

---

LONDON – ATLAS II Thematic Group 3: Global Internet: The User Perspective - Session 1

Saturday, June 21, 2014 – 15:00 to 18:00

ICANN – London, England

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: ...representing the South Pacific Computer Society, which is basically an At-Large Structure from the AP region.

BIKRAM SHRESTHA: Hi, my name is Bikram Shrestha. I am from Nepal. I belong to Internet Society Nepal chapter, APRALO. Thank you.

ANUPAM AGRAWAL: Hello, everyone. This is Anupam Agrawal. I chair Internet Society Kolkata chapter, member APRALO.

JUAN MANUEL ROJAS: Hi, my name is Juan Manuel Rojas. I'm from Columbia, [inaudible] LACRALO.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Hi, [inaudible].

CHRISTOPHER PARSONS: Hi, I'm Christopher Parsons. I'm representing [Privatera] and I'm with [NARALO].

MAHMOUD LATTOUF: Hi, Mahood Latoof from Jordan from APRALO.

---

*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.*

---

JASON FRANCIS: Hi, I'm Jason Francis from the Barbados Association of NGOs and I'm from LACRALO.

MINJUNG PARK: Hello, everyone. I'm Minjung Park from Korea.

[MARY CHOI]: Hello, my name is [MARY CHOI] from Korea.

ARIS IGNACIO: Hello, I am Aris Ignacio, ISOC Philippines, APRALO.

SYLVIA HERLEIN: Hello, my name is Sylvia Herlein from Internauta Brasil, from Brasil, of course.

AIDA NOBLIA: Hello, my name is Aida Noblia. [inaudible] Uruguay.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: Bonjour, [inaudible]. I come from Quebec and I am from an At-Large community.

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Good afternoon. I am Sergio Salinas Porto. I represent the Association of Internet Users in Argentina, LACRALO.

---

CRISTIAN CASAS: Good afternoon. I am Cristian Casas. I represent the Center of Status of Legal Workers in Argentina, LACRALO.

JAVIER CHANDIA ROJAS: Hello, how are you? I'm Javier Chandia Rojas. I represent the Association of Internet Users, Chili.

MARICARMEN SEQUERA: Hello, I am Maricarmen Sequera from TEDIC, Paraguay.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I am [inaudible] from Uruguay, University of the Republic.

MERCY MOYO: I am Mercy Moyo from ITOCA in South Africa and AFRALO.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, great. So as we can see, we are quite an interesting and broad regional composition here in the room, what also reflects somehow the conversation here on our panel. We were lucky for our subject, our thematic group on the user perspective. This became the overarching seam of ATLAS II finally. The suggestion came originally from Jean-Jacques, and I was pleased to have Jean-Jacques as one of our subject matter experts who prepared this session together with Fatima, also representing different regions and different viewpoints.

---

When we created these thematic groups and thematic teams, then we also had to think about moderation roles, reporting roles, and as my co-moderation I could get Gunela who will chair and moderate or facilitate, let's say. I prefer the term facilitate much more than moderate. And for the reporting, we got our friends from NARALO who are seated there. A little bit distance, but it doesn't mean any tension or anything like this. So I think they need to—

But before I now will do as a presentation for them, I could have done this, but I think it's more authentic if we start with a short self-presentation by themselves, because I couldn't memorize or list all what Jean-Jacques has done in his interesting life and I would like to give the floor to Jean-Jacques to present himself.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, Wolf. I'm glad to be here with you. And as Wolf just mentioned, when the ALAC was searching for an overarching theme, there were quite a few suggestions and I had suggested "The Global Internet: The User Perspective" because when I looked at the history of the Internet – and I have been, myself, involved in this in some way or another for about ten years – I was struck by the fact that we all say that we work for the interest of or on behalf of the user, but sometimes the user is lost in all this.

So I'm not one of the founders or inventors of the Internet. Very far from that. I am self-educated about the Internet, as perhaps some of you are. It started in 2006 because I wanted to attend the first-ever IGF in Greece, and so I had to do a lot of reading and catching up. And then

---

the networking after that, the human networking, was actually the most important thing at least on a par with reading.

I was very fortunate to have been selected by the NomCom to serve as a director on the Board of Directors of ICANN from 2007 to 2010. In 2010, I was asked to join the ALAC as a representative from EURALO and I'm grateful for that, and I was reelected or reappointed for 2012-2014, and I'm ending that period at the end of this year.

Now, as a former ambassador of France in various places, you can imagine that perhaps as a former civil servant, I will, at all costs, defend the position of sovereign states of government, in other words. But you will see in my presentations and my remarks that that is not necessarily the case, thanks especially to my involvement in the ALAC. The At-Large community I have learned to respect and to understand the value of some of the things we're talking about today. I will [reach] some of the themes later on, but we're in the phase of self-introductions now.

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

Hello, my name is Gunela Astbrink. I'm from ISOC Australia and on APRALO, and I very strongly believe in end-users and their involvement in the multi-stakeholder process. I have worked with end-users representing end-users for probably the last 15-20 years. And in particular, people with disabilities.

I actually live with the end-users and trying to bring that perspective through to very many Internet and telecommunications fora, and it's sometimes difficult to bridge what the end-user who just wants the Internet to work with the technical part of the Internet community. And

---

so I'm very keen to ensure that all end-users with different perspectives have an opportunity to present their views. Obviously with three billion users, that's impossible. But for representatives with a wide variety of use to present those in forums like ICANN.

My involvement with ICANN is relatively new. I have attended probably three meetings, but the last meeting – Meeting 49 in Singapore – I was fortunate enough to be selected [inaudible] on At-Large mentee on the pilot At-Large Mentor Program, and so that is why I'm here in London at Meeting 50.

I should also point out that there is a new At-Large Accessibility Taskforce and I am very much involved with that. So thank you very much.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO:

This is Fatima. I will be speaking in Spanish. I am a member of ALAC for LACRALO. I'm involved in participating in LACRALO and I've been doing this for about five years, and last November at the Buenos Aires Meeting, I became a member of ALAC representing LACRALO.

And I'm not only involved in Internet governance from ICANN's point of view, but I also participate in other fora such as the Internet Governance Forum. I'm a member of the MAC (the Multi-stakeholder Advisory Committee) which advises the Secretary General of United Nations on the Internet Governance Forum, which this year faces significant challenges another of NETMundial, among other things. We will discuss this later on.

---

And I'm also involved in the Organization of LACIGF, the Internet Governance Forum for Latin-America and the Caribbean. There we're also trying to capture all these changes that are taking place in the global scenario of Internet governance from [inaudible] Argentina, we're also working with Internet users and we are also in touch with the academia with a university specifically, and our role is to train students on Internet governance, invite them to participate in these fora. We're lucky because we're part of a city in inland Argentina, Cordoba.

Many people have joined organizations in time and have gotten involved in Internet governance, and within LACRALO and other regional fora, we have an increasing participation. I'm very happy to be here today. The expert, Jean-Jacques, I'm just supporting him and I hope we will all work together and have a very productive meeting. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Carlos?

CARLOS REYES: My name is Carlos Reyes and I am the staff support for this thematic working group.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay, thanks. And now to our left, to Judith and to Glenn.

---

JUDITH HELLERSTEIN: Hi, I'm Judith Hellerstein. I'm assistant reporter. This is my first ICANN meeting, so looking forward to it. This is my mentor, Glenn, who you also see videoing and taking pictures of everyone.

GLENN MCKNIGHT: Hi, I'm Glenn McKnight and I'm the NARALO secretariat. Also with Gunela and others, we're on the Accessibility Taskforce. It's really great to be here. We look forward to trying to document as efficiently as possible the dialogue that's going on today. I think it's going to be a great event.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks, Glenn, and everybody here for your short and precise introduction. I think after fulfilling the formalities for this session and thematic group we can now go over and start with the content part, this exciting part.

And as I said before, we do not need to feel stressed. We have plenty of times for discussion. As a kind of introduction, giving the floor to Jean-Jacques for his preparation, some more I reflect about the subject.

I have some questions. I have some questions on the term "the Internet user" which is at large one of the most common words and terms, but who actually is this species, this animal, what is called the user? Can such a generalization be right? What does user mean from different backgrounds? Some people like [inaudible] the consumer. What I've heard At-Large many times, some people are confused about mixing both at the same time consumer/end-user and I have strong reservations against consumer approach as well. But in [NARALO], I was



---

told there is a streaming of people who come from the consumer representation side and still are used to use this term.

