

---

LONDON – ATLAS II Thematic Group 1: The Future of Multistakeholderism - Session 4

Sunday, June 22, 2014 – 15:00 to 16:30

ICANN – London, England

MARILLIA MACIEL:

...what the state represents is a perception of the public interest. A perception that, first of all, is just one perception. And a perception that changes over time. So as time passes, the national interest, or what is perceived as the public interest, may change, and it's important that other actors are there, even to highlight that this is a changing understanding, and it should be changed as time passes.

Another thing is that the state, it mediates different interest. The states are not homogeneous. They are composed by a bureaucracy in which different ministers, sometimes they do not agree among themselves, in which parliaments are percolated by different interests and lobbies. And what the states choose to represent is only a fraction of the initial interest that were part of the public debate.

And what I think, and Evan has just arrived. What I think is that multistakeholderism gives an opportunity for this different interests to remerge in the global debate, and for some particular topics, this is extremely important. If you think of network neutrality, and the lobby that defenders of network neutrality have to face internally, which is usually the lobby of telecommunication companies, which is very strong in Congress, it's very important that this interest reemerges in the global debate.

---

*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.*

---

Even to reinforce in a feedback process the discussion on a national level. So I think it's extremely important and we could not be represented only by states at the global level. But I think it is related why multistakeholder [?] are very important on a national level as well. We can answer this question of importance, first of all, with a [?] argument, to say that the nature of the Internet that is complex and layered demands that different actors with different expertise participate in the process of policy development for the Internet.

Otherwise we will have situation for instance in which actors that discuss laws for the Internet, and do not dialogue with technicians, people that discuss standards and technical aspects, the regulation of the Internet goes in one direction, and if the technical frameworks goes in other direction, then we have a regulation that is not coherent.

And even may not foster the interest that we may want to foster. So it's very important that the different actors participate. And another argument I think, that it is part of what we know on the national level very well, of participatory democracy, of involving different actors, so these actors can participate in the process of formulations of policies.

Not only participate with the government, but on the case of the Internet, really participate in a way that they can really influence the late outcome of the process. And I think that this is what has happened in some countries. And Brazil, as I said yesterday, should not be seen as the example, but it's one example that can provide useful ideas to other national actors that are [?] for models to enhance multistakeholder discussions on national level.

---

CGI was created in 1995, or the embryo of what is CGIBR today, which is the Internet steering committee of Brazil. The context was the liberalization of telecommunications in Brazil, and in this context of liberalization, the actors came to realize that it was very important to involve the different actors, to start to discuss what could be the adequate policies in the context of liberalization so the Internet could really develop in Brazil.

I think that one interesting historical fact is that, in 1992, Brazil hosted the UN conference on environment, the Rio '92, and on that moment, the government realized that in order to provide Internet access to the people that were attending the conference, it could not do it alone.

So it needed a taskforce that was created between our MIP, which is the national network of research that provides connectivity to universities in Brazil, backbones, and Civil Society, through an organization that was called [?] at the time. So they realized, based on the success of the Rio '92 in terms of connectivity, that it was fundamental that the government had the support of academics, technical community, and Civil Society in order to foster connectivity in Brazil.

And that was actually politically have shown that to the governments, the value of having and the participation of other actors. So this synergy in 1995 created CGIBR, and it's interesting because it was created in a multistakeholder way, whe this work was even not as [?] as it is today. It was created even before the ICANN model was envisioned. So it's really a pioneer in this area.

In 2003, the model of CGIBR has been reinforced, not only in terms of competences but also in terms of the participation of the different

---

stakeholders. So nowadays we have a balanced participation between governmental and non-governmental actors. So that our 10 governmental representatives of different ministers in Brazil, and there are 10 non-governmental actors that represent all the other sectors, the business, and the Civil Society, technical community, academics.

So it's a very balanced representation 10 on the one side and 10 on the other side. And the competences of CGIBR have also been enlarged in 2003. So CGIBR now establishes guidelines for the implementation of the domain name dot BR in Brazil, but that's not only, that's that. It also establishes strategic directions for the development of the Internet in Brazil.

It coordinates the development of policies. It is called to give its opinion on the development of regulations of, for instance, and now [?] has approved that network neutrality is one of the principles that should be observed in Brazil. And in order to further regulate what network neutrality would mean in practice, one of the actors that would need to be heard is CGIBR.

This was one of the struggles that we had. Of course, the telecommunication companies did not want CGIBR to be explicitly mentioned in [?], but it was one of the battles that we won. So CGI is going to give its opinion before network neutrality is regulated. And one may think that the fact that being a multistakeholder body with so many interests represented there, could be hard to move some discussions forward.

But the fact is that, from the Brazilian experience, some controversial topics have been discussed in CGIBR. And the steering committee has

---

approved resolutions on topics that are controversial, such as the SOPA, such as the dot Amazon. CGIBR adopted that position against the file for dot Amazon here in ICANN. It supported the civil rights framework in Brazil.

It approved the resolution that said that all of the members of CGIBR and their organizations were unanimously against the NSA on surveillance practices. So even topics that are politically sensitive, this body has approved resolutions that serve as a political landmark for other organizations and actors in Brazil. So that it has a political weight that is very important in our political, internal political scene.

And in terms of concrete projects, CGIBR has also been the organization that has conducted, by means of one of its arms, which is [?], and that does the measurement of the Internet in Brazil, Internet penetration, so they do every year a report talking about Internet penetration and how it is in terms of the different regions in Brazil.

We have very strong regional diversities too. So CGIBR does all this kind of measurements, how many households have access to Internet, which kind of access is that, what is the quality, and so on. And this is very important for us to have sound information to adopt policies in Brazil. And they are behind the deployment of Internet exchange points to a project that they have that is called PPT Metro, together with other partners.

They are working hard at implementation of IPv6. They have a project to implement the management of port 25 in order to fight spam, which was one of the cases of success, because we really reduce spam in the

---

region. So not only political resolutions and positions are very important, but also concrete projects have been set forth by CGIBR.

And forgot to mention, but it's very important that all the members of CGIBR, the non-governmental members, are elected by their constituencies to be there. So we have a certain mandate, and after the mandate is over, these actors are elected and take the place as representatives. And this is something that has really strengthened not only the body itself, but also the discussion about Internet governance among the community in terms of, in the time of the elections as well.

So it serves as a way to raise awareness and spread knowledge about Internet governance, and the importance of this multistakeholder structure for, and the Internet in Brazil. So I think this double levels of governance, the global and the national, they are really complimentary. And if we think that there is a strain of trying to resolve problems as close as possible to the end user, in order to enhance legitimacy and transparency, and to empower the end user to participate in policy developments, to have space like CGIBR really empowers and enables people to participate.

