
NETmundial – Working Session 2: Roadmap Part I
Wednesday, April 23, 2014 – 17:30 to 19:30
NETmundial – São Paulo, Brazil

JANIS KARKLINS:

Ladies and gentlemen, may I ask you to take your seats. We're starting the session on the roadmap.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is very difficult to start the session if half of the room are standing. Please take your seats.

Ladies and gentlemen, may I grab your attention?

Ladies and gentlemen, may I grab your attention? We're about to start the session, and I would like to invite you to take your seats. Thank you very much. We're starting session on the roadmap for the future evolution of the Internet governance. And during this session, we will address only first two parts of Section 2, section roadmap. In other words, we will address issues that deserve attention from all stakeholders in the future of Internet governance evolution. And we will address the section dealing with the issues dealing with institutional improvements. In other words, tonight we will be talking about Section 2, paragraphs 1 to 30. And tomorrow morning, we will be addressing the remaining part of the roadmap; namely, paragraphs 31 to 45.

Before giving the floor to speakers, and we will follow the same rules, I will give the floor to Jeanette Hofmann for brief introductory remarks.

Jeanette, please.

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.

JEANETTE HOFMANN:

Yes, thank you. I would like to highlight a few controversial issues that we got out of the more than 400 comments on the roadmap section of the draft document. The first key issue that attracted a lot of comments concerns roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders involved. The question is whether the document we produce here should make reference to existing language, namely, the Tunis Agenda, or leave it open for further discussion. I guess there is agreement that stakeholders do have different roles and responsibilities. But the question is how do we take notice of that in the document? Do we go back to Tunis Agenda language, or do we leave it open and come up with new language? That was key issue 1.

Key issue 2 concerns the status of enhanced cooperation. The question is -- and that is where commenters are divided -- is enhanced cooperation already taking place or is it something that should be set in motion? The concept of enhanced cooperation goes back to the WSIS process. And there is some ongoing working group chartered under the CSTD on this issue. And there are documents that you can look up.

The third key issue is a related one. It concerns the institutional landscape. The open question is: Is there a need for additional organizations and mechanisms to address issues that are not adequately dealt with or are we fine with the existing institutional landscape?

The key -- the fourth key issue concerns the IGF. There is general agreement that the IGF needs improvement. There is also by now general agreement that the IGF should become more outcome oriented.

There was a CSTD working group on IGF improvement, and many of the comments received reflect that report of the CSTD working group.

There is one concern, and that is reflected in the comments we got, and that concerns the question of how to preserve the open forum character of the IGF while we make it more outcome oriented.

The fifth and final issue concerns the IANA transition. The open issue with regard to our declaration is whether the declaration should be specific and list the various options under this discussion or whether it's sufficient to include general principles that should guide the process.

Just to mention it, there will also be a panel tomorrow afternoon that deals with the IANA transition that will also offer opportunities to comment.

JANIS KARKLINS:

So thank you very much, Jeanette, for this introduction. And we will follow the same rules as we established in the previous session: Speakers from the four stakeholder groups plus two remote participants in each round of comments. And we will go until 8:30 or until last speaker. And we will continue tomorrow with the Section 3 and 4.

So without further delay, I will turn to first speaker representative from government. Please introduce yourself and your affiliation.

>>

Good afternoon. My name is Andrea Glorioso, and I speak on behalf of the European Commission. We would like, first of all, to thank everyone who is contributing to these most important discussions.

We believe strongly that NETmundial is a historical opportunity to change the pace of the debate on the evolution of global Internet governance but only if we make a collective effort to turn our discussions here into limited number of actionable items. The current version of the roadmap already includes a series of clear statements on the need of improvements in several areas. I refer among others to paragraph 6, full participation; paragraphs 8 and 14, principles for inclusion of transparency and accountability; paragraphs (inaudible) and 36, capacity-building and access to information; paragraph 17 to 23, strengthening the Internet Governance Forum; paragraph 24 on coordination tools and others.