Another question is what can the term “user” or the notion “user” mean in different cultural context? If I have a closer look at Europe, I’m almost certain not even in Europe the user will mean the same for people from the north to the south of Europe or from the west to the east. Therefore, I am almost certain the notion of a user might be much different in an African context or in an Asian context, in a Latin-American context. I don’t know, but these are simply some questions that come to my mind when we now face the next couple of hours and we now enter into a discussion on such an interesting and difficult topic.

These are just some introductory remarks. Jean-Jacques, I hope you don’t mind, but the real input comes now from Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Well, hardly, Wolf, because this is really a collaborative effort of all of us and we will call upon you for your input during the debate.

I was asked to give an overview of the past decades. Now, relax. I won’t give you all the dates and all the links to specific texts, etc. This morning, by the way, there was a very good session on all of that and the NETMundial, which was given by both Oliver Crepin-Leblond and Nigel Hickson, and they gave us a graphic view of all the things which have been happening now for one year or two and all the things which will happen in the coming months, and you will see that in the international fora, there’s a huge amount of things happening in the field of Internet governance.

---

So I will not give specifics on that. I will not concentrate on the facts, but more on trends. So what are some of these areas that I would suggest we look at during our discussion? Amongst the trends I have identified, there is first the attitude of sovereign states, what in the American or the English language are called government, but perhaps sovereign states is an even more specific definition.

I think that some of these states or governments were falling into a state of benign neglect when the Internet appeared. They didn't know really how to treat it, and there was not the kind of excitement which the Internet generates today. So quite a few capitols said, "Oh, that's a thing for researchers, universities, military people perhaps, and engineers and that's fine."

They didn't see – or not all of them saw – immediately the huge potential of the Internet. And as a result of this early neglect, or perhaps lack of awareness in the first few years, I think that I have seen over the past few years the more recent past a game of catching up. Suddenly, in the GAC, for instance, you will see that the representatives of their various states are much more vocal and some of them are even asking in no unclear terms that the Internet should be guided, if not managed – at least guided principally – by sovereign states, or perhaps by an inter-governmental arrangement such as was proposed at the ITU.

So I put this in the category of catching up. Some countries, perhaps the United States, had a very clear vision right from the start, but many countries, and I think speaking from my own (which is France) that there was not such a clear vision of the impact of the Internet on human activity.

---

Another trend I would like to identify and open up to discussion with you is the appearance of DNB. You know DNS, of course. It's the Domain Name System. To my mind, DNB is now one of the major things in life – the Domain Name Business. It has become a huge, huge thing both in terms of buying and selling with or thanks to the Internet, but also as a constituency, as a reality in world economics.

So with businesses there came a greater sense of purposefulness, of opportunities to be exploited and to be carried forward, but also – and this I would like to underline before you – perhaps a growing sense that all this can only work with self-regulation.

I hasten to say that self-regulation was not invented by the Internet people. It was invented in the financial sector. For instance, by banks. Banks have made it clear on both sides of the Atlantic that they did not appreciate – in fact, they resented – government control.

And you remember the Reagan and the Thatcher years. The name of the game was self-regulation. “You should trust us. That's how it will work. And everyone will make a profit and be happy.”

Now, the major financial crisis of 2008 was not due to one little thing such as the subprime crisis. The subprime crisis was only one small reflection – well, with large consequences – but just one aspect of a greater malady, which was that self-regulation had not worked as was advertised.

Now, a third area where I would like to propose to you to look at some trends is ICANN itself, as corporation, as a representative of various

---

interests which are represented in its multi-stakeholder mode – or system, rather.

I would like to point out that, to me, someone from outside the ICANN world who now looks back at all this – and I was a member of the board – it's very striking to see that even today the whole of ICANN is still operating to a large degree in what I would call pioneer mode.

So pioneer mode is something where you bring your enthusiasm. You are the creators. You are the people who have smashed the frontiers. Go West, young man (or young woman nowadays). And in the name of that exploration, that sense of adventure, those who set up the Internet, but also ICANN, have found it quite natural to prolong that state or that condition of the pioneer mode in which volunteers have to do sometimes and very often with great pleasure a great part of the work, including basic research, drafting, etc., which in other organizations of the same type would be done more collectively, or perhaps by staff or by outside organizations for that matter.

So what I'm pointing at here is that we still have the huge advantage of a very, very dedicated group of volunteers on the board, in ALAC, in the ALSes, all over ICANN. But what I am saying to you is that as someone as a student of history and sociology what I see is that you cannot prolong pioneer mode beyond your mid-50s – or let's say midlife. Of course, speaking as a human being, midlife is maybe 40 or 50, but in Internet history, ten years is a long, long time.

So for ICANN also and as a consequence perhaps of its pioneer mode, the people involved – the volunteers – are constantly, even if they don't say so, they feel the need to justify the role they are playing. How is it

---

that someone who has not been elected on a national or a regional level has such responsibilities in an organization such as ICANN through the Nominating Committee or whatever other mechanism you talk about?

And that is why there is such a sensitivity and emphasis placed on accountability and transparency, and of course that is perfectly good. But I would venture to point out that it does have a cost in terms of human labor, as it were, but also of mobilization of all technical means and budget. It's that ICANN has, to a certain extent, become a review machine. And I haven't calculate this; I don't have the correct data to do that, nor the ability. But I think that if you look back at the past five years at least, the amount of inward-looking review processes – this or that part, for instance, the ccNSO will get reviewed every two or three or four years, the board will be reviewed incessantly, etc.

So I understand where it comes from. There is a true need for accountability. My question is simply is this the only – is this the best way – to achieve accountability and trust when you use, I don't know, maybe a third of your energy, maybe half your energy and your means in this constant review process? I don't have a quick answer to that, but maybe you'll choose to take that up in our discussion.

And of course, after the pioneer mode, there came a lot of others and there's a sociological evolution of ICANN from roughly military and engineers and research people, to business and lawyers and patent lawyers, etc.

And in this whole history, what about the user communities? I use the word user communities taking into account what Wolf just brought up. His two questions were: "Internet user? What Internet user?" In some

---

countries, they prefer talking about the consumer. And obviously, business prefers that we be consumers.

But also, the other question Wolf brought up was “User? But in what context? In what country? In what cultural context, and what social context, in what economic context, in what political constraint also?” So we will come back to that in the discussion.

As for the user communities, I would like to point out a few significant trends. First of all, you notice that little by little what seemed to us the liberty of breathing clean air and enjoying fresh water has become a commercial product. In other words, there is a general trend in society, at least in Western society, to commercialize everything and domain names are part of that.

But along with that there have been some other trends. For instance, default settings. Let’s say 20 years ago it was accepted, I suppose, that default settings meant that privacy was of course respected, but then due to the drive, the vitality, of the business sector – and I really admire them for that also – default settings were unless you read page 14 of the User Contract, the conditions, and you discover that actually you have the possibility of protecting your privacy – well, the default setting is everything’s open and for the open use of the domain name business or the Internet business, which is providing a service for you.

Again, there’s nothing wrong with this. I’m simply saying that there is a sociological trend towards not an obfuscation, perhaps, but a change in the nature of the default settings. So I think that as Internet users we should be careful to demand from our governments, from our representatives in our various parliaments, but also at the United

---

Nations and elsewhere, that we come back to default settings in which the general Internet user is placed once again at the center of the whole Internet system.

So with a total respect of rights, freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, lack of censorship, privacy, protection of private data, etc.

And in this sense, I would like to refer you to many existing texts, but I'll just mention two. One is Barlow who is the author in Davos many years ago of a Declaration of Independence of Cyberspace, and that is really worth reading. Perhaps, Carlos, you can put a link on the screen for that.

And the other, among many other references, I chose this one because they've been doing this effort for many years now. It is the Council of Europe, which has established a guide to the rights of Internet users.

There are many others and I'd like to hear you what you and your region have experience. Perhaps you are working on that to promote exactly the same thing. We need to know more about this, and not only concentrate on North America or Western Europe.

So the final issue about user communities I would say is representation. Is the user community well-represented in Internet fora? Not bad. In ICANN, well, it has improved. As you know, Sébastien Bachollet was the first person designated by the ALAC to sit on the board with voting rights and he will be succeeded by Rinalia Abdul Rahim, and she'll really make a difference I think.

But it is on the increase, but I think that for quite logical and understandable reasons, the business momentum, the trend towards self-regulation, is such that in spite of a growing number of cases of

---

conflicts of interest even among members of the Board of Directors of ICANN, the representation of the user community is, to say the least, not a majority concern.