One thing is to travel, you know, globally and participate in meetings such as this one in London. Another one is to participate in meetings in your own country. And CGIBR tries, we have national Internet governance forum, that takes place in different regions every year. So last time it was in the north region of Brazil, so we do it in the northeast, in the south of Brazil, to try to enhance participation as well.

And people identify much more when they participate on a national level with policy issues that, they can deeply relate to. It's very concrete

---

to them. So it's [?] to enhance multistakeholderism. I think that's it.  
Thank you very much.

LEON SNACHEZ:

Thank you very much Marillia. I shouldn't be asking questions since I'm a moderator, but I feel like I need to ask this question. Actually it's part of the basic questions that should help us part the discussion later on. And my question is, what can we learn, not only as ICANN community but as a global community, from NetMundial?

MARILLIA MACIEL:

I think that the main legacy that I see in terms of the global process is the process that we follow to arrive in the final outcome, that is a multistakeholder outcome. The process cannot be perfect. We were really under time stress to deliver NetMundial. We had very little time to prepare and I understand that the consultations, for instance, they should have been longer.

But I think that the fact that we arrived in a final outcome in a multistakeholder way, consulting all the sectors, this is something that could be taken, lessons from NetMundial could be taken to other forums, CG IGF for instance. This is something we should think about. And the IGF could be the place where we take some issues that are still opening our agendas suggested, different roles and responsibilities of actors, or network neutrality which were topics that NetMundial identified as open issues now on our agenda.

So I think the process is one of the main legacies. And of course, in the text itself, I think that we have some very good advancements, and

---

they're just considering Internet a public resource, such as [?] human rights, such as including the language of surveillance that even though we wanted it to be more strong than it was, but it was no other diplomatic victory to include in there, because in the beginning it was not in the mandate of NetMundial to talk about that.

So I think that we had some good achievement. It's a good document that we could take elsewhere, and I was happy to see that ICANN high level panel, for instance, makes a direct reference to NetMundial, outcome documents and try to build from there. To build something else from there, specifically in terms of roadmap that I do agree with, that we could have been more concrete in terms of roadmap.

But it's up to the community to take NetMundial outcome documents and build upon it. And ICANN has done that and I think it's a good thing. But maybe I can say something else.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Marillia. Evan, do you want to..?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

I had two questions, and I'm sorry, as you know, I came in a little late. So just in case I miss this, the process by which you came up with the model having the different microphones, and having the different setup for that, I found to be extremely innovative. And first of all, I want to applaud you and CGI for having...

Was this the invention of CGI?



MARILLIA MACIEL:

I really don't know whose invention was that. I think it was the secretariat, because I really wanted everybody and every stakeholder and group to have a chance to speak. And they felt that they could not control it, that everybody was speaking, and only one microphone. We could have a lot of stakeholders from the same group, and it was really hard to make sure that everybody would participate.

That's where the idea of the microphones came from. It was, the idea was received with mixed feelings. Some people thought that it was going back to the idea of silos, of separating the stakeholders, so it was not a good thing. And other people thought that since we had some high level governmental representatives, maybe they would not line up, and would create a situation of discomfort, but that did not happen.

And it's interesting that even people that were high level ministerial representatives, they stood in line. It was something very natural. I think it was good, I agree with you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Actually that's the, that is exactly the innovation that I'm speaking of. That governments, rather than being tucked away behind closed doors, as so often happens in groups like ICANN, they had to be at a microphone like everywhere else. And if there was some discomfort that was felt, I don't think the other people in the room were that forgiving, because that has been, what's been extended to us for all of this.

So on one hand, I wanted to find out who did it and thank them, thank CGI because I found this to be an extremely good model. And in fact,

---

although this isn't relevant to TG1, I would really like you to consider doing a workshop at the LA ICANN meeting, that would help other ALSs, that might help others in Civil Society, for other countries to do, to learn from the model of how CGI came up, because I think this model won't work in every place, but I think it has a lot to teach people that are trying to influence governments in other places.

And sorry, that was my main comment, but also talking about the future of multistakeholderism, that particular model of having the microphones, yes it looks like silos, but at the same time, it also brought all of the silos out. So things had to come out into the open. Things that previously, in places like ICANN, are left behind secret rooms, secret meetings and things like that, everything had to come out into the open, and that to me was one of the biggest benefits.

So I see great value of that, in being applied to the kind of things that we're talking about in this group. Thanks.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks Evan. Adam.

ADAM PEAKE: It's good that I waited then, because yes there is something to add. I think, in addition to the microphones, I think it's probably Daniel [?] and [?] in particular who thought through that arrangement and came up with it for the microphones. There was also the rolling inclusion of remote participants, and it was done, you know, I think it was every other round of going to the microphones, it was specifically going to the hubs and asking for their contribution, so it wasn't just, well it was

---

waiting but it was almost ensuring that they had a voice throughout the whole process.

A very short comment period, but there were over 180 substantive contributions made in that one month, which is less than ICANN has on public comments. So you had a very significant set of contributions in that period. And then, was it 13, 070 comments on those contributions within two or three days. And I think that shows the value of having people respond to a document, that which was what people were doing.

There was a document up there and people had the, they could read through it and say, “We like it, we don’t like it,” and so on, and that was, so we saw, I think, very substantive input as a result of the whole process. And again, Marillia, you mentioned, this could be carried on to the IGF, if we did allow inter-sessional working in a sort of informal multistakeholder way, the IGF might be able to produce documents that people could then respond to with the same sort of enthusiasm, because IGF contributions, when it comes around in February, when they do their usual sort of process, you might get 12, 15, 20 comments. And that’s in a two or three month period in a very established process.

So NetMundial really did show that people wanted to comment at times. I suppose the last point is about governments, the microphones, they were the ones still lining up at 9 PM and not wanting the microphone shut down. So again, they do have a lot to say, it’s just a matter of bringing them out of the shell which is downstairs, you know, level three in the car park, or wherever it is down there in this building.

---

So if you bring them in and give them something to comment, of course they want to have something to say. Thanks.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thanks Adam. Next in queue is [?].

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, [?] for the record. Just one addition to the NetMundial question, which is relevant to the evolution of the multistakeholder model, is that what was qualified as a roadmap, was interpreted by a lot of people beforehand as establishing milestones. When I hear roadmap, I usually think about there will be a meeting there and a meeting there and so on.

What it ended up being was a roadmap on teams, and so in that regard, it highlighted a certain number of issues that were not solved at NetMundial, but that were put on the agenda. And the notion of agenda setting is something that I've always try to argue is the first, most important stage in any multistakeholder process. And in that regard, there was a clear list of issues that were, of course, the IANA evolution that everybody knew was on the agenda, the surveillance NSA issue, but it added two elements regarding Net Neutrality and the role of intermediaries that is clearly on the agenda now, or back on the agenda.

