LONDON – ATLAS II Thematic Group 1: The Future of Multistakeholderism - Session 2
Sunday, June 22, 2014 – 08:00 to 10:30
ICANN – London, England

LEON SANCHEZ:	Good morning, everyone. Should I say start the recording, Evan? Yes? Could you please start the recording?
EVAN LEIBOVITCH:	The recording is started.
LEON SANCHEZ:	Okay. Well, good morning, everyone. Good evening, good afternoon for those who are on the Adobe Connect room.
	This is the Thematic Group 1, Session 2. We are going to speak about The Future of Multistakeholderism, as we did yesterday. This session's specific topic is how to foster a multistakeholder model at a local level.
	In a minute, Alejandro Pisanty will be joining us to speak about some efforts we've been doing in Mexico, and I say with because I've been also working with him on that.
	Also, Adam will speak to us about what they've been doing in Japan in order to foster this multistakeholder model into our wider audience.
	As soon as we get Marilia Maciel, we would also like to listen to her about what they've been doing with CGI in Brazil.
	A couple of notes from yesterday's session: we haven't received the reports from all the groups.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: One of the three only.

LEON SANCHEZ: Only one out of three sent out the notes to Evan, and I think that's Evan himself or Larry who took notes for Evan's group.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: No, I don't have from his. I have from [inaudible].

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay, well, then I would really appreciate if you could send the notes to Evan.

We'll take the same procedures as yesterday. We're going to listen to Alejandro as soon as he's ready. After that, we're going to have a question and answer with all the participants. Then we're going to break into groups. But this time, instead of breaking into groups like we did yesterday, I would like to break into groups by regions because I think it's a richer exercise if we analyze the multistakeholder fostering effort that we're doing by regions, either by just the tables how we arranged.

Alejandro, if you are ready, we're ready for you. Thank you.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Leon, thank you very much. How much time do I have? I guess you have adjusted the schedule a little bit.

LEON SANCHEZ: Yes. We're running a little late, so we were expecting you to speak to us for about 20 minutes. Maybe we can just adjust that to 10 minutes, so then we can continue discussing.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Certainly. Thank you.

Good morning, everybody. What I will speak about is in response to an invitation that was made to me by the organizers of this section of the meeting on some of the experiences that we have had with multistakeholder cooperation in Mexico and a bit further out and briefly some other thoughts on the matter as well.

Multistakeholder cooperation, the cooperation among different stakeholder sectors, is not necessarily something you have to plan for. It's not necessarily something you first design and then execute. Many of the instances that we know of cooperation among stakeholder sectors in Internet governance have started by just that – that cooperation – and it may have become established as a mechanism or even a more stable organization as things go on.

Multistakeholder cooperation in many developing countries – and that's our case in Mexico as well – for Internet governance started with cooperation for all the Internet work that was being done at the time.

This means the academic community from universities, the technical community starting in telephone and other companies, civil society groups and some government [electors] started coming together already as far back as the late '80s to establish an infrastructure of access to the Internet and to start working on some of the now

recognized Internet governance issues like establishing and managing the ccTLD, in our case .mx.

But this is a history that you know well from your own countries. There would be a few people who knew what this Internet thing was who would connect it together, who would come together with agreements on how to manage it like interconnection, maybe an exchange point, and the ccTLD management and domain name management.

In our case, this started very much in the academic center, spread to the telcos who were mostly providing the access services and maybe some domain name resolution, though the .mx registry started within a university and it still is very close to that one.

The hotter Internet governance issues came later. We have an evolution of Internet governance arrangements internally, mostly reacting to outside stuff like the formation of ICANN, which began to bring together more people. We had an Internet Society Chapter interacting with the NIC Mexico, which is a .mx manager.

Multistakeholder questions appeared in the public sphere in a massive way much more recently. In particular, in the year 2009, the federal government, the executive, started an initiative trying to impose a tax on all telecommunications. This was going to be a 4% tax on all telecommunications bills, and it was going to be in a category called "special tax on products and services," which is applied to things like tobacco, alcohol, and luxury items.

We started reacting to that, and we means people in the Internet Society in particular and finding some people in civil society in general

who were economics analysts, academics, and activists who were using the Internet intensively for social projects mostly oriented to access but also already on emerging Internet rights or human rights movements on using the Internet.

Leon here was also among the people. Leon, I, and another friend were the ones who started a campaign on Twitter, which was new in the country. There were about 40,000 Twitter users at the time. We started a campaign with a hashtag called #InternetNecesario, which translates as "Necessary Internet." It was intended to underline that Internet is not a luxury, and it shouldn't be taxed as a luxury good or service.

This campaign was in parallel to the lobbying that the telcos were doing, and we deliberately kept a long arm distance to the telcos in order not to be seen as a lobbying army, as a [pseudo] NGO that was being pushed around by the telcos. In fact, we didn't use ISOC's name at all in order to attract more people, and there were many spontaneous starts to this thing after we started it.

We started that campaign on a Monday morning, and by Tuesday evening of that same week – that means in 36 hours – the hashtag #InternetNecesario was top ten among trending topics globally. This attracted the people in the conventional news venues – television and the press – saying, "Hey, these Mexican tweeters, they are so few and they made a splash."

We managed to get into the national news and into the Senate. By Thursday that same week, there was a hearing in the Senate where about 60 people appeared from every kind of place – journalists, people with sports portals, people who were columnists or editorialists in

newspapers. People we didn't even know personally at all just appeared there.

This thing grew in such a way that three weeks later, we have actually managed to get the law enacted in a very different way than it had been proposed. Instead of this 4% tax on all telecommunications, the tax had come down to 3%. But most important, Internet access if billed separately was exempt from the tax.

Several major accomplishments here were that we quiet support of people from government who weren't able to go against their own treasury ministry but from telecommunications sector were actually supporting and providing arguments. We had civil society, technical community, and businesses coming all together without the formalities of any written arrangements or written agreements.

This has continued. We were able to stop the government of Mexico from signing, not the government from signing the ACTA agreement which is a very aggressive intellectual property agreement that makes life online very hard. But at least we were able to have the Senate make a declaration that they wouldn't ratify the treaty. In fact, the government, the executive, signed it. The Senate hasn't ratified it, so Mexico is not in ACTA at all.

Later, we have also always kept open communications channels with government and with the larger enterprise. At this point, we are intervening in ways that may not stop the transpacific cooperation, transpacific partnership treaty that is being proposed, but at least we are having an effect in modulating the intellectual property clauses which are, again, very aggressive.