All these statements need accompanying mechanisms to ensure they do not remain on paper. The European Commission has offered a number of concrete proposals covering these and other areas. I will not repeat these proposals here. Although, of course, we are fully available to discuss them at the earliest opportunity.

We also understand that not everyone is ready at this point in time to get to the level of detail we suggested in our proposals. Accordingly, we would like to suggest that immediately following NETmundial, a multistakeholder intersessional group is convened in order to identify the concrete mechanisms, milestones, timelines and deliverables that

are needed to turn the statements which are currently already included in the roadmap into concrete outputs and that such work should feed into the discussions and activities of both the Internet Governance Forum and the WSIS+10 process. Thank you very much.

JANIS KARLINS:

Thank you very much. And I would like to ask the delegates to lower the level of noise in the room. It is very difficult to hear those who speak. It is just a matter of courtesy. If you want to speak and you are not speaking in the microphone, please do it outside this room.

I am now turning to the next speaker. That is representative of private sector.

>>

Thank you. My name is Jimson Olufuye. I am the chair of the private sector-led Africa ICT Alliance in Abuja, Nigeria. I have very few comments. One on IANA stewardship transition. We generally support the content of the paragraph 26 and also to state that we do not need to look for replacement regime outside the current Internet ecosystem.

While we continue to be engaged in the current consultation, we believe that the outcome can focus on a lean but agile multistakeholder mechanism to handle the oversight function of IANA.

As a member of the ICANN community, we will continue to hold ICANN accountable to perform the IANA function it currently does.

Secondly, the spirit of NETmundial is already a significant outcome of this process where, indeed, it is challenging. But as a business from Africa with a strong belief in the multistakeholder process, if we leave the openness, inclusiveness, and accountability that we are already showcasing, we can solve the access challenge we are facing in developing nations and bring social and economic opportunity to all our people and can, indeed, be spared. But we can work collaboratively during this NETmundial taking forward into other fora a positive collegial spirit. Lastly, I would like to thank the Brazilian multistakeholder community for the excellent showcase of our bottom-up multistakeholder model really works. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you very much for your comment. Now I'm turning to representative of civil society.

>>

Hello. Hello. My name is Jacob Applebaum. I'm a journalist and technologist working on issues of surveillance, usually revealing secrets about the NSA, GCHQ, and other criminally active secret services. With their spiegel, I broke the story about the NSA spying on Chancellor Merkel in Germany. There are many, many stories like this to come, and they impact everyone on the planet. I speak here in my own capacity as a member of the human race.

This is a joint statement from a number of civil society organizations and individuals in Sao Paulo about paragraph 35 regarding surveillance. Mass surveillance comprises collection, processing, and interception of all forms of communication. It undermines Internet security and trusts in all personal, business, and diplomatic communications.

Mass surveillance is a fundamental human rights violation. Targeted interception and collection of personal data should be conducted in accordance with international human rights law. Critical and intermediary infrastructure must not be tampered with and service of targeted interception. Personal computing devices are the core of our lives. Their sanctity must not be violated. No system, protocol, or standard should be weakened to facilitate interception or decryption of communication or data. Future dialogue requires full disclosure of technical sources and methods for democratic discussion on this topic at the international level using forums like the human rights council and the IGF aiming to develop a common understanding of all of the related aspects and their implementation. The necessary and proportionate principle should be the vantage point of this discussion.

My own view follows. I believe that this statement is critical to a secure, free, and open Internet. How will we keep the Internet free and open for all? We must refuse to sabotage or intentionally weaken our infrastructure or any other systems. No back doors. No so-called lawful interception weaknesses that are exploited by those who do not respect our laws.