And I was at the meeting at the OACD just a day before the start of this ICANN meeting, and it was considered and mentioned as one of the outcomes of NetMundial, that it put this topic on the agenda. And the final one, which is of direct interest for me given the address that I

---

address, was the fact that one of the first time when in a relatively official document mention of jurisdiction of issues, was actually mentioned.

And it is the beginning of a recognition. That is a role that the IGF can really do without making statements about how an issue should be solved, but by setting the agenda. It's my frustration that the [MAG?] is not doing this in a sufficiently efficient manner, and NetMundial showed that identifying what the topics are is a very important one.

The second just now, on the second element I wanted to mention is, briefly, the key debate in the coming years is the reopening of the Article 35 of the WSIS Tunis agenda. And NetMundial was the first breakout of the wall, saying the notion that specific defined roles for the different stakeholders that are set forever in their silos, is not the way to go. So I just wanted to reiterate this, because this is an element that is now a topic on the agenda.

Finally, a question to Marillia, inside the CGI, you have those two groups, and you said that you've made statements on a certain number of issues, some of which may be sensitive to the government. Without betraying the confidential work inside, what is the proportion of declaration of that, almost are initiated by the government side saying, "It would be great if we had more support for a position."

Or on the country initiated by the Civil Society and business side saying, "You really need to come on this topic." So what is the proportionate influence of the two groups? And does the group have, through this, an influence on the position of the government and what it puts on the agenda?

---

MARILLIA MACIEL: Well, that's very interesting. It's one of the debates that we have in terms of transparency. There is a group of, specifically Civil Society people that wanted to push for CGBIR council meetings to be open and streamed. And this is something that they are discussing but they have not reached that conclusion yet because of sensitivity of the topics and so on.

So the information that we have is from the reports of the committees, but they are reported as shut in house, so it's difficult to know where the proposals actually come from. But my idea is that Civil Society has been so far the most active stakeholders in terms of these political debates. But the government has participated as well, and some topics, which were of key importance to them, such as the dot Amazon, there was strong push there, so yeah.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you. Alejandro Pisanty, please.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Alejandro Pisanty. I would like to, I think that [?] question is missing one key element, which is asking for the influence or initiative of the technical community. That CGBIR started very much as [?] ...of its operations and decision making is on the technical side, at least from the start.

---

MARILLIA MACIEL: No, absolutely. I think I may have stressed it enough, but when our NIP and [?] came together, and this was really the embryo, the people that after constructed CGBIR to what it is today, the technical community was a key actor involved, yes.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Marillia. Anyone else wanted to comment? Yes, Alejandro.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Alejandro Pisanty. I will now turn to, rather comment on the presentations and the issue of NetMundial, which is the scalability or the translate ability, whether, what and how much you can translate, you can take from NetMundial to other processes, which I think is a very important issue. Because I think that as people try to do it, [?] as already mentioned, the IGF for example, you will find that there are some things that are actually very successful and you should at least do this experiment with full conviction that it should work.

And in others you should be more careful [?]. NetMundial was a singular meeting, singular process. It was different from what we usually see in the multistakeholder processes either in ICANN with all its decision making, liability, and responsibility, or from the IGF with its more open discussion format, which deliberately does not arrive at decisions.

And so NetMundial is somewhere in the middle of that spectrum one could say. NetMundial was a very highly driven process. There were, that was strong leadership involved in making it happen. In many ways,

---

although the discussion in NetMundial may have been horizontal from the very start, driving of the processes are very top down, driving this.

A mass of resources put together by very few organizations, different directions set. These things are more top down then bottom up, and certainly not exclusively horizontal. By this, I don't mean that the discussion itself was not on a flat and equal footing basis. But the effectiveness of the process comes from putting a lot of money, a deadline, and a time of government officials, ICANN officials, and other people to work.

Second, it's focused on very specific issues. It actually has a mandate for two things, which are principles involvement. And it's not an open ended process. On the other hand, it's stated from the start, from the beginning, that statements that come out from NetMundial are not foreseen to be binding.

Which leaves a lot of room for people to accept, to make concessions and compromises, and the result that they would expect in a binding process. They say, "Okay, I got 80% of what I wanted,, the 20%, I'm not bound, you know, not to get it elsewhere." So that's another condition that makes it acceptable. Then the third point I would like to emphasize is that being one of, instead of a more stable process like the IGF has become, it has some unpredictability which maybe good, again I don't criticize it for being unpredictable, but let's look at in a bit more detail.

It's not a very robust process in the final sense. Robust in the sense that result is relatively little sensitive to changes in being... If you have had, as I said in joking, in other conversations, if you have had two more Hollywood lawyers, you will have top of intellectual property views.



---

If you have had a few more human rights activist organizations, you may have had a much more human rights oriented. As a result, you may have, for example, a stronger statement on surveillance. It's very sensitive to this small variations in the coordinates of the [?].

So when one tries to extract conclusions from the process from NetMundial, to copy it to other, to set a precedent, one should take into account these things in order not to take only the good parts, without safeguards for the risky parts. A good risk analysis should come now. And the other thing that we don't know, we're only beginning to see because it has not been long enough time after NetMundial, is how the actors will actually continue or not their commitments made during NetMundial.

We know that the few governments repealed NetMundial's conclusions because they went to the microphone. But we don't know even if the governments of India, Cuba, and Russia, whether they will reject the whole thing, or they will actually according to 99% and have their observations expressed in case they need them.

On the other hand, governments and Civil Society, academia, every other entity that came to NetMundial and went out happy with their agreement, we don't know how stable that commitment is, until we watch it for a couple of years. So I think these are things that do not detract from the effort, and the quality, and the enthusiasm that we're putting to NetMundial, but that we have to, as I said, be careful in not just thinking it's paradise.

We found paradise, we haven't the promised land, and now let's do everything like we did there. And certainly, the things that worked well,

---

for example, organizing the queues, stuff that are more procedural as well, those are excellent to be kept in that.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Alejandro. You want to comment on that Marillia?

MARILLA MACIEL: Just about the drafting, because I think it was a very interesting moment. Specifically, at the end of the day, when people went to the microphone and made all the comments, the executive multistakeholder committee would sit and try to include the comments into the text. And this was a politically an interesting moment.

The drafting rooms were opened to observers, so everybody could be there and see the changes being made on the screen. And one lesson that I would take as Civil Society representative, is that governments are much more used to this environment. So they would be together, reinforcing positions of one another, and bring in text, and bringing contributions. And sometimes we did not get the same support from Civil Society because it's usually not how we operate.