We have started a group we call the initiative group, which is 12 people – 3 per sector – who would meet formally every few months, which includes people from the office of the president of the republic digital strategy office, the telecommunications ministry, a foreign office.

It includes someone from telco world. Two people from software online services like Google and Microsoft people locally who are also the leaders of the chambers of these industries and the trade associations. We have some civil society activists who are more human rights oriented. From the technical community side, we have NIC Mexico, ISOC, and one or two more independent people coming together.

This group has been able to organize something that we call the dialogues on Internet governance. We decided not to call it the local Internet governance forum because we think that the situation is not yet ripe for this. But we already had last year and are planning for this year to have this large meeting where things are discussed like Internet network neutrality, intellectual property rights, and so forth.

What we get there is I think that the most valuable outcomes we get is: first, a lot of public attention on these issues; second, a great opportunity to actually bring the sectors together instead of each of them acting out of their own office and lobbying capacity. They come together. They talk to each other. We are conveners for conversations that are not Leon or myself but telco to regulator, for example, on issues like network neutrality.

I think the most important result may be that we actually are able to explain Internet governance issues to lots of people who come in with preconceived outcomes like let's have a law that criminalizes things like

children abuse online without thinking that the actual crime that goes behind online child abuse images is a heinous crime, it's a terrible crime, but it's happening in real space.

You don't need the Internet for a parent or an uncle to rape a small child or a baby in front of a video camera and then sending or selling those images online. That's what we try to convey to law enforcement, that they should actually focus their attention on the actual, physical crime that is being committed and not start new legislative processes which end nowhere instead of trying to focus on modifying the laws that exist and adapt them to the specifics of the online issues.

For Internet governance this, of course, also means making mechanisms that separate human conduct or social and governmental conduct from what happens in the operation of the network and to create arrangements that are stable, that can last for long, and that are scalable.

That's why we are not trying to have an Internet governance forum, for example, because that would create the temptation for some actors or even some governmental actors to actually try to steal the show by coming up with some action items for which the country is not yet ready.

What we learned there also is to observe external influences like, for example, people who only read the ITU book or who only read even, let's say, the [non-ID] telecommunications book and then to be able to focus inviting these people, for example, to take some courses or to go hold seminars in their offices for their staff and eventually also for their bosses.

This, in turn, helps people think more clearly about the Internet, focus less sometimes on its governance, and go back to the actual operation or to expanding access or to creating more content or to fostering a more competitive economy for services, startups, and so forth.

I believe this is not a model, again, that can be taken everywhere. But if some participants are feeling stuck up a narrow alley where you are thinking, "I need to have an Internet governance forum, but it's dangerous in my country because the government's not ready and they're going to come up with some really wrong measures on occasion of the forum," informal conversations, keeping back channels, and always thinking, "How will this scale up? How will we get more people involved, and what will have to change when we make more people involved?" these are useful guidelines.

I will stop there.

LEON SANCHEZ: Adam has written a paper on that that was on the Document Store we sent you out on previous e-mails. I hope you received the e-mail and that you read through this document, which is quite interesting.

I'd also like to give the floor to Evan who raised his hand.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks very much, Leon, and to everyone, Alejandro.

My question for Alejandro goes back to something you were saying about how there was this tax and that the bringing forward of this tax seemed to bring together, so you had the corporate interests and you

had civil society that all seemed to be on the same side that were saying, "We need an Internet. It's not a luxury, and it's something."

What is your take on the necessity to have a crisis to bring together the various stakeholders to be working together? Is this something where you almost need to have something like this that happens to bring everyone together as opposed to seeing this kind of thing just organically come together?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: I'm not a political or a social scientist to speak with any deeper authority on that, but I think it's a general observation that a crisis does bring a lot of people out who are thinking about stuff and suddenly by the crisis they are galvanized and ready to go out even on the streets and demonstrations blocking telco access and stuff like that, which we don't do but other people do and they think it's successful so I won't argue against that.

The crisis in our case also depends very much, I mean, what happens with it depends very much on what you do. There is no general recipe.

What I do think is a good thing to do because you need it is to try to use that crisis if it comes up or otherwise your other collaboration efforts to educate people. You're always having to educate people about the Internet. It's amazing. I think many of us in this room have the same experience. I'm not saying something exceptional.

How you come up to someone who is making large-scale decisions like deciding the whole portal for a ministry or a company or deciding policy – regulatory competition policy or creating a national access to a

network program with a huge budget – and they don't understand the most basic thing. I don't think that they have to be able to design routing tables or configure Cisco or Juniper, but it's just not understand how IP works, how horizontal and how bilateral and reciprocal Internet communication is, for example.

To go a bit further more on that, another thing that we were able to intervene in as a community – I'm not saying this personally, but I know that the community reaction was very useful – is a law enacted in one of the states of Mexico against spreading rumors that make society uneasy, so Twitter and Facebook. It's a very specific law, and it's like local and state governments wait a little bit.

This is just like the press or like people talking on the streets. What are you going to legislate? Who are you going to put into jail? Just because it's the Internet doesn't mean that it's something new. The human conduct there is the same. These are educational opportunities for people to think about it and make, let's say, less dumb laws like that.

On the other hand, Evan, a crisis is a great opportunity, but it will only work if you are ready. It will only work if you have lots of people who know this stuff who can take it a step forward beyond the reactive, just beyond reacting to the crisis or to the new evil. It will create new enemies for the Internet community, which we don't need if we go too far. But then again, this is a very political judgment and I wouldn't make any more general scientific-like statement on that.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay, so any other questions or comments from other participants? We'd really like to hear your thoughts on this. Adam, could you tell us about what you've been doing in Japan to foster this multistakeholder approach and what's been your interaction with the government, which I read it has been very fruitful but it has some things that might improve on this panorama.

ADAM PEAKE: Good morning. At the domestic level in Japan, there is very little or there is a limited amount of what we talk about as multistakeholder engagement. By that, I mean the sort of attitude or the approach of open and inclusive and bottom-up policymaking.

It's a rather hierarchical system of policy development working groups, particularly around the ministries. They all have working groups that may be led by academia or industry or what have you, but it's extremely top-down and controlled by the ministry as opposed to what we think of with a multistakeholder model, which would be bottom-up and inclusive. What we're trying to do is change that around a little bit and introduce this more inclusive and open process to policymaking.

It's important in some ways because Japan is actually one of the champions internationally of this bottom-up, open, inclusive multistakeholder model. If you look at Japan's statement in NETmundial or if you go back into the WCIT (World Conference on International Telecommunications) that you may have heard about, all of these different processes, Japan is a great champion for these issues internationally but it hasn't really adopted them particularly at home.