And another and final remark on this is that the diversity and the dispersion of the Internet user communities is such that it's very difficult to regroup, and that's where the existence of the ALAC, the existence of your various ALSes if they are active, can begin to make a difference. Thank you.

[applause]

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks, Jean-Jacques, for this great introduction. I think this gives a lot of incentives and keywords for the debate. But before I open the floor, I would like to give Fatima an opportunity to add some complements or to add your counter-reflections or to ask some critical questions, etc., so discourse is open.

But I would like you to express your particularities, etc., and then we open the floor for questions from the floor for comments, etc., and other aspects and we should try to structurize a little bit the debate afterwards. Fatima, over to you.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO:

Thank you, Wolf. Actually, the summary and the perspective that Jean-Jacques is showing us is [super] complete. There's very little to add. I just wanted to add the last item that he referred to, which is regarding the users community, and we have raised this in our original proposal for



---

this thematic session. I am happy that this morning we have discussed this issue and that Alejandro Pisanty talked to us about the origin of the At-Large community within ICANN.

And precisely one of the items we considered for discussion is the fact that the community of users is based on trust, or the At-Large community is based on trust, and this trust from the user was what made Internet grow. We, of course, know – are cognizant – about the technical issues on the Internet that have allowed us to develop standards and protocols that made Internet evolve so that we can have the Internet we are having today.

But without the users' trust, Internet wouldn't have been able to develop this way. We wouldn't have had the e-commerce. We wouldn't have had in some of our countries what we call electronic vote. We wouldn't have virtual meetings in our At-Large community, because we wouldn't trust in the tool we are using. So I would like to put forward this issue of how the trust that the user is placing, how much importance do we give to this and how much importance we give to users representatives.

On the other hand, another issue I'd like to place on our table is something that has always been around in [inaudible] community, and this morning one of our colleagues from LACRALO raised it. And this is the fact that the users of the Internet, are they stakeholders – when we see the information, the [inaudible] information technology will recognize [four or five] stakeholders and we don't see the user as a stakeholder in itself, but it's always associated to the organizations of civil society.

---

And we see here within ICANN there is a different space for civil society to participate. So this is something I also want to discuss with all of you. Are we going to consider that the work we do here will allow us to have new and different stakeholder, which would be the Internet user or not?

This is all for the time being. I will encourage all of you to participate or engage, to speak. We have simultaneous interpretation, so don't be afraid of talking in your own language because we will all understand each other. Thank you.

[applause]

WOLF LUDWIG:

Thanks, Fatima, for these complementary remarks. Let me come back and pick up when you were referring to Alejandro Pisanty who said At-Large community originally when it was created was based on trust.

During such a sentence, one year after the Snowden revelations last year somebody told me the Snowden revelations to me was something like 9/11 for the [world order], and we all know what happened in a very traumatic way to the [world order] after 9/11. All these terrorist scenarios, all this hyper-security mania started after 9/11. And I was slightly confused or shocked when I for the first time heard this assessment as Snowden revelations was similar to 9/11 because it more or less undermined or destroyed the trust of Internet users towards the Internet.

Now the question is: is this somehow justified? To me, it didn't destroy my trust in the Internet, but it undermined my trust in governments,

---

not standing up doing something or in secret services, the key problem are the secret services and why do governments not try to better control such secret services?

So a lot of people, what we call the users, are completely confused about this different development. When there was some basic trust into new communication [inaudible] Internet, but is clearly shown by the dynamics how many users nowadays, more than three billion, use the Internet.

On the other hand, the more people getting familiar with the Internet, there are [inaudible] sort of ruptures on different levels, what is not promoting trust and confidence from users into the Internet. [inaudible] some additional observation, and from my perception, last year was a very critical year. I've never had as many critical discussions when I met people who [inaudible] know what I'm asking directly asked me "What's your opinion? Do you think Snowden is a liar, is a betrayer? Do you think we can trust him, now being close to Putin, etc.?"

There are so many open questions and all relating to the user perspective. So the user perspective is on the table now and we would like to hear your perceptions from your environment. Yes, please.

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

Just following on from what Wolf and Jean-Jacques and Fatima have said, it's very much where is the place of Internet end-users and Internet governance? We have heard about setting the scene for this. How should end-users be involved? Should end-users be considered as a new and different stakeholder in the Internet governance ecosystem?

---

So I suppose those types of questions together with this key question of trust is one of those aspects that we all have opinions about, and I think probably you've heard now from us here and we are very keen to hear from you so we can get a good idea of what the community feels about these questions.

So I'd like to ask for some comments on that please. Yes?

RANDY GLASS:

Hey, this is RJ, America@Large and I just want to start off because I have been taking notes and I'll pass the mic around the room if that's okay.

First off, to answer your question about the end user being a stakeholder, obviously they're a huge stakeholder. They're the ones that drive this business model. Without them, we would not have a need for the Internet in reality, so it is all about them, the end user. And I think the At-Large in general really I think is created in order to represent those end-users.

But I wanted to really quickly hit the talking points that are on the website, the five points that in the end I guess we're going to come up with a resolution of or some more talking points. But the first point of the talking points talks about the Internet users themselves and surveillance and the global Internet, and I think it's basically asking will this global Internet as we know it continue?

I would like to bring up the point that as long as there has been public communication, there has been surveillance of that communication. Mr. Snowden I don't think really came up with anything groundbreaking. What he did was come up with the proof of that, the documentation of

---

that. Several of us in this room probably know that most of that is true and has been going on for quite a long time, and probably didn't become public until about the 80s or so, but it has been around and people have known. There has been knowledge of it.

But I'd like to raise the question of: has that changed the end users' at the time? Has that changed their habits? What kind of impact has that had on them? In my own opinion, I would say probably not much. I think that people tend to go along their route the way that they do it, and some news on the government intercepting their communications or knowing what they're doing at all times, I don't think that that necessarily has a great effect on the average person, but I think it is important that we know about it. My personal opinion is I don't like it.

But the next talking point talks about the emerging economies or developing nations, and I'd like to point to a trend—

GUNELA ASTBRINK: I'm so sorry for the interruption. Tomorrow when we continue the discussion, the topic [inaudible] the emerging countries, developing countries. You can save the question for tomorrow.

RANDY GLASS: I'm ahead of time.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: We will continue the discussion tomorrow, please. Thank you.

---

RANDY GLASS: Okay, will do. I would just like to bring up the point of the mobile devices being more popular now, and I think that is very important in what we're talking about. But I'd like to also pass the mic along, too.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Before we go to our next colleague, I would like to give Fatima and Jean-Jacques a chance to directly respond to him, and then we come to you, okay? Jean-Jacques or Fatima?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you very much for those very interesting remarks. They were more remarks than questions. Surveillance as opposed to trust, you're absolutely right. Some of us knew, perhaps not in detail, but the general framework of how sovereign states operate.

What is new and what was revealed or made more apparent by Snowden is several things. First of all, that all this was done on the basis of laws or regulations which were very old, which were in some cases 20 or 30 years old in the case of the United Kingdom or the United States.

And of course, technology and the usages of the Internet have evolved so much since that time that invoking those laws in order to carry out mass unwarranted surveillance was of course one of the revelations.

The second very interesting question you brought up was to what extent have the Snowden revelations had an impact on the general user? I would say directly not so much. For instance, youngsters still continue putting all sorts of photos on Facebook and they don't worry

---

about the consequences that may have in 10 or 20 years from now. But it's not directly related to the surveillance mechanisms.

What has had an impact is on the behavior, on the attitude, of sovereign states. Frankly, I think that NETMundial would not have been organized, or not so fast, without the Snowden revelations. Otherwise it could've been done ten years ago. Why was it not done ten years ago? Because there were no Snowden revelations.

The European Parliament wrote a fantastic very, very carefully-researched report many years ago about the echelon system. It's a system of intelligence sharing between the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. But ten years ago practically no one in Europe knew about this, and yet there was a report from the European Parliament, which is still worth reading and etc.

So what has changed I think through this public awareness some states have taken this a bit more seriously than they would have normally, and they said, "Ah-ha, there's something amiss and we have to address this question." That's why the organizations, what is called the ISTARs – ICANN and the others – got together spontaneously two or three times in the past months, and then there was NETMundial. NETMundial is the first time that all these participants, all these institutions or organizations, meet on an equal footing.

At the ITU meeting, it took the fantastic talent of Fadi Chehadé to have ICANN treated as an equal partner. Otherwise it would have been "You are the Business Constituency. You don't represent the users, nor the governments. But we at the ITU do."