So if we're going to repeat the process, we need to learn from our political good points and our political mistakes, whereas Civil Society or non-governmental actors could have acted better, to give support to our representatives there. How do we feel about the opening drafting rooms? Was something that we like it or not? Reflect on those things.

---

I think Alejandro is right. We need to do more, you know, in depth reflection about the process in order to [?] it, to find what was good, what worked well, and what didn't.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Marillia. Alejandro?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Comment on Marillia's comment. And I'm very glad that we see several of these things eye to eye, because I don't want to detract, I want to say this very explicitly. I commend very much the effort that Marillia, Adam Peake, several others in this room, made both in the substance and the process and just sheer sweat, blood, and tears to get that result.

But I would like to comment also on the drafting process. There was a draft that was more than 90% finalized a month before NetMundial, that I know of. There was a leak that came out, which was 90% of the final result. I would see in different venues, I saw some of the Brazilian leaders discussing with other people what was already very much the final draft a month ago, a month before NetMundial.

So the drafting process was done according to traditional diplomatic rules, and I would [?] governmental, it's everybody who wants to get something done knows that you have to work for six months for it, and it's, that is good. So, there is... I don't want to say the hidden part of that drafting process, because it wasn't hidden, it was happening, people knew it was happening.

---

But it was not an open draft online that everybody could contribute. There was no wiki, no open, open to the world notepad. This was a carefully managed process. This was one of the parts where I say, this was a carefully managed process. If you want that kind of a result in six months, you have to manage it carefully.

And that's the non-scalable part of the process. And again, there is nothing against the quality of the end result. It's actually a worthy favor of the way it was conducted, but it's different from what you expect from an IGF or an ICANN process. Or again, in ICANN processes people complain that they take very long, but what's happening is the same thing.

You have a document for discussion that has been bounced around all of the constituencies, and that can take a year and a half.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Alejandro. Okay. Comment from Marillia, and then back.

MARILLIA MACIEL:

Just as a point for clarification. When the comments were made online, the initial contributions, the executive committee had several present, physical meetings online, that should be the first draft. And the secretary in parallel did the same in order to facilitate our work. It was a document that should be taken into account.

The document was leaked and circulated, but it was something that was not un-satisfactory in terms of the committee. We did not like the [?], we did not feel that it reflected any actual contributions, and we did not

---

use it at all. Of course, after we came out with a first draft, which was the one which was put online for public consultation, several actors that were on the high level panel also wanted to produce, ICANN produced a text, Germany produced a text.

And we had a meeting with other members because it was in a different time zone and we spent all night awake, which was a nine hour meeting, in order to keep as faithful as possible to the contributions. We were fighting like hell to keep the text as it was. So just to tell you, it was not a very structured process, and I agree with you.

There are things that need to be improved and were done on the fly, on the mend. But it was really genuine. It was not precooked. And this, we can guarantee you by the times we were discussing there that...

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Marillia.

UNIDENTIFIED:

Yeah, just to chime in on this very interesting exchange which is, how a multistakeholder process can produce document. There is a misunderstanding, I believe, that the only way to produce something that is legitimate, is to basically add everything, all of the time, completely in the open.

I see a huge value in having groups that are sufficiently trusted, work, for a portion, in their own space, and [?] in closed meetings, on an intensive meeting. Not necessarily under the scrutiny of everybody else in the early drafting phases. The fundamental challenge is to make sure

---

that the group is not necessarily composed of just representatives of constituencies, because this is, in my view, and there are arguments about that.

But it is not necessarily to form expert groups that are becoming the drafting group. It is, in my view, more something about, what I usually call connectors, i.e. people that the rest of the community trust that within the group, there is at least one, or two, or three people that they trust enough not to think the same way they do, but to make sure when a contribution is being made, even if they do not agree with it, they will make sure that it is taken into account.

It is a completely different type of representation from the voting process that we have in parliamentary elections, where you are supposed to vote for people who represent you. I would like, actually, in many processes to have the capacity to vote for people that may not think the way I do, but that I know will respect my arguments and make sure that if I make them, it will count on them.

And the second element which is the corollary, is the fundamental role of secretariats. And secretariats is not just documenting, and there are cases where it is important to document dissensions, because it is a faithful picture, but also times where it is necessary to focus on the few things that make the discussion just move one step further.

One, the two keywords for me is, groups that are facilitation or coordination group that are form of connectors that you trust, will make sure that your contributions are taken into account. And the second thing is, the role of secretariat is to have whatever group identify formulations that are acceptable by all actors. So that each step is

---

understood as a common question, a common problem that all the stakeholders share, instead of a problem that they have with one another.

And I can tell you from experience in Internet jurisdiction project, it takes an incredible amount of time to try to find one single sentence summarizing a complex problem, that embodies a common understanding of a common problem, rather than saying, “We have a problem with one another and it’s about this.”

So the role of secretariat and the different composition of working groups, or contact groups, is something that we haven’t explored enough, I think in the work. And is part of the multistakeholder approach. And this includes how we are to compose these working groups, which is not necessarily by elections.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you. I have two people in queue, Alejandro and the gentlemen beside [?] who hasn’t spoken, so...

UNIDENTIFIED: He is James [Sink].

LEON SANCHEZ: So please, James.

JAMES [SINK]: It is actually in response to [?] comment. I do support the views of [?] subgroup, the main be working in private, away from [?] to craft

---

documents that need to be done rapidly. Within the ITF process, there are concept of design team where groups of people come together, working in private, to come up with solution to a complex problem, which then present a public and then to actually get things moving forward.

So in the scope of the multistakeholder process, I think we need to embrace and to use that system in place. But what happened in NetMundial was a little bit disturbing, is that although there is a group of people working, but no one actually knew, or rather, very few people actually knew that is a drafting team working on that document.

And if you have, if NetMundial, the organizer [?] explained the process earlier on the [?] prevent a lot of misunderstanding.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you. Adam, would you like to clarify this?

ADAM PEAKE:

Actually, James, so you mean... It's Adam Peake speaking for the record. So you mean the drafting team, when it was working in Sao Paulo?

JAMES [SINK]:

No, no. Before. The wiki leak was very disturbing. It's not surprising, just disturbing. I don't think we need to hide it, which have informed the committees, say hey, we have a team that's going to draft this comment, and we will discuss this further in Sao Paulo.



---

ADAM PEAKE: Yeah. I don't really understand why, sorry Adam speaking for the record. I don't really understand why it was a problem. I thought it was pretty clear that it was the role of the multistakeholder executive committee was to do that task. But it may have just, that it was lost in the rush of things, remembering that we actually held our first meeting on January the 27<sup>th</sup>, and we're talking about work that was completed end of March, including receiving 188 comments.