It's also interesting and it fits into a political environment where the prime minister, Prime Minister Abe, is trying to revitalize Japan and move it forward again. We've had a great stagnation of the economy. Again, these are probably issues that you read about in the press around the world. Japan has been a rather inactive international [organization] economically for decades, I suppose. Abe is showing some interest in using multistakeholder processes to, I suppose, give Japan a bit of impetus back into its economic and social standing and progress.

Essentially, what you see in the Document Store is an initial draft trying to explain why we think this more inclusive approach would be useful. It doesn't particularly focus on, for example, the ccTLD or anything like that. It's more about how can we use these processes generally. One particular issue that's important right now is privacy and the development of new and more appropriate to Internet or ICT-based economy on privacy regulation. We're trying to promote a model for just being more inclusive in that area.

If you look at the paper, what it is it's taking a very early stage and trying to put a high-level agenda together of why this approach would be useful. That it doesn't have to just be about the typical ICANN issues that we're interested in today and that it is relevant to other areas of the economy and society.

If your country is at the same stage in this, then perhaps it would be helpful to think about how you might start to frame it. It is Japan specific, but it might give you some ideas as a starting point of where you might go to and how this can be useful.

The reaction so far is that we're at the very early stages. We have a document out for draft comment. We're hoping to follow the NETmundial model where you had an interactive document where people could comment paragraph by paragraph. We'll follow our own ideals of being open and inclusive in how we develop this process.

Will it be successful? We have absolutely no idea, but one of the good things is that Japan, as I've said, is very supportive of this model at the international level, so it's quite useful to throw that back at them domestically and say, "Hey, you're promoting it internationally; therefore, let's do it at home as well."

I think that's all I'll say. It's just that I suppose one thing we've decided is that it is beyond ICANN. It's beyond the typical issues that we talk about in this meeting. We're particularly interested to try and develop it around privacy and privacy policy.

That's it. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Adam. I see Erick Iriarte raising his hand and wanting to share with us some thoughts. Eric, you have the floor.

ERICK IRIARTE: Thank you. I will speak in Spanish. A basic topic that we need to understand is that there is no one multistakeholder model. With the passing of time, what we have realized is the relationship between time and space. There is no one solution for a country. If the [inaudible] works in a country, that does not mean that it will work in another

country. It depends on the persons exercising the multistakeholder model.

We have some countries where the government lead the multistakeholder model, and this is multistakeholder topic within the government. But this is something different when the multistakeholder model is led by the private sector or the civil society and they look to involve all the decision making parties. These two basic structural differences make that in some places where the government have their role, they do not pay attention to other actors, but they call that multistakeholder model.

This reflects that when the civil society tries to participate in decision making in the government, the government tells them, "This is not your business. That's why you have voted for me. That's why you have selected me. We are the ones representing the community."

This is the classical view or vision of democracy saying that only those who are selected are the ones able to represent. This is an old vision, and this is anti-democratic if we compare with that to what we have right now.

The thing is that we cannot look for only just one multistakeholder model because that will oblige us to be what we are not. We are not equal. We are diverse. We have diversity in our cultures. We have different cultural processes, and our relationship with government is not exactly the same.

For example, data protection in Europe is seen as a counter answer to certain governments. The data protection is Latin America is not seen

against government, but it's also seen against mechanisms against people that may affect our personal life. These are different points of view on the same topic, so how can we face so difficult topics such as Internet governance or the management of a national policy related to a certain topic when we are comparing or seeing different models that have to do with cultural diversity?

What we do when we try to extrapolate one model that may work in one [determined] country with its own dynamics, we may make a mistake if we take that model to our country and face that model to our reality because their realities are different. We can speak about developed countries to developing countries or developing countries to developed countries.

We have different models and the dynamics are different, so we need to think about the multistakeholder model and we need to decide what it is that we want.

Do we want to have a unique model that is a solution that will be applied to everything in terms of Internet governance, in terms of decision making or policymaking? Or do we want to recognize the cultural diversity, the differences that we have as a community and understand that we can have our own proper and correct solutions with minimal and common points that we should all have.

Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Eric. I see Lianna Galstyan with her hand raised. Please, Lianna, you have the floor.

LIANNA GALSTYAN: Thank you. Lianna Galstyan, APRALO from Armenia. I was listening to these presentations, the situations in different countries, and I want to share the situation in Armenia about multistakeholder model.

Since I represent the Internet Society, we made a lot of efforts to foster this multistakeholder model regarding Internet governance issues. The situation is so that we have a lot of members from academia, technical community. We have even representative as a person from government. It happens so that we have lots of intellectual ability of these people.

Gathering all these efforts, we try to suggest the government to establish a body which will deal with Internet governance issues. We borrowed all these principles which is implemented in many countries, such as the human rights and net neutrality principles.

Our government since Internet Society was established in 2000 and we were the first who dealt with development of Internet in the country, at that period, government was not ready to be a part to be a stakeholder.

But now since so many people know how to deal with and they want to regulate some issues, they want to become a stakeholder. Since it's not so easy to in a country their policy so that from top down and not from bottom up, we have taken this opportunity to create a body where government will be a stakeholder as well. But from the other hand, will be the civil society, academia, business, and private sector.

So this is maybe so much about the situation. Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Lianna. I see Zahra. Zahra, could you please tell us what you think?

ZAHRA MOHAMED: Thank you. I come from Africa, and I represent AFRALO. I'm Somali Chapter ISOC. My question is I'm coming [from] Africa. The situation from Japan we are far [from].

I am wondering how it's possible when you are doing with a country or region where the governments are regime mostly or dictatorship, and they have no idea or they don't want to see any open civil society or Internet society who want to do something. They interpret all these things to something against their position. So how to manage this situation?

Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Zahra. I see Alejandro Pisanty raising his hand. Are you going to comment on what Zahra told us? Yes? Could you answer her question? Thanks.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: This is a question that I don't think has a general answer. It's very much country-by-country and year-by-year. Things may come and go [inaudible] build a solution can surely go back.

I think that we have to recover – I don't know what to tell you –but we have to recover the experience that many of the Internet activities and some of the Internet governance activities in particular that have been successful in many countries have been successful when they are kept way below the radar of the government.

Where you have civil society, the technical community, some people in the academic and non-technical community. By this, I mean political science, sociologists, economists, etc., and some actors in the government and, of course, the private sector quietly making arrangements and changing things slowly without inviting overt and active government intervention, particularly if you're facing an authoritarian government because those governments reaction will necessarily be opposite to self-organization.