---

I think that, to make a long story short, yes the Snowden revelations have made an indirect very large impact through the attitudes which the governments are now taking.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO:

There is not too much I can add to Jean-Jacques, but I'd like to add another perspective for our discussion. According to what Wolf said a few minutes ago regarding the fact that Snowden revelations did not make users use trust, but they did lose trust of the Internet [that of] governments. After NETMundial, Jean-Jacques explained what happened. All these ISTAR organizations were involved and led by ICANN and Fadi – the Brazilian government was very much involved, [inaudible] through the Brazilian President.

And what she did is she submitted it to discussion, was by having a government get involved and say, "We don't want the surveillance being carried out by the U.S. only," another government got involved. As a result of that, users started trusting the Internet again. And this is why NETMundial was so successful, because a new door was opened up that allowed users to say, "Well, we're going to trust you again because there's at least one government that is saying that they don't want massive communication surveillance."

And I leave this open for discussion, too. This gave rise to another risk, which is the fragmentation of the Internet, the possibility of creating national Internet, separate from the global Internet we're looking for as a result of these revelations. We don't want to be surveyed as a result of that. We create our own Internet. It is not what we want. We all want a single and global Internet.



---

So when a government gets involved – in this case, a Brazilian government – we, the users, or representatives of the users, may see this as a positive signal that tells us that we can recover users’ trust again.

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks, Fatima. I see two more hands from colleagues from LACRALO here first, and then afterwards, [inaudible].

JOHNNY LAUREANO: Johnny Laureano from the Association of Internet users.

WOLF LUDWIG: Please, for the interpretation, slow down the speed.

JOHNNY LAUREANO: Johnny Laureano from the Association of Internet users Peru. I’d like to go back to the title of the meeting “Internet Governance and the Perspective of Users.” Even though we may have some confusion about the definition of user, we also see this in [inaudible] governance.

For some people, governance is government, political, politics, power and this may lead us to think that eventually governance, from the point of view of some end users whom I represent, is basically focused on a relation of power, except power everything is an illusion and you see that in Dr. [Bowl’s] presentation. We have 15 representatives and only one person represents users. Only one.

---

We don't trust governments. We don't trust private companies because, without private companies, governments cannot spy. We all know this. The government cannot spy without the cooperation of a private company. If this is the case, why don't we do something to achieve a better representation of users? We have a commitment of us no matter what country we come from or what continent we come from. This is a matter of power. And I insist on this, because as users, we need to have more power in the board, because the board is the only place, the only group, that can help us lead the way.

In NETMundial, as a result of what's happening here, it was very clear to me that the Civil Society was divided into four parts – the academia, the technical community, the civil society, and obviously Internet end-users. Which I'll be very clear about this, no doubt about that. Those of us who attended NETMundial and those of us who know that the ICANN played a major role. If we are not able to acknowledge that the end user is part of this, the Internet user should not only be used to promote a governance model within the ICANN only, this should also be transferred to other government models in other countries, and this makes me submit a proposal which I hope will be supported by all of you as far as possible.

We have said that this governance model, its basic role, its basic model, is their bottom-up model. So you go from the bottom up. Are we doing this? I think we are. And since we're doing this, I invite you to think that we can have governance if we have power. It cannot be a government if you do not have the power.

---

So how can you start participating in a governance model? Where can we find a way to do governance? Where can we translate the great ideas that are being mentioned here? I believe that these can be achieved through the ccTLDs.

The RFC 1591 says that this role of the ccTLDs is at the service of the community of users and the common purpose is to serve the community. And I've heard many times that many people defend a model that suggests that ccTLDs should not play any role, and this is not bottom-up.

I encourage you to think that this model may be used to eventually have a model that will work, that will go from theory to action. [inaudible] because I have two proposals, is that the ICANN has a responsibility of promoting the operation of an Internet governance forum in all countries that are willing to do this. We know that Internet governance fora, whether people from many countries, from many areas, but not necessarily the people who are there represent the interests of the governance fora or the different countries.

I do know how many Internet governance fora there are in some countries. In France, in Spain, besides the IGF there are other fora. But this means only some people, some institutions. And we have our thought, we have our ideas. We are working with governments because we want to provide [inaudible]. This only natural. Our job, the job of my colleagues who are members of the Latin-American Federation of Internet users, is to transmit this clear idea. We want a greater representation in government decisions, which we call governance.

---

Let's not try to define governance so accurately. We know what we are. If we're here, it's because we know who we are.

Well, I am sure these two suggestions will generate some feedback and I hope this will also be discussed in other meetings. The idea is that the real governance model may be practiced at the ccTLDs in the different countries and the Internet Governance Forum may also be promoted among different countries so to generate a discussion about the future Internet. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thank you very much. Before I give now the floor to Sergio, we are now having let's say the sort of open round where we, in a kind of a brainstorming, collect your inputs, your complementary ideas, to what was said here in the plenary. Before we finish tonight, we will make sort of a wrap-up. I would suggest to restructure a little bit the different aspects what have you said.

There's a new element you added to the debate, what is a crucial was. It's a power [hierarchy], and what role. We had a business factor, which was mentioned by Jean-Jacques several times. Consumer notion, which is very close to consumption. Many of us do not consider ourselves as consumers in regard of the Internet, even if some DNS businesses, people would like to have us in the consumption or in a consumer role being uncritically and selling, buying, etc., playing the game.

The [inaudible] element is the power [hierarchy] because there are still a lot of governments who sees the Internet of the perfect means of control. Therefore we have to come back to this element, but we then

---

afterwards need to better structure the debate to be a little bit more pinpointed. Therefore we will have breakout sessions tomorrow. Then we can discuss in what sectors we can sub-divide the debate to get more precise. Sergio, it's on you now.

SERGIO SALNIAS PORTO: Good afternoon. I'm going to speak in Spanish. First of all, it's a pleasure to see my former colleagues from ALAC. I'm going to suggest some things which are related to everything which has been said here so far.

You have talked about consumers. We are users, Internet users. At least this is the vision of the Association of Internet users of Argentina. And we're prosumers. We produce content, and at the same time, we consume bandwidth. We consume and we hire domain names. So we also consumer things related to the Internet, but we also generate a high traffic in the web as a result of our real content production.

What happens to us when we discuss these things, when we discuss where we are and where we're going within the ICANN is that we start thinking whether we are similar to somebody. And we say we are like – do we have the same interests than the technical community? Do we have the same interests than companies that register domain names and numbers that may join ALAC as user organizations. Those are the things that mean a conflict to us, that make [inaudible] where we are and where we're going to.

I'm saying this because we've seen this in our region. We have seen how things have moved in our region. So the discussion of NETMundial places us in a key position today. We're not talking about Internet users

---

and the others. We should speak of different layers, and maybe this multi-stakeholder system should be discussed with the ICANN and reformulated. We should have a place for Internet end-users.

Should we have a place for those who defend consumers, who try to [reach] a digital divide? Should we also have a place for the academia? Should we have a place for the civil society? Which is not necessarily—

I apologize, I'm sorry, for my speed. I'm going to fast. Can you hear me? Slower? Aren't you getting the translation? You are? Can I continue? It smells like something is burning.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: ...something burning.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Oh, that's smoke. I can smell it.

WOLF LUDWIG: Just a moment. May I suggest until we are now checking the problem, we agreed to have a break in between. Therefore, I would say let's use the time until they find out the problem for the break and come back 15 minutes later. I hope that we can continue immediately afterwards. Thanks a lot.

I think we are almost complete. Back to the continuation. We had this interesting last intervention from Sergio. Sergio, you have finished all you want to add? Okay, you still have the floor, and then we go to the first row.

---

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Wolf. I will speak in Spanish, so I will ask you to wear your headphones. I'm trying to resume what I was saying ten minutes ago. I know it's a little bit difficult, but I would like to continue with that thread and say the following.

What I mean is "we." When we, in ALAC, when we see what happens when we approve ALSes and when we function with [inaudible], what we are seeing actually is something I'm going to put with an example.

Those of us working in organizations of Internet users – and I want to say that my organization went through an electoral process with more than 82,000 voters – we are not talking about two or three people. We are talking about 82,000 voters in Argentina.

When we are placed on the other side, we are sitting together with other people in a discussion related to domain names or to telephone issues, we are being placed in an uncomfortable place. It's as if in a union, part of the union had the companies inside them, had the companies with whom they want to discuss their collective bargaining agreements.