So I think it may just have been lost in the rush, as opposed to anything that wasn't available. It was just everything was such short notice and such, you know, yeah, anyway.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you. Do you want to comment?

UNIDENTIFIED: Just a very quick thing. I think, you're not saying things completely different. I think nobody could expect that magically more than 1,000 contributions would categorize into one document without the group doing it. I think what James is saying is that probably it was not explained enough that one of the committees was actually becoming a drafting committee doing this.

That's just another presentation. I think...

---

LEON SANCHEZ:

If I understand it, if it were more clear, than we wouldn't have these surprises to all of the sudden get a draft from nowhere, and then just being disturbing. So Alejandro, would you like to comment on this?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

Very quick comment on these last parts of the conversation. And I would like to put forward something else to move discussion forward. The brief comment is, I have been on both sides of discussions like the one you just have had. I have been on the drafting committee that had to be very discreet because there were some very intense discussions or consequences of getting the text known.

And being, then having stones thrown at the team I was in, and I have been on the side that thrown the stones. And I think that we should tell everybody that we should be a bit more mature, and understand that translate, you're not going to get 1,000 people to agree on a 20 page document if you don't have the document agreed by at least 100 of the people first, and you need 10 people to actually put it together, so it scales 10 to 100 to 1,000.

And then global agreement. And then only three countries got walking away. So we should be more mature and grown up about this. Now I'm going to go a step further and try to change, to move us a step up, I think. What made people very happy about NetMundial, I think, is that there was a result.

That's one of the things that made people very happy. There was a process, people took part in the process, but the main thing that made them happy about the process is the outcome. There was a document.

---

This produced a response. The Brazilian government may now go and say, “You know, I can show you how to manage a multistakeholder process.”

Right? Because it put 20 officials of the government, [?], I agreed with ICANN, so I can get the Internet community under some, not under control, but within a stream that itself is all over the place. You know? So we can show you, we can, it’s almost, as I said on another occasion, when I need your multistakeholder opinion, I will give it to you.

It’s not that bad, but think of the actual effectiveness. And the achievement of the result, it was very important. And I was going to, a part of my mind was perversely trying to leave this argument for the very end in the plenary, as a sniper shooting at the whole thing, and I won’t do that to be loyal to you, because I am proud of this session.

So, here is my next step. No one, over the last two days in the ATLAS, has been concerned about one fact I mention at the end. We’ve been concerned about process, about consensus, about participation, about openness, about inclusiveness, about whether the multistakeholder groups are actually in dialogue, whether they are in silos.

Yeah, fine, we can continue for a couple of years. ICANN may stop working today, and nobody in the At Large will notice for about a year. You know, eventually you will find that there is something funny, or hard, in trying to get access to your newspaper online.

But what’s going on? And somebody will tell you, you know, you haven’t been able to remove something in the domain name because the root has disappeared. And how does it still work? Well, because

---

there are many copies of the root around and some of them have survived and are still managed, and no one has registered a TLD, and the address pool is being managed by the RIRs without central coordination.

Nobody will actually notice, because we are not caring enough about one variable, which I think is not accountability and transparency, consensus, participation, and openness, which is a key that we must demand and contribute to, which is effectiveness. If ICANN doesn't work, if the IANA function doesn't work, if domain names don't resolve, people cannot put in and out, move, not total regulations of ccTLDs, because you have very few of those, keep the data up to date in the ccTLD database and so forth, then everybody else, the intermediaries which rely, the website owners, and newspaper owners, the e-commerce site owners, those will be suffering.

And we will be indirectly suffering, but it will come to us too late. We have to be more concerned about the effectiveness of ICANN, of the IGF, of NetMundial, of all of the other organizations that actually have to do something. I'm very proud and happy that James came into this session. I find that not everybody knows James here, James is fellow I admire.

He has been one of my mentors, without his knowing, I just, you know, try to catch some droplets of his wisdom over the years. He is one of the first people who did the IDN technology, the internationalized domain name technology in the IETF. I have a distinct memory from the year 2001 in Stockholm, where Patrik Fältström and other of our [?],

---

have the first Wi-Fi access points connected into a bar in Stockholm, during an ISOC and ICANN meeting.

And we were having light dinner there, and James was using that Wi-Fi connection to do some coding in his computer in Singapore, because there were some new ideas about IDN that he was testing together with a few other people. So, very glad that people who have produced this kind of results in the IETF, who have pushed them through all of the policy process after the technology process, can come and tell us, you know...

And you can see that producing that kind of result, creating an effective organization, not only a transparent, affordable organization that pays for trips, an organization that can get your food and your hotels, your function.

So the process is to function, is actually to produce a result of which money, and lives, and honor, and fame rely. So let's also look at what we can do for effectiveness in ICANN.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Alejandro. And, okay. Alberto Soto.

ALBERTO SOTO: This is Alberto Soto speaking. I would like to say that I fully agree with Alejandro. And a practical example was an interview after a conversation that we had about Internet governance. I don't know, she was against or in favor, but the question that she made was very interesting.

---

She said, “If I don’t have problems in Internet, why should I learn about governance?” And I told her, “Well, you will realize only once you had a problem, or when ICANN stops working.” That is the only way in which you can learn about that. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you very much Alberto. And speaking about effectiveness, Evan has a proposal here.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Yes, but you said you thought of it first. I want to take up Alejandro’s call of effectiveness, and in fact, what we are going to be doing ourselves. In what we’re going to produce. In other words, we’ve been doing a lot of talking. We’re now at the point in time where we have to take everything that’s been going around the table, all of the good things everybody has been saying, and turn this into a document, turn this into a statement, into assertion that is something forward looking.

That will be effective. That does not just state the obvious. That does not just say nice, vague things, but in fact produces something innovative, something that we can give to ICANN, something perhaps that we can learn from in that department. And so, we’re going to turn a corner now, I think, at this part of the session, and start thinking about how we are going to craft this.

It’s my role to try and sort of hold the pen on it, but my goal is to be responsive to what the group does. So I want to take direction from the group, rather than lead it. I want to sort of refer to what you were saying James, in terms of the, having the drafting committee and not

---

knowing what it was doing. On the other hand, I found it very useful to have a straw man come out through the leaks, even though it was, even though I didn't like it much more than anybody else.

At least having a straw man that we could start with, gave us something to work with, because sometimes the hardest thing is going around the room and say, "Well, somebody write something." And even if you don't like the first draft, you don't like the first proposal that gives everybody something to complain on, and then the answer is, "Okay, write something better." People write something better and we end up with something, with an useful document, which may describe in fact, what happened in NetMundial.