What I think that's very important here is the global character of many of the actors involved or the global networking. That's why I took the microphone to reply as well.

You can get lots of ready-made responses that are easy to adapt to your situation from civil society organizations which have been dealing with human rights. You can get stuff about censorship and even some technical tools to hide communications from censoring authorities or to demonstrate that censorship and blocking and filtering exists.

You can have policy proposals that are non-contentious, that are more in the commercial or competition space that slowly open things up. Organizations like I am thinking of, for example, is the University of Toronto's Citizen Lab led by Ron Deibert, which provides very solid technical support for censorship, liberty of the press, etc., situations.

Several [good] people I won't put on the spot by leaving their names on the record, but I'm happy to share with you, who are very good at anonymizing and making confidential the communications of people you have to protect from damage from authoritarian states.

Then the policy information and think tanks like the Internet Society on the technical-to-social interface, APC (Association for Progressive Communication), which is very active in several African countries. For the more political front and issues like gender and so forth which, again, you can advance without entering a direct confrontation hopefully with your authorities. [That's out there].

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Alejandro. I see Ellen Strickland also wanted to comment on the topic. Ellen, you have the floor.

ELLEN STRICKLAND: Thank you very much. I'm from InternetNZ, part of APRALO. I just wanted to comment about our national work that we do around multistakeholder processes.

As InternetNZ, we're in a position as both technical community as a ccTLD but also with a unique setup so that our domain name and registry service are subsidiary companies. As an organization, we are a nonprofit committed to the community, so civil society. So we're very committed to multistakeholder processes. Internationally, we engage as both technical and civil society.

But our work within New Zealand around multistakeholder, I wanted to just share our experience and, I think for us, the important – certainly my experience. I organize the program for NetHui, which is our national Internet governance event. It's in its fourth year. It will be in two weeks.

We've found that very much the success of the event from when it was first imagined has been about making it contextual to the country and evolving with the community, creating it with the community.

As InternetNZ, we also do outreach to the range of stakeholders. We do things like a parliamentary Internet forum where we engage with current parties and do education and outreach to the members of parliament around Internet issues and work directly engaging with the business community.

But NetHui is the place where we bring together everyone. We decided that Internet governance forum, the idea of the word "governance" just didn't suit the New Zealand community. They think of government. Similarly, we find multistakeholder is a word that's sort of a running joke. So for us, it's an Internet issues event for the Internet community.

I think those words – "Internet governance" and "multistakeholder" – are very important to us, but working with the community it's important to find ways for them to engage with and understand what you're talking about but kind of decentralized way of identifying issues. And that staged approach to thinking about, "What are the issues that are mattering?" People coming together from different groups to talk about it, and things coming out of that towards policy formation and action.

I think the most important thing for us has been the evolution that from the first year we had streams that were aligned more to traditional things: business, education. We had community organizations running each stream. Whereas this year, we've actually done a completely decentralized approach where people put in their ideas for sessions. What topics do you want to hear about?

Based on the amount of input on each topic, that will be a panel if it was a very hot topic. Then the sessions are run in groups, and each session includes different stakeholders. So you look for a business perspective, a government perspective.

We sort of evolve. Another initiative we're doing this year is having an Internet research academic network at a national level because we found we had academics coming to these events, but they really add value and actually supporting that as a sector of a group of stakeholders would be very valuable.

I think, again, it's about evolving. The thing I would say, it's about doing. We've talked a lot about the model or the "ism." I think the idea of multistakeholder "processes" – it's a process and you learn.

To just conclude, our engagement with government, I think one of the successes we have this year is that we've had our minister for ICT speaking previously. We've had a panel where we've had MPs do a panel at NetHui where it was a panel of just then. They've been willing to do that and were quite nervous the first year and were more relaxed the second.

This year, they've agreed to have a panel on the topic of digital rights that will include the MPs but also other stakeholder groups. They've come through doing to understand the value of this. They are interested in having a panel and are saying to me, "Oh, but make sure that it's open to the floor and discussion. That's the bit that we really appreciate."

I think it's that processes, learning by doing, is really important with the community.

Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you very much, Ellen. I see that Erick Iriarte wants to take the floor again. Eric, you have the floor.

ERICK IRIARTE: I was listening to Ellen's comments, and I'd really like to live in a country such as the one she's describing. [So I tell you if it were in Colombia], the minister of communications in Colombia is quite open. We do have a national strategy.

Those of us involved in telecommunications and Internet in Colombia would be more than happy to have this government relation model, but those of us involved in intellectual property with the [PUMA] project similar to networking monitoring wouldn't agree so much with the government's view on what actions are being done in the network in other countries.

I want to mention which their models on how Internet is related to population. It's not necessarily towards an open Internet but to control content so that their political views are not affected. We will not see all countries the way we want them to be. Internet users want open, free, neutral Internet, while government influence through politics are not required to block access from community.

I'm not quite sure that in a dictatorship in a nondemocratic government we will see it open the doors to the community and invite them to design the policies of the informational society. They will otherwise invite their friends. They will create special groups or communities just for the show just to say that there is a civil society group, but actually they are their friends.

Or on the other hand, the mechanisms or organization from basis they coopt government representative and other government from the private sector and the civil society, but they are actually the same people. It doesn't matter eventually if they are talking about multistakeholderism. What they are actually doing is to design the best discourse for us to have resources for own ideas.

We're no longer in this time when we believe that the theoretical discourse that we can claim from the community is the truth by itself. Reality has already confronted to us to the fact that our countries realities are disparate and politics make these realities very dirty. Dirty because they don't understand that the population has a different view of policies.

EN

It's not because we don't have the chance to elect the representatives we want. Actually, many of them are there because of the democratic vote.

It's been some time already that I'm no longer politically correct, so let's stop them selling us this story that multistakeholderism will solve the problem of democracy in our respective countries. The truth is that there is no multistakeholder model that could automatically fix the dynamics of each country to the extent we have other national problems.

These other national issues do have an impact on local multistakeholder models, and it's not the other way around. If we're not aware of that, we will continue within 15 years talking about the same thing believe that our grassroots discourse is a simplistic, and it's not the case.

I think it's a good time to [inaudible] in the foundation to say how to interact to change things in areas where things are wrong. Activism in authoritarian countries is not only taken the toll of destroying access to some spaces for some people. Some people have already gone to jail. They have lost jobs, and in some cases they have even lost their lives.