So we need to start having a look at how or what is it that we're going to do to have, in principle, a reflection of what the NETMundial document showed us.

We are not all together. Many times we have interests the same, but many times when ALSes are approved and those ALSes have companies incorporated into them working with databases and we incorporate it into ALAC, we are having a problem and this needs to be reviewed. This

---

needs to be revised and we need to have a space so that we, Internet users, can discuss issues related to domain names and numbers.

I'm saying this because I remember that once in the Singapore meeting we had one of our colleagues – an ALAC colleague – who was a registry, and he was sitting together with us as another colleague. For me, this person, who I think is a great person, is an excellent person – a very good person – but in issues concerned with interests, these interests are in conflict with our organization and they cannot be sitting in the same table where we are sitting.

Now I'm going to discuss another issue. It was said that there's no trust in the governments and that the Internet was based on trust. So I believe in governments. I do not believe governments are enemies of the people or of its citizens. There are many cases – and I say this in my region – where there are governments which have not been involved in privacy issues. Brazil, Argentina, Chili, Ecuador, Venezuela, Cuba. All of these countries have not intervened in data extraction processes. This does not happen in Africa either. I have not seen any case in Cameroon, in Nigeria, in Dakar.

I do, however, see this in the north. And we are having a north-south problem and the debate we're going to have is a north-south debate. Hopefully, this will be [less than that], but I think this is where the debate is going. Thank you very much.



---

WOLF LUDWIG:

I think you have added very good points to the debate. We are taking notes of this that nothing is getting lost, but now I would like to continue with our list of speakers here. So next one is Annette.

ANNETTE MUEHLBERG:

Hello. Thank you, Jean-Jacques, for this profound introduction. I would like to focus on [inaudible] brainstorming. We said, okay, what comes up to our mind? I think to define users' interests, we can also have a look at history and what have been rules set up already. One basic issue is human rights. This is something I think most of us – maybe not all of us, but most of us – can unite in defining these interests as important interests so that we can translate human rights as technical [inaudible]. Can someone help me out? Because it is not true that everyone can speak his or her language here. Requirements – okay. So translate human rights and technical requirements and organizational requirements.

So there was this discussion about the role of consumers. I would like to just add something. I like the interpretation of Wolf that he does not like the definition of users as consumers. Yes, I agree, because I think we are rather citizens and users, but the good part about consumer is that if you are a user and you're doing processes in the Internet and you're doing business just as normal user, you buy something, then there is already a legal system for it. That is consumer rights.

So in the sense of consumer rights, I think yes we could take care of those. So I would not define us in the main – how do you say? I would not identify I am a consumer, I am a user, I am a citizen. But yes, we as

---

users and citizens, we do have consumer rights and so we should pick those up.

There was the question about the role of surveillance and the time after Snowden. We talked about trust. We talked about the security of infrastructure. I think that many people discuss that the Internet is broke, and this is a really serious discussion. It is not just like, oh, yes, we already knew there is surveillance here and there.

Sergio, I do not agree that this is a north-south problem. It is a problem of power. It is a problem of private power and government power. It is companies who do data collection and who organize access and they can survey what we are doing and they can collect. They can make profiles and all that. And it is states and secret services. Actually, it's rather states within the states. It is very often even governments do not know what's going on in their own secret service. So it is a democratic problem. It is a problem of concentration of power in political issues and economic power. So it's a threat to democracy all over the world.

And I think it is really serious. Even more serious because it is not only about surveillance, but what we learned the last year with the Snowden documents, which was really clear, and I think this is also an issue for ICANN and users within ICANN. It is about the fragility of infrastructures. It is that those infrastructures cannot only be surveyed, which is bad enough, but they can be manipulated.

And this is a very serious issue. I think we have to sort of start right from the beginning, actually, discussing how do we organize as an organization part. How do we organize the Internet and what

---

technology do we use, and what laws can apply? In this sense, the users have a very important part all over the world. Thank you.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: I am a little bit worried because users are not necessarily aware of what we are doing. We are speaking in their name. what I have done in the past is a little exercise in L.A., in Los Angeles, I asked the question. I was walking in the street and asked people, “Do you know what IANA is?” Well, they don’t know.

So if you do the same thing here, do the same thing – for example, the director of this hotel who received the ICANN check probably does not know anything about ICANN. I think our duty is to inform users of their right. If we do that, if they are aware, they will express their opinion. They don’t know, and so they can’t talk.

At-Large has evolved. In the beginning you could be a member as an individual at the very beginning. However, that model does not work. So what we ended up with is structures. Structures that worked a little bit better than individual membership. But what I believe is that these structures need to remember that they represent individuals. These structures need to inform these individuals that they have a voice. That’s what I wanted to say. Thank you.

WOLF LUDWIG: Very good point. Thanks a lot. Before we continue with our colleagues here in the back to the left and here to the right, I think one colleague is not [inaudible] back again.

---

Just one aspect [inaudible]. I think actually it's an important question. We pretend to represent the user, the large majority of the user. [If you now] say we have three billion Internet users, I somehow feel very uncomfortable with this pretention that we represent the Internet users.

Talking to my neighbors from time to time, that happens, I have the impression that many of them do not even want to be represented. Many of them use IT or the Internet like they use a car. As long as a car works, drives, normally they do not care how. So they do not want to know what is under the machine deck, etc. As long as the whole system works to their perception, they are completely satisfied with it. They do not care too much about privacy some of them. They do not care much about the technical layers, the political layers, the infrastructural layers as long as in their daily use at the workplace or at home the whole thing works.

And I think somehow we need to be there, that a lot of people are completely satisfied with this narrow daily relationship with the whole system, what makes us extremely concerned, but say, "As long as it works, I'm happy."

So this analogy with using a car, and again here we are on the consumer level of the discussion, as long as something is okay, it's okay and they don't care about the rest. Just a short complement to [inaudible] when you were telling us about your test in Los Angeles asking people. Yes, please?

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

Yes, I tend to agree with you, Wolf, in regard to the person who is your neighborhood or down the street. It's difficult for the average person to understand Internet protocols, for example. Do they really want to? If the machinery works, that's fine.

I have worked as a consumer representative. And I use the word consumer here, and sometimes they are used interchangeably. Annette mentioned about consumer rights, and then it's the word consumer; whereas with end-users that tends to mean the end-user of a product. So it's gone down all the value chain until it gets to the person who's the user rather than the provider who might be a user in the middle of a system.

So I just wanted to make the point that from being a representative, that was quite a layered system where the organization I was with was representing a body of uses on a committee from a number of different backgrounds. It happened to be disability. And from those particular viewpoints that were received from that committee that were a body of uses who had memberships. So it went layer by layer.

Then we hoped that we were representing as well as possible the wide array of end-users in that particular group. So it's complex. We always fear, do we really meet everyone's needs? And so that's a comment. I'm sure there's a lot of other issues there, and maybe we should just move along to the next speaker who I think is Humberto?

HUMBERTO CARRASCO:

Thank you. I'm going to speak in Spanish. Thank you very much. I would like to express my satisfaction by hearing about the high level of

---

discussion about the users. There are several issues that catch my attention here, especially because they are related to my doctoral dissertation.

I would say that many of the issues, at least within LACRALO, I'm a secretary at LACRALO, it's because there are some confusions between the concept of user and consumer. When we talk about consumer, we are talking about an economic relationship, and the aim of the relationship between the provider and the user is a monetary relationship.

The concept of user is a more holistic concept that includes a lot more, and I'm going to give you an example. When we users – and I consider myself a user – when we fight for access on the network, we invoke the technology principle and we do this because of an interest that does not have an economic character, and this is [inaudible] to information.

On the other hand, there's the supplier that would like to restrict or manage the speed of content because perhaps it is a lot more expensive for them to have hundreds of people downloading videos or music. And so there is an economic interest versus an interest that it's not economic. There's different layers. I'm sorry.

We're discussing different layers. On the one hand, there is an economic view; and on the other hand, there is a non-economic view. This is a way of explaining the difference between user and consumer.

Another issue that we need to highlight is the fact that there are certain countries that consider consumers are SMEs (small- and mid-sized

---

enterprises), and so this is another issue that we should deal with at some other location.

And finally, I was using the elevator and a lady told me, “I have seen a lot of people with this badge that you have. It seems that this is a conference. What is this conference about?” So I said, “Well, this is an Internet conference,” in general terms. And she said, “Oh, probably you mean the lack of privacy on the Internet.” That’s the first answer she gave me. This is the general perception people have of this.