We require decentralization, protection, and promotion of network neutrality, free and Open Source software, free and open standards,

free and open hardware. No data retention, end-to-end encrypted communications, and a right to anonymity. We must end ongoing mass surveillance and make transparent the ongoing cooperate collaborations with these states. We need transparency and accountability. No secret laws. No secret interpretations. Real democratic processes. This document should reflect these values.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you very much. If I may ask technical services to put the sound signal once two minutes are up again. And I would like to remind that during this evening's session, we're dealing with first two parts of the roadmap, paragraphs 1 to paragraph 30. Of course, your statement will be taken into account. But the surveillance issues we will be discussing in-depth tomorrow. Thank you to follow this guidance.

Now I'm turning to representative of academia.

>>

Hello. Milton Mueller, Syracuse University. We would like to -- speaking on behalf, I think, also of civil society, we would like to add a sentence to paragraph 26. The sentence was actually in the original draft of the outcome document and was removed through some very interesting circumstances. This is the sentence we'd like to put back in.

"It is desirable to keep an adequate separation between the policy development process and the operational aspects as well as external

accountability mechanisms." This sentence pertains, again, to the IANA transition.

We'd like to put this in, first of all, because it's simply an accepted part of good practice in the technical community to have a separation between policy development and the implementation process. It also has good accountability features. We're very concerned about the way in which ICANN might be given control of the DNS root without adequate accountability mechanisms. And we're concerned that ICANN and the Commerce Department have separated the discussion of this issue into two tracks, one of which will discuss accountability in isolation, the other of which will discuss the fate of the IANA functions in isolation.

We're very concerned that if you give ICANN the IANA functions without settling the accountability problems first, that ICANN will have no incentive to impose accountability measures on itself and, indeed, the rest of the world, including the Commerce Department, will have no leverage with which to extract accountability commitments from ICANN.

So we think it is important to put this sentence in. Again, it was in there originally. There was support for several submissions for having this kind of a separation, and we think it belongs back in. Thank you.

[Applause]

JANIS KARLINS: Thank you. Thank you very much. I'm now turning to remote participation coordinators.

>> Okay. Now we have a comment from Chicago, USA, followed by video from Bhimavaram Town in India.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: This is a comment on issues dealing with institutional improvements, and it reads: The preconditions set by the U.S. government on the IANA transition are unwarranted. ICANN must be an independent organization free from U.S. control, and the process from transition must be equally determined by the international community with no preset -- with no set preconditions.

>> Now video from India.

>> Good morning, everybody. It is 4:00 over here. This is (saying name) representing civil society and academia. As a roadmap for all stakeholders in Internet governance, an Internet openness of all countries, all stakeholders from all capacity-builders like Internet users from ordinary people like you, farmers, technologists, the woman from (indiscernible) shall remain in all Internet governance and also make them participate actively and accurately with Internet users and capacity-builders to build their lives and become self-sustainable.

This process also (indiscernible) to make the global ecosystem a system to sustain worldwide, just like Internet rather than addressing Internet (indiscernible). But Internet is a society, too. (indiscernible) and also we're proud to be global stakeholders and Internet multistakeholders all over the world --

[Timer sounds.]

Consider these points. Thank you so much.

[Applause]

JEANETTE HOFMANN: Is there a second remote?

>> (off microphone.)

JEANETTE HOFMANN: Okay. So next one will be government but if I may add one comment, the more specific your suggestions are, the more likely it is that your comments will indeed be reflected in the document.

>> Thank you very much. Yeah. Thank you very much. I speak on behalf of the Government of India in this forum.

At the outset, I'd like to point out two clear reflections on the oral process, as well as the direction which we are going.

On one hand, the Government of India, we always believe that the perspectives and views of the stakeholders must be respected and have to be recorded and to be provided the right place.

As regards to text that we have in the present, we believe that it is fairly imbalanced. I will explain the reasons why it is -- we feel that it is quite imbalanced.