So this is not just a question of wanting a multistakeholder model. It's a question of what do we want as a future democratic country, what we want for our democracies. If we are not sharing this view, at least we should clearly understand that not all countries have the same conception of what multistakeholder model is.

Again, I'd really like to live in a country like Ellen's where the prime minister opens his doors. Unfortunately, I do not live in such a country, as not many of us.

LEON SANCHEZ: Sergio Bronstein on the queue.

SERGIO BRONSTEIN: I have to apologize for having arrived a little bit late. I have the impression we are discussing whether it is true or not that this model of multistakeholders is valid or not. Actually, I think that this session deals more with validating something and see how to make progress. Otherwise, we will continue discussing how pretty our experiences are, but actually in ICANN we're not getting to the bone in the hard way and we're making little progress.

So if I may, I will restate some of the things we say when we speak of government, we're speaking of power. We're not speaking of consultation. Consultation triggers decisions, but decisions are the bone. So I think our work should be on identifying which are the actors that make the decisions, see what roles they hold, if they are the ones that should be there.

If it works in the case of Internet management, it could also work as a mechanism for policy design in each country and for each issue because in the long run, all political manners of power exercise is actually a road towards making a decision. I think we should first identify the actors in the case of Internet.

NETmundial has already identified the actors of civil society, the government, and the business community. The civil society was broken down into four roles. What is the weight that should be given to each one of these? What policies should be carried forward to leverage the action of these sectors and then determine what is the power to be ascribed to each of them.

It's easier for us from ICANN than from any government. In Venezuela, we are making this proposal to take over some specific issues under this framework. Now we are holding a debate on Internet penetration. Should we first discuss is this the indicator is this the other indicator?

I don't think that's right. I think we should first decide to get together and then work. This is a way of exercising power. I think in ICANN, we should not identify what the groups are in this multistakeholderism but define shares of power and how to make progress.

I apologize because I'm thinking out loud. As I said yesterday, I'm not a scholar on this matter. I'm not deeply knowledgeable, but I'm worried. I'm concerned that we discuss and we present good experiences, we reflect, but we're not making any progress.

In my personal case, I don't have a clear idea of what is NETmundial's vision on the sectors at stake. I'd really like to see coming out of this session some sort of arrangement here.

Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: This group's subject is the future of the multistakeholder on a broader sense than ICANN-centric. Okay? That's why we've been putting different experiences and efforts at the national level so we can all exchange this information and this knowledge to better find ways into which we can advance this multistakeholder approach on governance.

Actually, this kind of objectives you are setting to the table are going to be discussed in a minute in the breaking sessions. I would really appreciate your efforts and your contributions to the discussion group when it is turn to do so.

I see Evan Leibovitch wanted to ask a question to Erick Iriarte. Evan, you have the floor.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Thanks very much, Erick. In fact, I want to elaborate on the point that Sergio was making in the sense that as the reporter of this meeting and trying to bring something in a statement that we can come out and bring something that the ATLAS summit can actually agree on as an action plan, Erick, could you possibly elaborate a little bit more on what you were saying in a way that allows us to move forward?

It's one thing to understand what's broken. I'm also trying to figure out what we need to do to move forward to make some constructive comment out of this. Listening to what you were talking about, you were saying that – I may have misunderstood – but it sounded in some cases that you were saying the multistakeholder model wasn't even applicable in some of the contexts you were working in. Could you elaborate, or did I misunderstand?

I'm just trying to bring forward, as I take my notes and come forward with some action to do out of this, the experiences that you're talking about. What can we learn from this in what we are trying to move forward with? I'm trying to do what Sergio is asking for in saying not just reflect on what we're doing but using this to learn from each other and to suggest things going forward that we can propose to all of ALAC and to all of At-Large as it's trying to reflect on this at the summit.

Thank you.

ERICK IRIARTE: There are minimum regulatory or design points. At least any construction to be made of a multistakeholder model should at least consider some common points. Evidently, an equalitarian basis, equal participation from the [WSIS], and equal engagement in decision making.

Second, this variety of stakeholders involved is actually parties from different sectors, such as the government or the private sector. Representatives from these sectors are invited to participate. This is a basis for real participation on an equal footing. It is not a multistakeholder but a multi-sector participation.

These are consensus spaces. These are not decision making spaces. Typically, decision making in our apparently democratic processes get the higher number of votes. It doesn't matter what the loser votes vision is. The multistakeholder approach brings this idea of consensus rather than majority voting.

EN

Here you have three basic points, but even with these three minimum necessary basic points, there are some spaces where the multistakeholder model is not allowed. It is not allowed because the government authority is an authority that generates, as Sergio said, decision making. The government is the only one that can make a decision to the extent that the citizens – the civil society, the private sector – do not have an influence and could only act as advisors to validate the positions.

If that is the case, actually it is not multistakeholder. Even if they convene 5,000 organizations, they will just give their opinion but the government may not take those opinions into account. We need that the construction of the multistakeholder model should be real and effective as the countries assigned in the [WSIS].

There have been models that have changed. There are several models in Latin America and Africa that have shown changes. But there are some areas where the multistakeholder [inaudible] is simply not accepted.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay, Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. I'll just do a quick follow up.

Erick, it's interesting that you mentioned the idea of the end user or the role as being simply advisory and not deliberately contributing to the decision making process.

As you're aware perhaps of the structure within ICANN, when it comes to policies you have the GNSO and ccNSO that are involved in the policymaking. ALAC comes in afterwards as an advisory body that submits things to the Board. It's their option to choose to listen to us or not listen to us, and which of those two paths they choose is fairly clear from the results.

What I understand you're saying is that the philosophy of having multiple sectors, multiple stakeholders involved is not the problem. It's the various levels at which they are brought in. To have multiple stakeholders and multiple sectors brought in but only as advisors who are not listened to is not very helpful. It has to be completely in the decision process. Do I have that right from you?

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you. We have two more people on the queue. We have Alejandro Pisanty and then Carlos Aguirre. Then we'll break into groups. I'm sorry, and Adam Peake. Then we'll break into groups to follow up on the discussion. Alejandro, could you please take the floor?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Thank you, Leon. This appears to be a discussion that goes more and more into the general and away from the ICANN-specific indicated material. I think that is actually a feature, not a bug. It's actually something that we can bring back to make a useful contribution to the document that we are supposed to be producing.

So I'll try to do part, first touch on some of the points that have been debated and then try to channel this into the work we'll have to do in the workshop.

I'm very glad that Sergio Bronstein has continued the conversation, picking it up from yesterday. We have had a chance to think about these points a bit further overnight so to express them more sharply.