So, taking that, I'm going to give the floor back to Leon to keep the meeting rolling, but right now I think we're at the stage of our group where we have to start seriously considering about putting together a document. Personally, I would just give you an idea of my goal is to have a statement that is less than one page.

We want people to read it. We want people to act on it. We've said a lot of things, but I think we can't just enumerate everything we've been talking about on a document that is going to be presented as part of a manifesto, together with numerous other works from the other thematic groups. If this is going to be something useful, this is going to be something that will be read.

We can't be too verbose. And I'm hoping that there is a way that we can gel the things that we've been talking about into some reasonable plan of action. Some people have been putting their hands up. I'll give the floor back to Evan to moderate going forward.

---

But now I'm asking everybody to just shift their minds into a different way of thinking about this. Everyone has been giving their opinions, everybody has been saying this is what things are like in my region, in my country, in my ALS, etc. We now want to turn that into, okay, what is our advice to ALAC? What is our advice to the summit?

What is our advice back to ICANN as a whole? Leon?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Evan. I saw [?] and then Carlos Aguirre. And let's move forward to crafting the document. So [?], you want to comment on the crafting of the document?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

For the record, this is [?] from the Center for Internet Society and NCUC within ICANN. On the document, I see a number of excellent questions presented on the whiteboard over there and the projector over there. Yet, much of our discussions actually haven't addressed most of those questions.

There is some kind of... On the first question, for instance, about equal footing within the multistakeholder model, there has been some implicit, you know, discussion around that, saying that there can be, sorry.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Yeah, sorry to interrupt [?]. Those were the questions from the last session. That's why nobody addressed those right now. But they actually have been addressed last session before you came in.



---

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

Okay. Well, perhaps I threw a bit of a spanner into the works then about, given that this is At Large, and the question about legitimacy of, about equal legitimacy of all participants within a multistakeholder model, there is right now, no way of actually adjudicating that.

There is, for instance, most of the, a great many of the Civil Society participants in these discussions actually don't come from grassroots organizations, don't come from trade unions, don't come from, you know, religious groups or political parties, etc. Grassroots based, large grassroots based, but come from academic organizations, okay?

Come from think tanks, etc. Now how do they claim the same amount of legitimacy as folks, for instance, who are building out technologies, again, and agreeing on standards as governments, a great many of which, are elected into power. And why should I, for instance, have the same seat at a table as someone who I've elected, whereas no one has actually elected me?

So I think this implicit understanding of equal footing, is actually something that I'm seeing more and more of now, earlier... The challenge against, you know, disparate roles and responsibilities that I completely understand and I'm onboard with it, but equal footing is something that doesn't quite seem, to me at least, to have a sound political or philosophical basis, which has been explained to me.

There might be one, but I've never actually encountered people on mailing lists addressing this question head on. And I might have, unfortunately, missed it at the last session.

---

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks [?]. Carlos Aguirre please.

CARLOS AGUIRRE:

This is Carlos Aguirre. Thank you Leon. My idea was to contribute to the drafting of a document, as Evan said. I think it was a good idea to have a draft document or a straw man. This has to do with transparency. And we should all read this draft before finishing this document so that we can agree on the document, so that can become our final statement.

I think that document, this is just a suggestion, should have general conditions related to what we have discussed here. And based on those general concepts, we should conclude, at the end, on the fact that these are issues or questions that should be further developed after this ATLAS 2 meeting. Thank you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Sorry. That goes back to what was said earlier about the way, what NetMundial's biggest contribution was agenda setting, was proposed to resolving things, helping to actually set agendas. And so perhaps that's one of the things here that, you know, we've had all of two days to do this. These are the things that people have been talking about for a long time now.

So over two days, if we can make a contribution along the lines of what we suggested in terms of setting agendas, in terms of perhaps drawing attention to some of the overarching themes, that we can call attention to, that we can raise questions. I think it's absolutely legitimate to have

---

a document that raises questions as opposed to answer everything after two days of work.

So, I think it's legitimate to have something along those lines.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thanks Evan. Adam, do you want to comment?

ADAM PEAKE:

Yeah, quickly, Adam speaking. Quickly to [?] point, I think you're right. Equal footing is a very confusing, as a blanket statement, I don't think it works. I think where I see equal footing is having great validity, is at various points in the process. So that I think that we should have an equal footing in probably agenda setting, in the initial discussions, and so on and so forth.

Whether it's in a final process where we have heads of states, and also an [Adam?] at the table with, that may not be appropriate. Perhaps the final decision may be taken at different, with a different role. I don't know how, but you see where I'm getting at. And one example of that, perhaps not a very good example, is that in NetMundial, we had the executive multistakeholder committee, which was very multistakeholder and we were very much equals.

And then there was this strange process that jumped in at the end, which was the high level committee, which was predominately governments, which had a sort of role to provide, a political articulation, which we never really understood. But what it did do was provide a veto on some things that it didn't like. And so, perhaps that's what

---

comes in, perhaps at some stage our elected representatives do have a power that the rest of us don't possess.

Not quite saying it in the right way, but you see what I'm getting at. I think we have an equal right at certain stages, and we must have an equal footing at certain stages, but not necessarily throughout.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Adam. I see [?] and then Alejandro Pisanty.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [?], very quickly. Following the methodology that I mentioned before, the topic is the future of multistakeholder and so on. I don't think we have formulated one simple common question. That would be a question that is common to all stakeholders, not only At Large, but all stakeholders regarding the future of multistakeholderism.

And it covers whatever the formulation, it covers and it should cover, issues that we have touched upon that are related to legitimacy. That are related to process. That are related when transparency, when not transparency. To stages of process. To participation, the different roles of the stakeholders.

I wonder whether it wouldn't be interesting to do an exercise here, just going around the table and asking each of us, and asking ourselves, if we had to put one title on top of the one page that Evan is suggesting, regarding the future of multistakeholderism, what would be the question that we would put as a title? That would be a question that

---

every actor would see as the right question to ask regarding the multistakeholderism and its future.

I do not have the answer yet, but I wonder whether just... What is the angle? What is the angle which will not be the position of At Large, per se, on the issue of multistakeholderism, but a formulation of the question that would resonate with everyone, and then the description will bear more the discussions, if you see what I mean.

Because we today are talking about the multistakeholder model, and everybody is addressing the issue from its own perspective, and whether my group is sufficiently represented or not. We don't have yet, and the future of multistakeholderism was already an interesting way to do it. But having a formulation which starts with how to, is it possible to, or that sort of thing, is sometimes a way to get people around a common issue.

And ideally, it could become a thread afterwards in the discussions in ICANN, and the contribution of ICANN in the larger space, towards that. I don't know if it's...

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you. I do think it's useful. Now we go with Alejandro Pisanty and then with [?].