Firstly, there is no reference to the Tunis Agenda-related dimensions. The words "Tunis Agenda" don't even get reflected in any part of this text and we believe it is the process that we are actually being developed on. It will be a pity if you don't make that reflection. Second, we also consider this as a convergence as multilateral as well as multistakeholder processes. It is the Tunis Agenda actually which reflected for the first time the existence of the two platforms, and we believe that it is not a zero-sum game, and from that perspective, it is important that the -- this also forms part of the core, some of the core reflections of many of the delegations in this process.

This takes us to the next question as to as a result, what do we do with the -- in case such core ideas and core views of the delegations are not reflected? And this working group must focus also the nature of the outcome document as to be what is the name that we'd like to give at the end of it.

Now, coming to the specific -- the four issues that have been raised, I think I'll be able to touch on only one of them.

With regard to the issues of roles and responsibilities of the stakeholders, I think it is best that we do not touch upon these

particular responsibilities and roles in this format. It ought to be done -- these responsibilities were defined at a certain level in the WSIS process and we would like the same platforms to redefine if there is any change in the responsibilities and roles of various stakeholders.

JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you. Private sector.

JOSEPH ALHADEFF: Thank you. My name is Joseph Alhadeff and I'm here on behalf of ICC. I chair the digital economy commission there.

We wanted to make a couple of quick interventions on a couple of topics. One of them was related to the conditions for the IANA transition -- for the IANA transition.

We actually find that those conditions are important to maintaining and promoting the stability, functionality, and security of the Internet.

We also think the multistakeholder nature of that transition is tremendously important.

We are very happy to see the request for the strengthening of the IGF, and we think that is a very positive aspect of this document.

We would suggest that when we look at the strengthening of the IGF, we keep in mind the unique characteristics of the IGF and its importance to maintain those characteristics, because that is what has

made it a successful forum for dialogue, capacity-building, and exchange.

Finally, we take a look at Paragraph 16 and we think that this is a tremendously important paragraph dealing with the need for mechanisms to consider emerging topics, and we know this was a topic that had great currency in Baku and was -- was felt to be of great importance by a number of developing economies.

And we think perhaps more emphasis could be placed on this issue, and one of the concepts was perhaps there could be a use of technology to help make some of these issues more accessible through more searchable databases of the work that's being done in global fora and to leverage work that's being done to catalog that work across various fora that's already existing.

I believe also in one of the commission comments they had made a reference to the use of technology to that end.

Thank you very much.

[Applause]

JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you. Next, civil society.

IZUMI AIZU: Thank you. My name is Izumi Aizu. I work for the Institute for (indiscernible) Economics at the (indiscernible) University in Japan.

I'd like to have some special thanks to the organizers but especially for the staff members and the volunteers. Some people on the podium, or is back, you know, working very tirelessly. Some missed three dinners I heard just -- thank you all.

And here I'm the member of the IGF MAG. I was the member of the CSTD working group on the improvement of the IGF, so for that, I'd like to make some comments and proposal.

How many of you know how little financial resources and human resources that IGF has been running on?

If you want to improve the quality of the IGF and ask some four points from A to D, without resources you cannot really improve.

This funding issue for the IGF was a very difficult issue at the CSTD working group, so which one should pay more or burden to take.

We don't have any easy answer yet, but I still propose -- want to propose to add the following answer or sentence after Point B: In order to improve the participation and quality of IGF, its funding should be significantly increased, and to that end, IGF community should work together.

So I appeal to the governments. Some governments used to provide more funding like my government of Japan. They ceased. Some other governments still remain. Some corporations, but I'd like to appeal to those Internet companies who are not here but are making a lot of money, our work is for you, so I need -- we need your support as well. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you. Next is a remote participation.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Okay. So we -- we'll have a comment from the Brazilian remote hub here in Sao Paulo.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: --- technology development that has to be taken to ensure the civil framework --- other portions of the world so we will just stick to comments on text.

JANIS KARKLINS: So that will be for the next round.

Now I am inviting next government representative to take the floor.