I think that, as I said yesterday in response to him, there are lots of people in the world I hope that are trying to make the world better. The thing is that they are trying to do it in different ways. Multistakeholder cooperation models will have to be adapted to these different approaches and cultures.

They are not a panacea. They are not the only way to go. They are one very specific way to go in Internet governance and in the management of other sets of resources that are or have been [inaudible] where there's also some property rights which are evolving in different ways in different parts of the world, etc.

For the ICANN or the Internet governance environment more generally, what we need to do is do have in mind the type of political analysis that Sergio has emphasized. Look what are the power sources. Look at what are the specific actors. What are their interests, what are their specific incentives and also the constraints within which they move?

One of the advantages of a more open environment, for example, is that governments which are usually constrained to strictly follow the law, be very careful about not making commitments that are not backed by a budget or instructions from their superiors and so forth. Create

environments where they can speak and think more freely together with a community before designing or deciding what is actually going to happen.

Also, as Erick has emphasized, multistakeholder groupings or people coming together will be different according to the aim and environment in which they move. It's very different to be able to just bounce around ideas that will enacted by different parties and actually making decisions to which the organization itself will be held accountable.

It's one thing to have a national-level Internet governance forum for discussion where you'll bring people together, they will speak, and then they will meet elsewhere to make decisions and another thing to design something like ICANN, which actually is responsible for the operation of our resource.

Therefore, you have to have structured decision making processes. You have to have processes for the review of decisions and even possibly making these decisions go back to revert those decisions. There you have to have a lot more structure.

Inclusion is another important factor, as Sergio reminds us. Who has to come to the table? Who's the convener? Who cannot walk away from the decisions because they have a responsibility? Also, the issues of legal liability have to come into the design of effective multistakeholder processes for different resources.

Again, if you only have an open discussion, you have a lot less legal risk than if you're looking, for example, at ICANN, which is actually managing or contributing to the management of the resource. But

there's someone in ICANN signing the contract or authorizing a new gTLD or a new global IP address allocation policy. There you have to be prepared to deal with lawsuits and reverting decisions, actually having made people spend money or not earn money in a business.

To try to channel this into the forward steps of this workshop, I think that we should ask ourselves what are the characteristic of the most effective proven or known multistakeholder processes and make sure that we're able to make these statements specific enough that they are useful, general enough that they are not only valid within the very narrow ICANN sphere but they can scale to different political systems, to different economic arrangements and so forth.

Also, I think that as we move forward, we're supposed to spend nine hours together altogether over the weekend. We're about at the middle of that for the workshop level. We should begin to think of the output document. One thing that I would encourage everybody to think personally, I would encourage everybody to think about is that we have a statement that does two things, goes through two constraints.

One is, to use a very American turn of phrase, it "stands the red face test." We are not going to be ashamed of the result in that it's awfully wrong or that it's banal, trivial, you could have picked it up from a glossy magazine. It has to have more depth and experience.

The third test is that this is going to be part of a statement made to the Board. I think that we should put ourselves to a very high standard in trying to write something that can actually influence the Board, that can be used by the Board for outward negotiations and that it really

contributes something that the Board could not have picked up elsewhere.

I don't think that we're going to reinvent the wheel either, but at least make sure that the Board will have a tool with which to interact with other parties that comes from our side and, therefore, legitimizes and strengthens the At-Large part of the multistakeholder model.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Alejandro. Next on queue is Carlos Aguirre. Carlos, could you please take the floor?

CARLOS AGUIRRE: Thank you, Leon. I have been listening during this morning. I have been listening to the presentations of my colleagues regarding the multistakeholder model in their countries or their intention to have a multistakeholder model.

I would like to say according to what Evan and Sergio and Alejandro have said before to move forward in terms of what we can do. We need to find solutions or try to find to find solution words to create or draft our final statement.

That is to say to contribute to the solution and not only to show pictures of events that are happening in different parts of the world. That might be interesting, but they are not leading us to a solution. As [Alex] has said, we should do this in a general way so that we can adapt this to different particular cases.

In that sense, Argentina, which is my country, the experience in Argentina is very similar to other Latin American countries where the possibility of participation has been almost nil during all these years. But taking into account and based on the work of NGOs and activists in this sphere, we were lucky enough to have different events.

Ten years ago, we had a meeting with the government. Well, the government opened the doors. The events contributing to that had to do with the pressure and the assistance and the commitment the capacity building. The opening of doors to put it somehow incorporate our new leaders, training them, NETmundial has greatly contributed to that.

So time is giving us answers when work in a consistent manner, when we follow a strategy, when we follow the same path. When we work on that, when we show our pressure, at the end we get the results. At least, some of the results we are looking for.

Of course, we are not having 100% because perfection is not always possible, but this is the way to move forward. Contribution is important, and experience is important. Our experience is that training is important. The formation and training of leaders is also important, but we need to insist on that taking into account that. This should be mentioned in our final statement, I believe, because this is important.

Someone mentioned recently, and I'm going to sum up, someone mentioned the topic or the fact that the systems governing our democratic countries make, for example, that five votes may win against three votes. But sometimes we need to look inside, and

sometimes when we take into account the ICANN [inaudible], we have seven votes winning over 14 votes.

This is even worse. Sometimes this happens in the GNSO structure, which is a mechanism that they use so five defeat three, but seven defeating 14 votes? Well, that is something complicating.

I think we should improve. I'm going back to what I said before. All models can be improved. We need to generate a general model so that we can adapt that model to a particular situation. But we need to focus on the general principles to take into account, but we need to pay attention to what we have and try to improve that.

Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Next in queue and last for this particular session is Adam Peake, and then we'll break into groups.

ADAM PEAKE: Hello, again. I just wanted to come back to some issues. We're talking about decision making and what these processes can do and what they can achieve.

Some of you will remember Beth Noveck who was leading one of the high-level panels that ICANN had running until quite recently in her activities in the GovLab.

There was an announcement not too long ago on the ICANN lists about a Google Hangout that they led, which was looking at what they call

"crowd law," which is the development of legislative drafting processes in what I suppose we could call the multistakeholder way, but it would be better to say that it would be more the open, inclusive, bottom-up model rather than trying to label it multistakeholder.

Some of the examples they gave of this crowd sourced or citizen led activity, the best known of these is, of course, Marco Civil which was very well publicized as it was signed into law during NETmundial. But you saw there an important piece of legislation that, instead of going through a typical drafting process of parliamentarians and ministries, was actually developed online through participative processes.