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

It's very good to have the questions by [?], because these are questions that we will have to ask ourselves all of the time. Leads us to sharpen to having the results of the previous session, though they were pretty

---

solid. I won't repeat what has already been said about equal footing, I will extend it forward. Things that maybe we have also said but now while [?] and James were here.

This equal footing means you have a seat at the table, but it's not the same mechanism every time you go to a multistakeholder mechanism. By the way, [?], we, after the first intervention yesterday, at the beginning of this workshop, we dropped the word multistakeholderism. We dropped the -ism, because we basically, for many people, when you read it, it suggests a faith.

So we're talking about multistakeholder mechanisms, participation, decision making, and so forth, but not -ism anymore, that I know of. So and that leads to a more refined reply to [?] question. You have the general view about multistakeholder processes, the most effective processes, and the most respected rights and expectations, are processes in which all stakeholders are able to participate.

But they have to be designed with effectiveness as well as participation, openness, and so forth. And therefore, maybe the simplest way to express it is form follows function. So you have different mechanisms for different problems, a history and present in my foresight, immediate future at least of Internet governance, is issue centered. It's not one Internet, multistakeholder Internet governance mechanism or organization that deals with every issue.

You have one way to deal with spam, one way to deal with Net Neutrality, you have one way to deal with fraud, phishing, and so forth. And what's in common among them is technical rationality, participation of all stakeholders, and an institutional design that serves

---

the result better. So you dealing with, you want to have governments represented by law enforcement, as well for by human rights people.

And you want to make sure that law enforcement is actually enabled, empowered by the mechanism, but it won't go against human rights, technical rationality and so forth.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you Alejandro. So one last participation from [?] before into this exercise that...

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

[?] from India. Once again on what Adam said, which amounts to different stages in the multistakeholder process, different spaces on the multistakeholder process. Up to a point of time, it's on an equal footing and after that, a slightly less equal process. And then finally, it is a more of an intergovernmental process. The danger in that is, then something is discussed and agreed upon at a purely multistakeholder level, and then process goes up to a lesser multistakeholder process.

At that level, whatever was discussed in the previous stages could be completely thrown out or completely reversed and completely rewritten. And so that is one thing that we have to think through. I'm not saying that could happen, that will happen. Another thing that I'm not thought through, that occurs to me, is that through the phases, it could be entirely multistakeholder process, with some understanding that the governments could have veto like powers to discard a portion of that, or to modify a little bit of that.

---

And like a veto, truly use that veto like powers to modify what is absolutely essential, from what was agreed upon by the multistakeholder process. And the third thing that comes to me is that, totally different approach thereby in some areas, it could be a different type of multistakeholder process, with a more important, with more importance to government and some processes it's equal, and some processes, in some decisions, it is more of a business given importance to.

As in the example of security situation, they have more of security experts constituting the committee or forum, and to... There are various possibilities, everything has to be thought through. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you. So now I would like to go through the table, as [?] suggested asking you which would be, may not the right question, but what would you like to... Where would you like to frame the punchline, like title for document? Evan has already drafted a first line here, but either way, we want to know your thoughts on this. Alejandro, can we start with you please?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY:

I don't have a punchline right now. It's just the title as charged.

LEON SANCHEZ:

Thank you. Eduardo?



---

EDUARDO DIAZ:

This is Eduardo. I think that maybe we would be more effective with our time rather than coming up with this question that I think is a good idea in terms of engaging. We have here a lot of conversation today, and we may have a different understanding of what we're hearing.

And maybe a better way to go is to have one kind of, what would you say about as a result of this as a statement and then take from that...?

LEON SANCHEZ:

Yes, thank you Eduardo. So, well, we were just commenting, Evan and I, is that obviously we should have this framework for the document and also some overarching themes that we should develop within the document, obviously a document no larger than one page.

And I see James, you want to, you raised your hand?

JAMES:

I do not have a punchline, but I do have a suggestion. Since you are talking about the future of multistakeholderism, or multistakeholder, there are a lot of different example of multistakeholder experiment that has been done, ICANN being one of the, IGF is another, NetMundial is another excellent example.

There are a lot of things that some of the things that ICANN has done well. There are some things that ICANN could have done better, and likewise could be said for IGF and [?]. It would be very interesting, at least to me, to see a document actually, document of this experiment and experiences, what works and what doesn't. And perhaps from there, we're able to filter down to certain things that could potentially

---

go [?] could have been done better in the future of multistakeholderism.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you James. Anyone else? Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Well, again, just going through... Sorry. These things keep turning off. Oh, the moment somebody else pushes it, the switch is off.

Okay. I would just talk loud if it wasn't for the need for interpretation. So forgive me. Again, this is Evan speaking. So what I'm trying to do here is to follow up on what [?] was saying, so perhaps we can work separately on a title, one that asks an overarching question. And then try and deal with it, with the possibility of overarching theme, that perhaps we can deal with in the document.

I've been able to come up with four that I've simplified out, that seem to address most of the different things, and of course, we need a drafting team to take these themes, flesh them out into explanations and action going forward. The four that I've been able to abstract from this, some of which have come out just in the last couple of hours, but really reflect what we've been talking about for days.

Accountability, access, legitimacy, and effectiveness. I think whatever we do has to address these four points, and we can do this, and I believe that without specifically talking about maybe, you know, this is what ICANN is doing right or wrong, this is what NetMundial did right or wrong, we can learn from all of these.

---

And like I say, I'm right now trying to act in a way where I can coalesce what everybody is saying rather than lead it, but it seems from what I've been reading so far, that those themes, I think, if we can adequately elaborate on these, that we will have covered, I think, the heart of what we've been talking about.

The four?

LEON SANCHEZ:

I don't know if it's possible to put it on the screen. Yeah, we can put it in the chat.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Sorry. Well, there are just four words. So we can type them or maybe you can write them. The four words are: legitimacy, effectiveness, access, and accountability. And by access I mean access to decision making, not access to the Internet. So, if we can focus on those four things and contextualize what we've been talking about the last two days, in terms of those four themes, and break it down that way, I think each of these things has to be addressed, in whatever it is that we come up with.

The term effectiveness has been brought out just recently, but really a lot of what we've been talking about the last two days, has to go to the fact that whatever we do is not just theoretical, it has to be something that can be concrete, that we can give to the, that we can give to the ATLAS session to deal with.

---

In terms of legitimacy, we have to ask questions and set guidelines in a way that will create something that will be taken seriously, that will, when governments look at this, like in the case of CGIBR, you know, there is immediate legitimacy, they have a seat at the table. Why? Because they have demonstrated that what they do serves an interest, and provides a perspective that wouldn't exist necessarily without them.