>> Thank you. Thank you, Mr. President, and good afternoon and in the name of the Saudi kingdom, I would like to draw attention that the kingdom of Saudi Arabia had too submitted its observations, including the roadmaps, and it is on the Web site, so it is very important to look into these observations and we're not feeling comfortable because we did not include the kingdom's observations in yesterday's document

where the -- and this is opposite to when we talk about transparency and openness in the preparatory period for this meeting.

In addition, I would like to draw your attention that the content of the section related to roadmap, it is -- it is beyond -- it's not comprehensive and it's not specific, so I would like to also talk -- and as -- mention, as previous speakers, that it is very important to look into the outcome of WSIS and anything that is related to Internet governance has to go back to the definition of the WSIS.

And as we know, that a number of the outcome of the WSIS will not be executed, especially when we talk about cooperation, and that where the government will be -- carry out its responsibilities and rules when it comes to Internet. That's why we demand that we include this in the documents.

And also, the documents got mixed with the roles of the stakeholders, so we -- again, the definition of stakeholders has to go back to the definition of WSIS as well, and we suggest that we have -- also recommend the intervention -- innovations to reach what we can call new Internet, and thank you, Mr. Chair.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you very much and it seems that we omitted representatives from academia, technical community in the previous round and we're fixing that.

Please, technical community.

MATTHIEU WEILL:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Matthieu Weill. I am the chief executive of AfNIC, which is the country code top-level domain manager for .fr in France.

I'm also a technical community representative in the high-level multistakeholder committee for this meeting.

In the previous session, there was talk about whether the document is good enough or not, and I think it was an important concept, and I've read a lot of support for the principles section, but now we are in the roadmap section and I would really urge us to change our mind-set.

In the roadmap section, it's not sufficient to provide descriptions of issues. We need deadlines. We need actions. Concrete. And I would really urge everyone, and everyone on the mic, to think of what we can do in the document to make it more concrete, because as it is now, I don't think we're passing the "good enough" test in this section and this is a good test for whether the outcome of this meeting is credible or not.

So my contributions now specifically will be regarding IANA first.

I support the -- in the Paragraph 25, the mention that the consultation should be extending beyond ICANN, and I'm really considering the IGF as a proper forum for that.

And I would support the comments voiced by the European Commission earlier this morning, and in the various publications, that the scope of the consultations should not be artificially limited unless we undermine

the trust in the outcome of this transition, and we need more trust in the IANA system.

And finally, I would like to support the enhancement and strengthening of the IGF and suggest that we add a reference to concrete deadlines for implementing the improved outcomes in Paragraph 19(a) and mention that these outcomes should be achieved at the latest by the Brazil meeting of the IGF.

Thank you very much.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you for your comments.

Now, a representative from private sector.

>>

Yes. My name is (saying name). I am here on behalf of Africa ICT Alliance, member of WITSA, and of ICC.

So I wish to shed light on two issues that deserve attention of all stakeholders in the Internet governance future evolution.

One is there are still clear awareness challenges related to Internet as a developing engine in many less-developed countries. So many of the challenges users face on the Internet are principally due to low awareness about and inability to implement solutions embracing Internet trust, integrity, security, privacy protection, and governance.

We, therefore, urge more support from all stakeholders for raising awareness about related best practices to ensure swift and positive use of Internet as a developing engine.

Second one is, we also suggest supporting stronger multistakeholder participation in the Internet governance from developing countries, providing more on-site participation support, as well as interactive remote participation.

Many related multistakeholders in developing countries did not have the opportunity to hear about this process at all.

And those (indiscernible) participant in -- from Africa could not attend NETmundial due to different technical or logistic or financial challenges, so I would recommend embracing more participation of multistakeholders from developing countries for future IG meetings. Thank you.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you very much for your comments.

And now I'm turning to a representative of civil society. Please.

>>

I am (saying name), acting head of digital at Article 19, and I am reading a joint statement from 100 civil society organizations and individuals

from the north and the south that met yesterday at (indiscernible) in Sao Paulo.