The other examples that were in this particular session of the GovLab that Noveck ran was Wiki Constitution – I can't pronounce that – but it's for Mexico City and it's a constitution for the city of Mexico. There's a very advanced piece of legislation. It's the Magna Carta for Internet rights, which is being developed in the Philippines. There's a whole range of these different initiatives going on at the moment.

Again, it's not really that we're looking at only ICANN-like processes or even privacy-like processes. This type of approach is now being used for legislative drafting both at the national and the narrower city level, which is an interesting development on where we started off with, I suppose, starting off with ICANN in 1998. Now we're getting onto the drafting of national legislation, so I thought I'd throw that one in.

I do have a video file of that particular session so if anybody's interested in that, I could probably put it on the shared documents space.

Thanks.

EN

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Adam. I said that the queue was closed, but since Sivasubramanian raised his hand and I wasn't aware of that and he hasn't spoken this session, I would like to give the floor to Siva.

SIVASUBRAMANIAN MUTHUSAMY: This is Sivasubramanian from India. This is a comment on what was talked about as happening in New Zealand. One observation is that when we have a conference or form a committee without any agreement on the word "governance" or the word "multistakeholder," it becomes just another ICT conference or it loses its significance.

You should have all the credit for whatever that you've done, but when we make an effort in the direction of Internet governance and the direction of multistakeholder conference, everywhere we should insist on agreeing on the word governance and multistakeholder and avoid describing it in certain other negative ways, for example, Internet governance and communications. I think that is important, and I would like some comments on that.

On what Adam said, if there is still a minute or two, I want to know a little more about this Magna Carta initiative in the Philippines and what they are doing.

Thank you.

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay, so does anyone want to comment on that? Adam?

ADAM PEAKE: I'll send you the links to this rather than trying to go through things I
                             don't well enough having only read it once. But there's a whole set of
                             links and then a video of various people presenting their different
                             initiatives, not just the Philippines example, but Mexico, Marco Civil,
                             and the whole range of issues. So it's quite an interesting recording of a
                             Google Hangout.

LEON SANCHEZ: Well, thank you. So now I would like to ask you to break into groups
                             divided by regions. So we should have, in theory, five groups divided
                             into each of the regional At-Large organization structures.

                             Let's break into groups and then comment on some basic questions like:
                             is the multistakeholder model really taking place in our region? How is it
                             taking place? Who coordinates these efforts? Which are the different
                             approaches that we've experienced, which many of us have already
                             commented on this table? Let's try to have three or four points to give
                             back to Evan so he can add them to our final report.

                             Si, Alejandro?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: As a possible process [aid], it may be useful for us – I mean, I haven't
                             done this in detail, but I've done it in other cases – to summarize our
                             results in a table where you have some specific countries as well as
                             more general statements.

The columns would be like the degrees of multistakeholder involved and effectiveness. So you will have like open discussion forums. You will have specific mechanisms that act on decision making, and more general let's say broader and deeper decision making.

So like Carlos Aguirre told us, for example, you would have in Argentina a consultation. In New Zealand, you would have a very active participation in decision making. Those are sort of the degrees where you could summarize the results instead of trying to write an extensive text.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Alejandro, I like what you're saying and I think that would actually be more useful, as you say, rather than descriptive texts. However, that almost suggests that it might be better to stay at the table like this, come up with the columns of what the questions are so we can agree between the regions on what are the questions to be asked of each region, and then just to try and come up with that determination.

Because if everyone breaks out and they come back with the answers but the questions are all different, it becomes very difficult to put that into a single table.

So I agree exactly with what you're saying, but in order to make sure that we are all asking the same questions and all then giving useful to answers to compare with each other, perhaps it's better to stay at the table rather than to break out and just fill in this spreadsheet.

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Again, trying to make this more practical because trying to make your work as a reporter easier and [inaudible] easier also for us to feel well represented by the text, why don't we take a few minutes break in order for you, Leon, and someone else maybe – I mean, those who are at the head of the table – to just design this very basic structure.

If we open that discussion now for the whole group, it may make it a lot longer. If we take ten minutes, then we can fill it up in half an hour by getting the structure from you guys. It doesn't have to be perfect. This is a workshop. It's a fast piece of work. Whatever you give us, we'll try to fill in. My view.

LEON SANCHEZ: Thank you, Alejandro. I agree with that proposal, so let's have a ten-minute break, and when you come back, we'll have more work for you.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay. Because this is for reporting and making a record of what this group is doing in the tabular format as we were talking about earlier, I will briefly chair or moderate this part of the meeting.

Because our goal right now is to try and get at least on a regional basis if possible your feelings about a number of questions that we've come up with. Obviously, you didn't have access to the questions while you were talking, but I'm hoping we can try and get some kind of a consensus feel.

What we've come up with is a series of questions. I believe we have six of them. For each of them, I'm trying to get some kind of a value

between, say, 1 and 5 where 1 is none at all and 5 is completely and to try and get on a region-by-region basis what your best guess is at how your region treats each of these issues.

I'll ask the questions first. I will go in order of first Latin America, then North America, then Asia Pacific, then Africa, then Europe. Those are the five ICANN regions. To the best of your ability, I would ask for somebody from each of those regions to try and give a value of 1 to 5. We are not being exact here. We are simply trying to get some kind of an idea that we can present to the rest of the community on how we see these issues.

Without more delay, I will get to the specific questions. Then we will call on each region one-by-one to try and give your best approximation of this. As I said, 1 being not at all and 5 being completely.

The first question is: do the governments in your region include outside groups, include outside stakeholders, in identifying issues and having conversations about them?

I'm being distinct about this in going along with what Sergio said because having the conversation is not the same thing as making decisions. That's the next question.

So the first question is: do governments in your region include outside participants in identifying issues and creating dialogue about Internet governance issues?

We're not limiting this to ICANN. This is in general about Internet governance. Okay, so can somebody speak for Latin America/Caribbean

or at least try and give an approximation? Again, 1 being nothing, 5 being completely. Alberto?

ALBERTO SOTO: Can you say a few words before giving the number?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: For the sake of brevity, unless there's a real difficulty with [giving] the number, I'm going to try and get through this quickly by just asking for the numbers unless there's a real reason to [explain].

Okay, sorry. Alberto, I don't know if you heard me, what I was saying. I'm just saying, if you need to give an explanation, please do. But in the interest of keeping this brief and fast-moving, I'm trying to emphasize on getting the number values as opposed to a textual explanation. Thank you.