And I would like to finish with an analogy. The good thing about the Snowden case is that before the case – and I’m going to give you a metaphor if you want to call it that way – people did not know there is a mirror that they’re looking at. People didn’t even know there was someone behind the mirror. Today, after the Snowden case, people at least do know there is a mirror and that there’s somebody looking from behind. Thank you.

[applause]

WOLF LUDWIG: Thanks a lot. I would like to give the others a chance first who have not spoken. Yes, he’s the next one now, [inaudible].

DIEGO ACOSTA BASTIDAS: This is going to be another voice in Spanish. Diego Acosta Bastidas, Free Culture and Free Software from Ecuador. Ecuador, for many of us, could be Galapagos, could be the Yasuni. But it is also Snowden as well. It is a small country, very small, but with sufficient [arrests] and determination

---

to make a decision before the Snowden case. It is very easy to talk about challenges in power. It is very easy to discuss vulnerabilities on the network, but it is very difficult to make decisions. We did.

This is just an introduction. I would like just to be very concrete to refer to what has been said by my colleagues from the Internet Latin-American Users Association, with respect to the need to analyze a motion by this working group in relation to what Fatima has said, because I agree fully with her, so that we can develop a very concrete motion to analyze the visibilities and the perspectives to create a scenario that is specifically used by Internet users by marking a separation with the denomination of civil society.

This precision is something that I would like to receive feedback from the working group, because it will probably receive the very valuable criteria, comments, and justifications that we have heard. That's all.

WOLF LUDWIG: And we have next here.

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Can I just suggest that we, because of time limitations, could you please be fairly brief and introduce yourself first? Thank you.

SUNIL LAL: I think we all agree, starting from the [inaudible] to the Internet, it has grown so exponentially. The primary reason for that is the applications, and of course the users who have embraced it. Clearly, the users are at the center of this ecosystem.



---

Now, what does not follow is that necessarily these users would know what is good for them. So that's why you need to have some form of knowledgeable representation to do basically understand what the users would be needing, what would they be requiring, and to factor that in in policy making.

Now, within the current ICANN ecosystem, you have the users' interests are represented by ALAC which has only one, a singular vote in this Board of Directors. And in fact, ICANN's representation also comes from an [ALS]. So At-Large Structures are primarily responsible for representing the users' interests.

My concern is how can we be sure that the ALSes are faithfully executing and representing the user rights? What form of review do we have to make sure that the ALSes are doing their job that they have a vested interest in?

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

There's a lady at the back there, please. Yes? We really need to cut off I think – yeah. Okay.

MONIQUE EPSTEIN:

Hi, my name is Monique Epstein. I just want to give some of my thoughts that I have listening to you. The first one is I am representing specific class of users, which are seniors. Seniors using Internet.

And the first problem I have accessibility, and accessibility not only – for instance, the fact of reading or the characters are too little and so on. But especially the problem where some places in France you don't have

---

Internet, even in France. That is accessibility. That means that not all people have access to Internet yet. That's one thought.

The other one is a word which is very important, and which you did not use. It's the word empowerment. Internet is a tool for empowerment of all kinds of minorities.

And the last thing, because you say always that the guy on the street does not know what is ISOC. In my environment, the people who work with me don't know why I'm coming to London. They don't understand at all. Nobody knows what ISOC is and so on. They only one thing which people know as consumer and not user is the fact that they pay 30 Euros to access the Internet, especially the seniors, and they find it's too expensive so they are not satisfied because they pay too much or because the access is not good. But that's the only thing they think of, not more.

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

Thank you. I think it's Phillip's turn now.

PHILIP JOHNSON:

My name is Philip Johnson. Just for briefly, Internet Governance: User Perspective, from my understanding this team is very important. It has helped me to get to understand the user's perspective. I can see there are users with different diversions of focus. There are users that [inaudible] concerned about access or applications on the Internet. There are users who may be looking at fraud on the Internet. There are users who are looking up opportunities or expanding economic interest.

---

So we as an ALS, there's a need to also look at [inaudible] countries. For example, I come from a country that Internet access is very difficult to receive. You have low bandwidth. You don't have many people get on the Internet. So there are users who are concerned.

As everybody has said, we need to introduce ICANN to our community. Many people in our community do not understand the good work that ICANN is doing. When you come to this meeting, what are you going to disclose? Are you going to disclose about us having Internet in [inaudible] country?

So there are users from different perspectives, so this is what we need to look at and focus on which [inaudible] would be looking at.

AZIZ HILALI:

Thank you. Aziz Hilali, AFRALO chair. I will speak in French. I would like to address the future of ALAC, because we are representing end-users and that is the subject of our discussion. Did you mention representation of civil society of end-users? And there are many people who are not informed as to what ICANN does. As far as we're concerned, our ALSes try to do that with the means that we have at our disposal.

However, I would like to address the question of how ALAC, and therefore the ALSes, how they might plan the future based upon the decision that was made by the government of the United States to let go of the IANA function. And what I see is the future of ALAC is much more significant, much more interesting as well.

---

And so we need to consider how ALAC might have even more possibilities to represent the ALSes. Right now there are about 150 ALSes. That's about 500 or 5,000 individuals that each ALS represents. That's about 150,000.

I had read a paper by people who criticize ICANN, saying that basically 150,000 is not necessarily a worldwide representation. What people say is that as long as the Internet is working, as long as users have access to the Internet, they don't understand ICANN and don't need to.

As far as I'm concerned, what I try to do – at least what I did in the university that I did this – I added a course on Internet governance. Those are engineers who will work in the telecommunication world. They understand DNS security. They understand governance. But they don't necessarily understand all the intricacies of our work.

We don't know what the future of ICANN is, but what I believe is that ALAC and GAC need to have much more power in terms of the structure itself of ICANN. So how can ALAC, how can ALSes, gather more people, represent more end-users? Thank you.

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

And Anupam now please.

ANUPAM AGRAWAL:

Hello, this is Anupam Agrawal of ISOC Kolkata ALS. This is just to reaffirm the point made by Wolf that the general user is not basically bothered about how the Internet works or who are the stakeholders.

---

There was a little survey which was done in our part of the world. The first question was: have you accessed Facebook? The answer was yes. And later in the survey, the question was: have you accessed Internet? And one-third of the people said no.

They are just using Facebook without bothering whether it is Internet or it is not an Internet. Out of the 67% who responded yes to both the questions, they were not bothered about surveillance at all. A little bit of surveillance is okay for them by the government unless and until the government misuses it for their own political purpose. That's when the question of national security is invoked.

So I India we have more than 1,000 laws, different laws for different things – practically for everything. But nowhere national security as a term has been defined. It has been used in different perspectives by different political parties in different contexts as per their own will. And that's where the Internet user gets [inaudible]. Internet user is put into trouble when the government wishes to misuse it. That's one point.

Second, the general user thinks the Internet is the solution for spreading the education. So Internet is a solution, so it is okay. So primarily, Internet users in our part of the world is bothered about access. The cheaper, better, simpler applications, if that is there we are good. The rest of the things I think it is left to the people who are representing various forums, all the technical and diplomatic matters. Thank you.

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

Thank you Anupam. We're going to finish off with an intervention from a remote participant.

CARLOS REYES:

Thanks. This is Carlos Reyes. I have a comment from Javier Rodriguez. Actually, three comments from Javier Rodriguez. The first comment: “We cannot talk about users’ perspectives if we do not address the issue of the lack of representation of the users on the Board. The first bylaw stated nine members from the Board coming directly from At-Large, 50% of the Board. Today we have only one vote.”

The second comment: “Members of the Board from At-Large group were nine, 50% of the Board. At-Large only one vote on the Board. How can we talk about users’ perspectives if all can be just empty words because no votes to push ideas forward?”

And the last comment: “Concentration of power, yes, on the ICANN Board. Judge and party at the same time. Who on the Board thinks that it is fair and proportionate that the At-Large have just one vote? Let’s fight back today to recover our nine votes on the Board. Patrick Henry said, ‘Give me liberty or give me death.’ I say give me 50% of Board votes and then we can talk about your so dear ICANN/IANA transition.”

[applause]

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

Yes, please, go ahead.

PASTOR PETERS:

Good evening, everybody. My name is Pastor Peters Omoragbon, president of Nurses Across the Borders from Nigeria, and [inaudible] AFRALO community. Yes, I am involved with ICANN as an end-user. You

---

can call me an end-user or a consumer. What [inaudible] as a consumer, I see both technologies as [inaudible]. But what [inaudible] is that?