The proposed transition of the IANA functions to the global multistakeholder community is an important step in the globalization of Internet governance.

This transition should be discussed and designed with full deliberative participation of all relevant stakeholders from all regions in a variety of fora extending beyond the ICANN community and its meetings.

It is desirable to keep an adequate separation between the policy development process and operational aspects, as well as external accountability mechanisms.

All stakeholders must be able to meaningfully contribute to the deliberative IANA transition process, whether structural or functional separation is the best way to do this.

The DNS is a global resource so everyone has a stake in its future.

To safeguard the stability and security of this resource, transparency and accountability of ICANN in general, and of the board in specific, should be improved.

We concretely suggest to add to Paragraph 27, "It is desirable to keep an adequate separation between the policy development process and operational aspects as well as external accountability mechanisms," and we suggest to add to Paragraph 28, "Improved transparency and accountability of ICANN in general and the board in particular needs to be fully realized now as the IANA transition takes place."

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you very much for your statement, and for saving us 30 seconds. And now back to technical community.

>>

My name is (saying name). I'm representing the Russian nongovernmental think-tank, the Russian Center for Policy Studies. However, my comments concerning the roadmap for the future evolution of the Internet governance also incorporates some views of other Russian institutions representing the academia and technical community.

The first comment relates to paragraphs from 18 to 20, (indiscernible) of the roadmap, and it includes the following: The IGF mandate should be modified to allow the community to pass consensus-based decisions on the Internet governance policies, for their voluntary adoption in the framework of the WSIS.

Second comment relates to paragraphs from 25 to 28. The major aim is to provide for a clear division of functions with regard to IANA operation. Namely, policy development functions should be separated from technical functions and from administrative functions, with (indiscernible) of such functions to be set by stakeholders consensus and aside to dedicated organizations.

The mandate of these organizations should be agreed upon by means of a treaty, and their accountability mechanisms should be built with

account of best practices, including openness, nonpartisanship, stability, and resilience.

Appropriate deadlines and working plans should be developed for the aforementioned actions.

IGF 2015 and the expiration of IANA contract in September 2015 sounds like appropriate deadlines for the moment from this stage.

Thank you for your attention.

JANIS KARLINS:

Thank you very much for your comments, and now remote participation coordinator, please, you have the floor.

REMOTE INTERVENTION:

Okay. We have a comment coming from the remote participation hub from Cross River in Nigeria.

REMOTE INTERVENTION:

These are Nigeria civil society government on the private sector's comments on issues dealing with institutional improvements.

To achieve better results, properly constituted institutions made up of different stakeholders with a functional physical secretariat properly structured to handle different issues, receive, investigate, and recommend sanctions from defaulters to their regional IGF, from different regions based on an efficient segmentation model.

This secretariat should be able to coordinate regional activities. Various areas like security of user resources, transactions, availability of relevant Internet governance laws which should be domesticated in line with such standards. Provision of paid services over the Internet should attract a percentage of tax which should be shared between the originating country and the destination country, with a fraction going to IGF to run the secretariat properly.

JEANETTE HOFMANN:

Okay. Next is government.

>>

Okay. Thank you. I'm a representative from Cuba. I'm going to speak in Spanish. Much better for me.

With respect to the general document, we have the following observation.

We think it is a good document to start the discussion for the issue that brought all of us here, but there are some things missing in this document.

One of the things that is missing and is reflected in this section of the document is the nonrecognition or the non-affirmation of the commitments we have assumed in the process of the WSIS, the WSIS in Tunis and in Geneva.

With respect to these issues, the multistakeholder approach as it is called in English, we consider it is very important that in the context of

Paragraph 7, we should mention here Paragraph 78 of Tunis, where it says that all governments should participate on an equal foot, sharing the same responsibilities in the Internet governance process.

This is a significant issue. It was highlighted this morning by several speakers and it's good to make some reference to it.

Within the context of institutional improvements, we think that Paragraph 79 and 70 of Tunis should be included or reflected here. We have sent proposals through the organizers of the event in that respect.