ALBERTO SOTO: Carlos Aguirre said that in Argentina, we're only now starting. So if we were to give a value, it would be rather reckless. However, I would give a 3.

SERGIO BRONSTEIN: The opinion is not on the country but on the region.

ALBERTO SOTO: I apologize. I thought it was on a country basis, so a 2 would be okay. So we've reached a consensus. The value is 2.

ERICK IRIARTE: A question on methodology: you should ask all the delegates and draw an average. Who can give a value for the region? Because what Alberto is saying does not make much sense or might not make much sense to Alberto. I want to see how the value's going to be reached. I mean, we could have different opinions, so I request assistance on the methodology.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: I believe it is an understatement to say that this is not very scientific here. What we are just trying to do is for the sense of brevity and trying to come up with something is to get a feel, a sense.

It's not going to be exact. There's not every country in your region that is represented here. We know that this is the case. Based on the expertise and the experiences of the people in the room to try and get a sense.

If there is a wild variation, that in some countries it's a 4 or a 5 and in some it's a 1, well, we're trying to get an average of that. If there's disagreement, then we'll come up with something. But, again, this is not incredibly scientific. We're just trying to find from the people in the room what the sense of this is. We know this is not going to be exact. Robert?

[ROBERT CASTONGUAY]:   Would it be easier if we meet by RALO with all the question, be able to answer?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Sorry. Robert was asking: is it possible to ask the questions and then break up again and then answer the questions that way? Leon? Adam? What do you think?

LEON SANCHEZ: Well, that was kind of the original intent to break into regional tables. The thing is that we didn't have the question sets ready. So if you're okay with that, I would suggest that we break into regions, answer the set of questions specifically, and then come back with the numbers to Evan.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, excellent. So what we'll do is I will read the questions out. We'll take a few minutes, convene within your regions, and try and come up between you with a number that as best as possible represents what you think the region is.

Okay, so I will read the questions. Please, make a note of them. Then when you go into your groups, we'll try and get your best idea of what your region – of how it rates with this.

The first question is: do governments include outside groups in identifying issues and having discussions or conversations?

The second question is the same thing, except it's decision making: do governments include outside groups in their decision making processes?

This is all, of course, in regarding Internet governance.

The third and fourth questions are the same things, but instead of governments, we're asking you about the operation of your ccTLDs in your countries and the RIRs in your region. For Latin America, that would LACNIC as well as the ccTLDs in your region.

Again, the same two questions: do they involved outside groups in having conversations and asking advice? And the fourth question is: do they involve them in their decision making processes?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Sorry, Evan. Two questions involve ccTLDs and RIRs? Okay.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The first two are about governments. The second two are the same questions, but about ccTLDs and RIRs.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: Just a short question on that, Evan. Decision making processes influencing, do you mean that they have a vote, or do you mean that they are seriously listened to?

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: My preference was not to be very specific about that in saying there's essentially two things. It's one thing to bring to people to have a conversation and then ignore them. The second question deals with: are those opinions actually taken into account when the decisions are made. Whether that's a specific vote or a different process, I did not want to be too detailed about that.

Alejandro?

ALEJANDRO PISANTY: Evan, that's why you have a scale here. It's a Likert scale. So 0 is nothing's happening; 5 is full involvement, and 3 is something in the middle.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Eduardo?

[EDUARDO DIAZ]: When you said about the decision part that you said that you take people to take their opinions into account for the decision, I thought we were looking to if the people that participated in the conversation had a say in the decision as in making the decision, not in somebody else take the opinion of those that participated.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: The answer to that is because this will differ so much from country to country and region to region, I wanted to keep the question open in saying: are outside groups, are they influential in actually how the outcomes happen? It's one thing to have a conversation and say, "We will invite people and we will make a table and you can talk." It's a separate question as, "Do we take the results of what happens at that table and actually have it affect the outcome?"

I guess I deliberately did not want to be too specific because the process itself will change from region to region and even country to country.

Okay, the last questions have to do with the segregation of stakeholder groups. As you saw at NETmundial, there were a number of different microphones. There was one for academia, one for technical, one for big government, one for civil society, etc. In ICANN, you have the various constituency, so everything is very neatly arranged. You have your constituency. You have your group with which you're identified.

The last questions are: in your region, is the usefulness of multistakeholder activity, does it happen in your region where this segregation happens? Is it very heavily segregated that when you make an approach to inform policy, are you immediately identified? "Well, you're business. You're civil society. You're academia," or so on, or do they not make a distinction? Is there no distinction?

I'm thinking specifically of the difference, for instance, between the ICANN model where everything is heavily segmented and the IETF model which is far less segmented.

So the question is: does this segregation happen in your region? Does it widely happen? When people make representation on Internet governance, are you segmented because, well, you're making this opinion from business, you're making this suggestion from civil society, from academia? Does the decision making process segment this very, very distinctly?

Right now, I think we can limit it to those questions. I mean, obviously, we could have more questions. We could do more detail. Obviously, this has been done in a short amount of time. The answers will come in a very short amount of time. So we're literally just trying to do a snapshot of the room and to get an idea of how things are.

Obviously, in many regions you're going to have many countries in your region. There's only going to be a few of you. So based on your own experience, based on your own recollection, try and come up with your approximation of how things are within your region.

Leon, I guess we'll take a few minutes now. Consult with the other people within your region. As Alejandro said, this is a Likert scale, so we'll go – I was saying 1 to 5 – 0 to 5, whatever. If you want to say very little, it's a low number. If it's complete, it's a high number.

If you have questions during the deliberation, we'll be still here at the table so please come up and ask. How much time do we get for this?

LEON SANCHEZ: That's the point. We're already out of schedule. We're supposed to be having a break right now. So we have very little time. I would ask to literally take three or five minutes at the most, and come back with the numbers so we can just adjust the schedule and take the break we're supposed to have from 10:30 to 11:00. So please, let's take three minutes to answer these questions in groups and then come back.

LEON SANCHEZ: Meeting call to order.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: Okay, the two groups from the Americas have already come up with their answers. Do the rest of you need much more time? Okay, you need some more time? Are you close? Please, try and do this within the next few minutes.

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We are ready.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: North America and Latin America. Everybody else?

UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We leave for the general break. Come back at 10 past 11:00 and go on with the session?

LEON SANCHEZ: Okay, let's do that. Let's go to the break and come back at 11:10 here.

EVAN LEIBOVITCH: So if you finish quick, you have a longer break.

LEON SANCHEZ: Exactly. If you finish quick, you have a longer break. LACRALO has already finished, so we have a longer break.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]