate to the world that the multistakeholder model can be used, and it works. There is a lot of suspicion about, and discussions about that it's impossible, that we'll never go to the end with timely results. Those kinds of discussion.

Net Mundial could at least show that it can work. It can come out with the relevant results in a timely manner. I do believe that it's a very good result that we can spread the word about. It's important to make sure that the multistakeholder works. Thank you. That's my two seconds. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Vanda. [Spanish translation 01:42:54] Interpretation is back on. Let's start again. I wanted to get an idea of the temperature of the room, with regards to this community here supporting the findings of Net Mundial or at least showing support for the Net Mundial final document that was published, and that is freely available on the web. I think we have a link in there. Is anyone...

I'd hope there would be less people against it than people for it, so I'm going to ask if there is anyone who'd like to put their hand up, if they're not happy with supporting the Net Mundial document – for this community to support the Net Mundial document? One, two, three... Okay. Hand up or hand down? Okay, there's a couple of people in the room. Anyone who'd like to support it? Who would think that we should support this document? Could you put your...?

---

Ahem? Let's do "ahem" then. This is one of those weird things. The hums are the IETF ways of... It's not even voting, it's just gauging the temperature of the room. Humming is just going "hmmm". The louder the hum is, the more likely it is that there are more people humming. Let's have a hum for those people in favor of... I don't know if we've got the humming technique in our bylaws.

Alan would probably be able to help us, but he's with the gNSO, and certainly they're not humming over there. Let's have a hum for those people in favor of putting together a resolution or a motion to support the Net Mundial document. People in favor?

ALAN GREENBERG: This is embarrassing.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: We need hums from people remotely as well. I'll also ask for you to stand like this, in a lotus position, and hum afterwards. Okay, maybe not. Those people who would like to go against this, could they hum now please? Okay. I heard more hums than just two or three hands, so that's good. The humming thing works well. Lots of people want to put their hands up.

Okay, so the idea is that we're going to get someone to support a Working Group, to draft a motion, to prepare a Working Group, to have a first report on the issue. About five years from now we might get an answer. Let's get back to this. What I propose is that we have someone who will draft a motion for later on in the week, when we pass all of our votes and all of this. I see not Tijani... Evan? You wish to say

---

something? We don't have the mics. I don't know where they've gone. Just shout it out.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

This is Evan, for the record, which goes in the cloud or whatever. Most of the people I'd spoken to that had a problem with the Net Mundial document was that it didn't go far enough – that they agreed with it as a core principle, but believed that it stopped short in a number of areas; on intellectual property issues and things like that. It stopped short, for instance, of the [full/four 01:47:43] things that were there to protect end users.

At least, I would support it, but my comment would be it's a good start, as opposed to the end. The other thing I want to mention in terms of where to go with it from there – I'm involved with the Thematic Group 1, the future of multistakeholderism. This is no doubt going to be a part of that discussion, going forward, so in terms of where this is going, there is going to be an ongoing discussion.

I just wanted to make a point in saying rather than, "Do you agree with Net Mundial or don't you?" I think there's a sentiment that's saying, "Yes, but it's not sufficient."

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Okay, thank you Evan. Nigel Hickson, and then we really are running out of time. Nigel?

---

NIGEL HICKSON:

I'll be exceptionally brief, because I've got to go to another session as well. Two points on Net Mundial. One, clearly, it didn't satisfy everyone. That's a consequence of the multistakeholder approach. If you were going to get rough consensus on that document, which we negotiated on until 2:00 in the morning on that first night, it was clear that it wasn't going to be what everyone wanted. There were compromises.

That doesn't mean to say that it can't evolve in the future, as has just been mentioned. The second point: what was said earlier about this fantastic facility of the remote hubs in Net Mundial is being taken up by ICANN for the Thursday session. For the Thursday public session we are going to have remote hubs this week. I don't know how many remote hubs, whether they'll work exactly the same as Net Mundial.

I agree with the speaker – I've forgotten who it was – but it moved me completely to see a young speaker in a t-shirt and jeans – and these are users, you, users sitting in an office in San Francisco or Taiwan, or wherever he was sitting – having a conversation with Larry Strickling on the floor of... It was just amazing. That's something we learn for in the future.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND:

Thank you very much Nigel. Tijani, then we have to close.

TIJANI BEN JEMAA:

Just one word. Those two or three people who are absolutely unsatisfied with the Net Mundial output, if we can know why they are unsatisfied, it would be a good thing. I propose they write the reasons



---

they're not satisfied either on the mailing list, or through the Skype chat.  
Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you very much for that, Tijani. I've also learnt that Evan Leibovitch has agreed to be the penholder. Well done Evan! You've managed to make yourself busy already, and we're just starting. Evan will hold the pen on drafting a statement that will both support the Net Mundial outcome, but also, I think, take into account the concerns that we've heard here about not going far enough. I've heard a lot of claps around the room and applause for that, and that seems to be the general consensus.

I'm not saying we have full consensus, but there's a general consensus in this. With all this, I thank you all for having stayed this whole session here. I hope it was helpful for all of you. We have an announcement with regards to the mentors and the mentees. They will be escorted, helped gently, towards the Windsor Room, which is at the other end of the hotel, by Gisella, who will very graciously bring them to that place. They'll be able to discuss the Mentorship Program there. Thanks to all of you.

GISELLA GRUBER: Olivier, sorry, just a quick question. Fatima's going to now lead the next session in Windsor. Fatima's over there with the blue folder. You can start following her, if she knows the way. I'm going to follow. Does everyone know if they're a mentor or a mentee and if they're supposed

---

to be attending this meeting? I hope you do. If you don't, please look it up here on the screen. Thank you.

OLIVIER CRÉPIN-LEBLOND: Thank you. Finally, this afternoon we have the Thematic Sessions that are going to start their work. If you don't know what Thematic Session Working Group you are in, please come to the front right now and check with staff. They'll be able to tell you. Have a wonderful lunch. Have a wonderful afternoon. See you tomorrow, or later on, of course, in the different Working Groups. See you tomorrow for the plenary in the afternoon, after all this work.

GISELLA GRUBER: Thematic Sessions start from 3:00. Please make sure you know which meeting room you need to be at, and more importantly, which Thematic...

**[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]**