In Paragraph 28, one mentioned ICANN and then this morning it was referred, as well as this afternoon, all the recognitions that were made in this respect. We think it's important that with respect to this organization, this should be done by following the principles of international law and we should include that reference and our delegation has a proposal in that respect.

Finally, we want to make an observation. I don't know. If we don't have time today, it will be tomorrow. With respect to security and stability. Within this framework, we think it's important -- okay. Okay. So --- proposal tomorrow just to be helpful to the table.

JEANETTE HOFMANN:

Yes, another section. So we hand over to the private sector.

KURT PRITZ:

My name is Kurt Pritz with the domain name association. I first want to thank the organizers, the volunteers, the Brazilian government, and

especially Hartmut Glaser and his team and Nick Tomasso and his team who have done great work.

The Domain Name Association, or the DNA, represents the interests of the domain name industry. This includes country code, top-level domains, and generic top-level domains. They're operators with firsthand experience working with the IANA function.

So I have some recommendations about paragraphs 25 through 27, which is the transition of the IANA oversight. I do not want to detract from the excellent principles there, but I have a couple of suggested additions.

ccTLD and gTLD operators are IANA's largest direct customers. And there will be close to 1600 TLDs soon. GTLD operators, a subset, will be IANA's largest customer with over 1300 members. This will be -- this will result in at least 1,000 IANA requests annually. The current ICANN proposal for fashioning a transition essentially excludes ccTLD operators from direct input.

I have many years of experience working with and reaching objectives in a multistakeholder model. It works well, and it will work in this IANA transition, as the document says.

It works because we have direct unfiltered access to experts in every area, in every area of the IANA work stream. Developing the transition process has to be customer focused and rely on the expertise of those with firsthand experience.

As ICANN board member Ray Plzak said in response to this issue at the ICANN-Singapore meeting, quote, "We don't have the equivalents from the name world sitting at the table. The point is that registries should be engaged in a much better manner than what they are right now. They are underrepresented in this."

So my suggestions are this, the DNA requests that --

[Timer sounds.]

-- additions to paragraphs 25 to 27 be made to, quote, one, the process reflect a focus on IANA's day-to-day partners; and, two, which is separate, the need to develop a reliable, tested and robust --

JEANETTE HOFMANN:

You need to come to an end. Thank you very much. Civil society is next.

>>

My name is Parminder Jeet Singh, and I come from IT for Change and I also speak for the Just Net Coalition. The first point is that the document lacks reference to the word "democracy" or "democratic." There is no reference to these words while "multistakeholderism" has been spoken of about 15 times. It should be recognized that multistakeholderism is a subsidiary principle to the larger principle of democracy. And this word "democratic" and "democracy" should be included in the document as many places as possible preceding the "multistakeholder" part.

The second part is that we should reference the WSIS documents, WSIS outcomes of the WSIS -- the summit, two summits, which I think would

mitigate many concerns that it is a kind of new start and many of the words are out of context. If we reference WSIS outcomes, that would make things much more balanced. And it should also be done in a forward-looking manner by referring to the WSIS +10 process that outcomes and the processes from here should feed into the WSIS +10 process.

And a separate point that WSIS +10 processes should be participatory and inclusive from agenda setting to the outcome.

Third is that the role of stakeholders was an issue Jeanette raised. I would prefer to include the language which says different stakeholders are different roles in different situations, whether we refer to Tunis Agenda or not.

And I would agree to the language used by the Vice President of Technology of the European Commission talking about general multistakeholderism and role defining being important. One of the specific outcomes from process could be to call for a meeting on democracy, multistakeholderism, and role of stakeholders. And I think that is one issue which is a smoke screen or a roadblock to discussing many other issues. So we should call for a separate meeting on that particular issue. Thank you.

JEANETTE HOFMANN:

Thank you.

[Applause]

Next is technical community and academia.