As a consumer, as an end-user, we'll make use of the Internet to engage in our various activities, whether that's officially or business-wise.

Now, since I became involved in ICANN since 2010, in my first fellowship program, I've done everything possible to be as active as possible. Now if we are trying to see how – when we're looking at the Global Internet: The User Perspective, I'm going to give my own perspective based on the little experience I've had within the ICANN structure.

First, let me quickly just observe. In all my contributions, in all my interventions, in the various conferences, teleconferences, my goal has been to promote and advance the [inaudible] of the ordinary Internet user [inaudible]. There are millions of Internet users who do not have that technical expertise, but they can go to the Internet and know how to browse and send e-mails, a lot of them [inaudible].

Now, when we're planning this program, as a member of the planning committee, we volunteers were asked to take part in the various roles. I volunteered number one to service – to volunteer as a moderator to this very section. My name was on the system [inaudible], but until I got here today, I discovered that my name was taken off. But I know in the course of the discussion through one of our teleconferences, [inaudible] volunteers you must be an expert in the discussions. You must have these qualifications.

---

And I did mention that, yes, ICANN is not all about experts or [inaudible]. It's also about those who do not have the technical abilities. You must also encourage them and let them be inclusive in the process.

So if you can give them some of the activities that some of you are [inaudible], that will also help to generate interest. But when I got here today, I discovered my name was off. And I did ask [inaudible]. I said if that was done, I should have been informed. I should have been informed. I traveled from Nigeria to here. Most members are not here because of [inaudible] a big sacrifice to come here. We are not paid for this job. We are volunteering for these services.

So if I volunteer to serve, I should be [inaudible] to be encouraged. So if I'm not encouraged, not only is it discrimination where there are selections within the ICANN itself, then issue of transparency is queried. So that is number one.

Now coming to the issue of the revelations by [inaudible] on the Internet community on whether we have governance. From my own opinion as an Internet user, the Internet is double-edged. It's a double-edged sword. It does us good and there is a bad side. But the problem that we are facing is the Internet has become a [inaudible], but we have no control of how the Internet is being used.

Today you have tourists who kidnap people, who kill them, and then they post their [inaudible] on the Internet and there is no way they can be tracked. So that is one problem. So you cannot have in place a creation that you have no control over.



---

So my question is how would the system, whether ICANN or the government, be able to prevent this from having? We're not [inaudible]. We know the negative influence the Internet has on ordinary people, but it has issues that ought to be addressed. Children are introduced to different kind of [vices] to the Internet [inaudible] because the end-user [inaudible] from the negative impact of the Internet use.

We appreciate our opportunities. I know how much the Internet has assisted me in doing what I'm doing today. So in [inaudible], I will only summarize by [inaudible]. The Internet is good. ICANN has done a lot to introduce Internet services, but [inaudible] by everyone to see how we could [inaudible] the negative parts of the Internet. Thank you very much.

WOLF LUDWIG:

Okay, thanks. I think we are clear that we now stop this first round of feedback of brainstorming for today. Referring to the last comments, I realize that there were several aspects mentioned. One was criticism for the formation of thematic groups. I think there have been enough call conferences after Singapore during the whole process when we created the thematic groups for the roles involved in thematic groups in each of the five subject matter experts, moderator, selection of reporters. There were criterias developed, and the criterias are on the website and the final choice about the candidates that made according to this criterias. These were all open and publically accessible on the respective website, and I think you could have commented on this three weeks or four weeks ago when the final selection was made. Therefore, today I think this shouldn't be a part of the debate anymore.

---

What I've heard and understood is now what also was mentioned by Monique is the question of access and accessibility, etc., and the development dimension. I think this should and could be another aspect which is listed.

Now, for tomorrow, what was said here in this first brainstorming, this afternoon after the opening, after the introduction, I tried to cluster the topics here on the flip-chart and basically we have – what I've seen up to six different topics. Can anybody see it from the back or do you want me to have a short [recap] of the clusters? I think it would be better.

This is only a sort of mapping as a result of the debate. There were so many different aspects mentioned by different speakers, and I simply tried to bring them in a sort of structure. I think the center of the debate today, the introduction was also the user and trust. Trust as a precondition for Internet users to use the Internet in a convenient way.

There are was again and again the question about notions – the notion of user versus consumer. This came up again and again. Some of the people feel uncomfortable what we have heard with the consumer notion because it's a commercial notion. I buy a car, I buy whatever product, I pay a certain price. If I'm not satisfied with the product, then I complain. This is a usual customer relations dimension, what I think may not be a complete understanding with regard to the Internet because many Internet users consider themselves as producers, as creators, and this dimension of creativity is not included in the consumer term. Therefore, I think we need some more clarification on this discussion. Therefore, in my opinion, this is one thematic cluster or could be a thematic cluster tomorrow.

---

Another one is a business aspect inside, because as users, we are customers of the business sector. Or what Jean-Jacques said, this is nice wordplay from the DNS Domain Name System to the Domain Name Business. This business side is a very important one. When you have been to five ICANN conferences and you look around, to what extent is ICANN [inaudible] business-driven.

I think we cannot neglect the business dimension, been talking about user and user rights. The other aspect was a government power relations. To what extent governments use new technological options, possibilities, means for surveillance, leaving the secret services [free hand].

I think we have a typical example. The U.S. on the one hand claiming being the mother country of civil liberties. On the backside, they do the contrary. [inaudible] government as well and it can tell a lot of stories about this.

Then we had some questions about access and the development dimension. I think this is true for a lot of RALOs, not only AFRALO. I would even say we have a development gap inside Europe between West and Eastern Europe. So this is not only in the north-south context. This [inaudible] and development dimension is broader and even more complex.

And let me ask in this clustering a final question. I've more and more difficulties when I pretend representing users. Users [inaudible] variety. For me, it's so complex in the variety that it's getting to abstract. Therefore my thinking is sometimes instead of pretending to represent

---

users, I feel more comfortable, coming back to Jean-Jacques, representing the public interest.

And to a certain extent, this is also a key issue for ALAC and [itself] understanding, because you can potentially always hide behind different expectations from users as [inaudible] mass, but sometimes it's easier and clearer in my opinion to have reference to the public interest.

So this is just a mapping of arguments we had. It's a suggestion. This is not decided here. And we should continue our discussion tomorrow in the opening [inaudible] of these clusters, we would like to create sub-groups and to intensify our discussion tomorrow, because I think it will be more productive if you create small groups. It will also be much more inclusive tomorrow having a round of small sub-groups, etc., and try to get some more results on this. Sergio?

SERGIO SALINAS PORTO: Thank you, Wolf. Just a thought about what you said. I am going to speak in Spanish. All right. So you were saying that we should have sub-groups, smaller groups. The problem is interpretation. If we have smaller groups, many of us here will not be able to attend, and so we need to think that we do this collectively or we see how we organize this so that we can generate the work in smaller groups.

FATIMA CAMBRONERO: Sergio, in the original proposal, the idea was to divide sub-groups per language because we have people speaking French, this could be one group. People speaking Spanish, that could be another group. And

---

people who speak in English, a third group. If you agree and you feel more comfortable that way, then it's not a problem for us because we have people speaking the three languages.

WOLF LUDWIG:

That's a good idea, Fatima, to break down by language groups, but I'm not sure whether it will be the most productive approach. A better approach would be first to see which people are interested in one of the sub-topics, and then see whether this fits with language conditions. And if we are lucky, it may fit this language conditions because some of the people at least know two or three languages, so we could get along without interpretation, and keeping the translation/interpretation option to those who cannot do without. Jean-Jacques?

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT:

Thank you, chair. I think I will not go along with that suggestion. I'll tell you why, though. Because I am a minority, too. I am a minority, and in spite of that, I think that, for once, considering the magnitude of the subject, we should stay together. Otherwise, you will have – for instance, I say this just off the top of my head. The Latin group or the Latin-American group saying or the Spanish group saying, "We have to place the problem of languages in ICANN in number one." That's been done in the past. Or the French-speaking group will say, "The U.S. is unfair." That's not the problem.

I'd like to give you an overview of what I come away with from our whole exercise this afternoon when Wolf will give me the floor, or Gunela.

---

GUNELA ASTBRINK: Yes, I think this is a good time to do it. Thank you, Jean-Jacques.

JEAN-JAQUES SUBRENAT: Thank you. Be patient. It will take a bit more than five minutes, between five and ten. I see two great themes in addition to what Wolf has so kindly and diligently translated by clusters. I would like to bring to you an overview, which is a very political, very strategic view I hope.