In terms of access to decision making, that has been key to what we've been talking about, including yesterday. That is, how do you ensure, I didn't say equitable, I'm just saying, how do you put together something that ensures that everybody that has a stake in what the Internet does for them, whether they're providing information, whether they are learning it, taking information, whether they are transmitting information, how does everybody involved with this make sure that they can achieve the maximum that they want out of this?

Whether it's innovation, whether it's information, whether it's freedom of speech, whether it's business interests. How does everybody have the maximum access? And in terms of accountability. So whatever we do, who is it responsible to ultimately? Who gets a chance to oversee this? Who gets a chance to change it if it doesn't work?

So, are there any questions, or complaints, or additions? Are these four themes reasonable in terms of trying to sum everything up? Am I missing something fundamental that you've heard over the last two days? That can't be covered in one of these four themes? Speak now, because we're going to... If this is agreed, then we're going to be going forward based on this.

---

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you Evan. I see Carlos Aguirre and then [?]. I'm sorry. Carlos Aguirre was first in queue, then [?], then you. So we go with Carlos.

CARLOS AGUIRRE: This is Carlos Aguirre. Thank you Leon. Based on what [?] suggested, having a question, well I asked a question, I drafted a question. It's a long question in fact. But I would like to read it to you. Perhaps we can ask something like this, how can we ensure the equal participation of stakeholders involved in Internet governance, in the different instances of the implementation of policies, maintaining the bottom up process and transparency, and identify the weaknesses of the model?

LEON SANCHEZ: ...Carlos and now we go with [?].

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [?] with the four themes. An example of the type of question that I really sense was permeating the discussion that actually could resonate with all other actors, is basically how to handle the tension between inclusion and efficiency in multistakeholder processes.

I like very much the notion of being result oriented, which is something that is really missing in the whole debate, and NetMundial has really triggered a mental shift on, it can produce things. ICANN is producing decisions, it's producing policies and so on. The question of inclusion is the counterbalancing, because sometimes efficiency requires to be smaller groups, smaller decision making.

---

It's, most of the rationale for the top down, and if you want, legitimate, accountable process, it's a value need inclusive mechanism. So it maybe not inclusion and effectiveness, but presenting a debate in terms of attention, is actually a potential cover for the four elements that you mentioned, which basically are sub-components of this [?].

It could even be almost represented conceptually as a sort of quad angle, with the tensions between the different angles. I think, generally speaking, whatever is put in the document, the goal, I think, is to have the maximum number of actors in the rest of the community, say that's the right way to ask your question.

And then the arguments flow and they are even more regularly accepted. So I don't know if my formulation is the right one, but that kind of thing, as an example, and Carlos was doing rather the same kind of thing. With the equal participation is an angle that can move forward as well.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry, [?] just as a clarification. The tension between effectiveness and inclusion. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Multistakeholder process is to pick on Alejandro's not multistakeholderism, but multistakeholder processes.

---

LEON SANCHEZ: So now we pass the microphone to [?] and then to [Martin]?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: [?]. The report should also say what ICANN needs to do to further the multistakeholder model, to take it to its future. For example, it could be a simple thing like defining multistakeholder model in a manner that's understood by all actors, both policy makers that [?] the public consciousness. And that [?]... ICANN can do it alone or the Internet community, or with the Internet governance community.

I'm just saying the initiate could be taken by ICANN to define it. And [?]. The thing is that ICANN could again take the initiated, or to build whatever it takes, to build whatever it takes to further the multistakeholder process, be it an institution or a research institution, or whatever. One example, one possible example is we had a working group called ICANN Academy working group, and there was a suggestion to make the ICANN Academy as an Internet Academy so that it's global.

So something like that could be thought of, examined, [?] and it's analyzed, and if it's agreeable, you could do that. So the report should say, these action points, or whatever action points that the groups face. Thank you.

---

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you. We've run out of time, so I would like ask you to be very, very brief [Martin] and [?]. And we need to wrap up, so please [Martin], go ahead.

[MARTIN]: Okay. Thank you. The key in the whole thing is trust, and I don't think that should be almost the words here, but I think transparency should probably be there explicitly, because that helps with the trust. We talked about the deeper rooms where things happen, the closed door where things happen.

As long as we understand what is happening, it can work. Maybe it's part of effectiveness, but I think it's worthwhile putting on there.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you. [?], very brief please.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Very briefly, I push back very strongly against any kind of, any attempt at defining multistakeholder processes or providing one definition of what multistakeholder means. That has been tried numerous times, including within ICANN at the [?] without any one definition being arrived at.

Precisely because there is no one definition. People, right now, when I ask them whether ITF is multistakeholder, they can't give me an answer because it's very different than multistakeholder, if it is, from ICANN, etc. And I would also push back strongly against ICANN being provided more [?] in terms of an Internet Academy, etc. etc. as suggested.



---

Just because the ICANN processes are very often seen as being very flawed. At Large's place within ICANN has been ignored, you know, a great many times, and you know, people have produced volumes of critique against that. So I, you know, strongly urge against that.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH:

Well, first of all, At Large's role within ICANN is a different thematic group that is right now doing its own thing in another room, that's something totally different. So I prefer absolutely not to touch this, someone else is. I agree with you totally in a sense, we've got to come up with a concise document, and getting to the level of detail that some have been talking about, maybe a bit much for us to bite off in a one page sort of overarching thing.

So, whoever is involved in helping writing this, it's going to have to stay reasonably high level. We've got two days and one page, we're not going to change the world totally off that, but if we can help set agendas, if we can help ask questions and help frame things properly, I think we will have done a really good job here.

LEON SANCHEZ:

So next steps would be to raise your hand if you want to volunteer with the drafting team. So [?]. Okay. Of course, with that vision of being on a very high level. So we have Alejandro Pisanty, Carlos Aguirre, [?], anyone else? Your name?

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

[?] form Access Now.

---

LEON SANCHEZ: [?] no I don't see [?]... Should we volunteer her? [Laughter]

Okay. Well, we'll volunteer her. I'll ask if she wants to volunteer.

ALBERTO SOTO: Alberto Soto speaking. I wrote some words that would be the trigger for this work, but Evan said it first. No one said that this model is useless, and that we have to disregard the model. And nobody said that this model is perfect, that is nothing is to be touched.

So, the topic would be the future of the model is optimization of the model. And based on that, we can work on the different topics that we should need to modify, if we take into account what you said. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: We are over time, so I thank you very much for your work on these two days, and look forward to having a great document with the volunteer drafters. I want to thank, of course, our interpreters. I want to [APPLAUSE]... I want to thank our technical team and of course staff for supporting us through these two days. [APPLAUSE]

This meeting is now adjourned.