The first is about trust, because it is intimately related to the public interest or the notion of public interest that we have. You have noticed that over the past two years – three, four years – each time that part of our community has spoken out strongly in favor of the public interest needing to be put at the center of all our work, there have been other parts of our community, business or others, who have said, “Yes, but how do you define the public interest?”

I agree it’s a very legitimate question, but I also caution you against the fact that it can be – I don’t say it is. It could also be a tactic. In French we say [inaudible]. It’s a way of drowning your fish. Be aware of that.

Now, there is one real problem. It’s how do you translate all of our discussion not in Internet terms, but in ICANN terms? You have noticed that all our discussions today were centered on things which are more abstract and which relate to parliaments, to government, to NGOs meaning rights, user rights, human rights, rights of expression, lack of censorship, etc. But we must be aware that none of this falls directly in the remit of ICANN. ICANN is about a technical function. ICANN is growing up.

---

So it is our duty as ALAC or At-Large to find the wording which would allow us to relate these real legitimate high-level preoccupations with the remit or the purview of Internet. And on the Board of Directors, there's still quite a few people who, when faced with this kind of question, will say, "Sorry, that's outside the limited technical remit of ICANN."

Now, the fact that ICANN took a very active – in fact, even a leading – part in the ISTAR meeting and then in NETMundial says that there is a growing awareness also in ICANN leadership about this contradiction between the requirements, the new demands, of the Internet users on the one hand and the limited technical remit of ICANN and its bylaws, and according to California law. It's our duty to find that fit between the two extremes.

I'd like to say also in this number one chapter about trust and public interest, I see two risks of convergence. One is between big corporations and some powerful states, or sovereign states as I have called them – governments in American or English. And the other convergence is between certain non-democratic states and certain democratic states who, in the name of, if you give them any opportunity to remember anything about terrorism or child porn or blasphemy – bang – they'll use it the next morning. And that is a wonderful excuse to clamp down on Internet rights, on freedom of expression. Blasphemy is used in some parts of the world, which some of you knew. For Western Europe, it's not even an issue, especially for Atheists, but that's another problem.

---

So I see these two convergences and I think it's worth your while looking into this and telling us tomorrow morning if I am right off the top of my brain this is silly, or maybe you just want to make a mention of it perhaps that there is the danger of these two convergences.

My second point was about really the user, the user community. [inaudible] first Wolf said, "My Volkswagen is working. Why am I worried? Nothing to say. I don't care about the engine or the wheels." Right. And [inaudible] put the same question in another form, and he said that you have to insist on community communicating to everyone their rights as users. That was very important.

So in order to bridge the gap between Wolf and [inaudible], I would say that what is the difference between the Internet and a Volkswagen? I love the brand, by the way. It's that in one case it's a commercial product, which is very, very widely used. That's true. But the Internet has an edge over the Volkswagen. As a student of history, I would say it is the first universal – underline universal – infrastructure in the history of humanity. And as such, we owe to our children, grandchildren, a much greater degree of care about the future than we have for our generations, because if we get this wrong – I almost used a bad word, \_\_\_up. Starts with an [inaudible] in English – that's done for several generations. We have to be very careful about this.

So try to end on a not positive but a workable notion or conclusion, I would say that we have to concentrate on one thing. It's a group of three words: awareness, trust, rights. You can change the order: rights, trust, awareness. Or trust, rights, awareness. Whatever.



---

Why is this so important? Because it is the only and the primordial means by which we will perhaps have some impact on user attitudes, and therefore as a consequence, the attitude of governments and corporations towards us as users.

I would just like to remind us the importance of education and training. You have to be speaking more about not how to solder wires for the Internet or IPv4 and IPv6, although that's important. You have to be talking in your communities about Internet governance as Aziz has done in his country.

The second thing is we have to relate all this to our local and regional governments. It is also at that level that we have to impress our elected representatives that we are now becoming aware of the stakes, and therefore we will not or no longer accept just a fuzzy definition of user rights.

The third thing is NGOs. I think you have mentioned NGOs with respect to one part of the user community, disability, and that's very important. Think about that example and you can work on from there.

We will also have to clarify some definitions, but don't be afraid of this. Don't be self – how should I say? – apologetic about this. Or the user community. No, the user community now more than three billion.

So, yes, we'll have to go into the definitions more precisely of users, consumers, prosumers, interest groups, etc.

And finally, I'd like to end with a word which was given to us as a very valuable reminder by Mrs. Epstein, Madame Epstein, who said in all our discussion, there's one word which was mentioned actually only once I

---

saw on the screen: empowerment. We must now consider it's not about revolution, although we did try to burn this building by smoking salmon in the basement I learned earlier. But empowerment is about the way we consider ourselves as the user committee, and therefore the sort of processes representation, etc., that we think would be suitable for our generations and those of our successors. Thank you.

GUNELA ASTBRINK:

Thank you very much, Jean-Jacques, for that very insightful summary of this afternoon's discussion.

[applause]

We are getting very close to the hour when people are going to start rushing in here for the rest of the ATLAS II participants. Fatima, would you like to make some concluding remarks?

FATIMA CAMBRONERO:

Thank you. I'm not really going to make closing remarks because this is an open discussion in my view, and together we will continue with this. Just to agree with the graph that Wolf did. I also make a difference, or I think that it was important to divide certain concepts.

Even though we do not agree what those concepts mean, on the one side there is consumers and on the other side there's users, there's also civil society end-users. Then there's users and organizations representing those end-users on the Internet.

And I would like to add another issue, which is the distinction we can make between design processes for the Internet and what Annette said,

---

the political principles of the Internet. This thing that you refer to as reorganizing the Internet and rethinking about what are the laws that we're going to use. We have design principles on one hand, which make the Internet continue to be what it is. Then on these levels, we need to apply the human rights, which continues to be principles and this includes the rights of users on my view.

We have also mentioned the other issues, and just to be brief, I want to add another issue regarding the work of tomorrow. Many of the people here are LACRALO people who came to this meeting because there is interpretation, and if the people of LACRALO tomorrow because there is no interpretation, I will need to leave with them because I am LACRALO representative. So I ask that we consider language divisions in the groups. Thank you.

WERNER HULSMANN: [inaudible] this group is tomorrow in—

WOLF LUDWIG: Excuse me, for the interpreters and the scribes, can you say your name?  
Thanks.

WERNER HULSMANN: My name is Werner Hulsmann from EURALO. In the [inaudible] that the group three tomorrow in Hilton 1-2, and Hilton 1-2 is now interpretation. So we have [inaudible] interpretation if this plan is [inaudible].

---

CARLOS REYES: Some of the published agendas from earlier are inaccurate now due to room allocations, so the agendas that were distributed in the folders are accurate. That's inaccurate.

WOLF LUDWIG: Okay. Well, as it was just clarified now, this was probably an old print version which is not accurate. So Werner, please, I think the most reliable update you will get from an online version. They are circulated on a daily level, so we have an overview of the At-Large meetings and by staff daily.

JEAN-JACQUES SUBRENAT: You mean on the Internet? Wow.

WOLF LUDWIG: On the Internet, yes. On the Internet. And for tomorrow, Sunday, our program is – and you can check this. I'm just now scrolling down. The continuation of the thematic groups.

UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: [inaudible] it's on the Adobe [inaudible].

WOLF LUDWIG: Yes, I also have it. And according to this schedule, we start quite early tomorrow morning at 8:00. I know some people in the room who are shaking their heads about this over-demanding schedule working

---

methods and hours, but we will meet here again tomorrow at 8:00 in this room.

So tomorrow morning we will start with more or less a short recapitulation of what we have said and summarize now. I would say to my perceptions there were two different ideas in the room. Jean-Jacques who is a proponent of staying together, and there are some people in the room who would like to break out. I think let's start tomorrow with a discussion about advantage and limits of the two concepts.

From a moderation point of view, I'm open to majority deciding on a concept. If we have two complementary approaches, it would be fine to me. So let's sleep about this. I do not think we have to come up with a decision now. So think about it. I see advantages for both methods of staying together and working piece by piece different aspects, or allowing other options.

For the moment, I think we have to close down here because there are other people from other thematic groups coming into this room for the last plenary today, which will go for another half-an-hour, just a summary of what was said in the different groups.

And please be aware there will be a dinner reception tonight for all the participants. I think you are aware about this. This will be a sponsored event. If you have question or if you need details, please ask one of the staff members.

Thanks a lot for your active participation and contributions today, and see you tomorrow.

---

[applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]