>> Thank you. My name is Hiro Hotta from JPRS, managing the Japanese ccTLD, dot.jp.

My comment may be very primitive. In the document, paragraph 3 refers to the successful experience of multistakeholder model. However, how it was successful is not described there. It doesn't mean that the many stakeholder players gathered together and talked. I don't think so.

So I think how it has been successful should be described or defined as concrete as possible in the document to share the definition of success. It is important for us to share to what extent we have been successful in order for us to raise ourselves to a higher level of success. Thank you.

JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you. Now is there a remote participant?

>> We have a text comment coming from Pakistan.

REMOTE PARTICIPATION: This is a question from the non-profit sector. To what extent shall we hope that NETmundial is going to be concrete and actionable with clear milestones and a timeline set as a way forward? Do you share the thought that heads of other states across the world should come forward and take initiatives to help strengthen multistakeholderism?

JANIS KARKLINS:

So thank you very much for this question. And the answer is very simple. The outcome document will be as actionable as we will make it actionable. And there we're discussing to put some milestones and concrete proposals for action as a result of this debate.

Now I'm turning to representative of governments, please.

>>

My name is Yamaguchi from the Ministry of Internet Affairs and Communication in Japan.

First of all, I would like to thank the Brazilian government and the CGI members and all related people for organizing the challenging meeting, useful meeting. I appreciate your very big effort.

And regarding the roadmap for the future, evolution of the Internet governance, roles of existing mechanisms are best on the multistakeholder approach should be respected, as Japan has also been insisting at CSTD, Commission on Science and Technology for Development, United Nations.

In this regard, international public policy issues in terms of the Internet have been widely discussed at the IGF with participation of multistakeholders, not a new mechanism. But IGF should be maintained and developed and used effectively in the discussion of the emerging topics.

Japan understands that the best ideas are included in the draft outcome.

On the other hand, we have two comments for the IGF improvements. The first point is about creative ways of providing outcome, our recommendation and analysis of policy options. Although we think the scope of the outcome recommendation is for emerging topics and issues, we need to implement them fully to pay attention of the education and collaboration with existing mechanisms in order to avoid the confusion of users.

The second point is about Number 20 -- 21, finding funding for IGF while ensuring stable --

[Timer sounds.]

And funding is essential (indiscernible) according to accountability and transparency necessary in order to avoid specific stakeholder influence on IGF. Thank you.

JANIS KARLINS:

Thank you very much. I would like to ask speakers try to stick to two minutes, please, and be maybe more precise if you have specific proposals for actions or deadlines that you are making.

Private sector, please.

MARILYN CADE:

Thank you. My name is Marilyn Cade. I'm a small business person who spends most of my time focusing on Internet governance and on ICANN matters. And many of the people in this room have seen me at a number of meetings.

I want to congratulate all of us, the organizers, the host, and the contributors to the work we have achieved and to where we are today. I like the comment made earlier by Jimson Olufuye from AfICTA about the spirit of NETmundial. I think this is, in fact, what we are all experiencing and should contribute to.

I think it is very important in the roadmap that we have acknowledged that Internet governance is not merely about ICANN. It is much more than that, and I really welcome and support that that is reflected.

Now to concrete comments. On paragraph -- sorry, on Number 1, paragraph 7, I wish to note that there is today a CSTD working group on enhanced cooperation. I am a member of that group from the business community. We're engaged in a gap analysis. And I would say that from my own view, enhanced cooperation is underway. There are others who question that. But the CSTD working group is working hard to identify gaps and to identify possible solutions.

I don't suggest this go into the document, but I do think it's important that that work be recognized and that people bring the output of NETmundial into the continuation of the CSTD working group.

I would also say that there is -- I want to talk briefly about the IGF and its importance and upon the -- about the sustainability of funding. I am a small business. I make a contribution to the funding. Many, many

more of us, not just governments and the technical community, can contribute to the financial continuation of the IGF. And we should, and we should also continue to advance the awareness about the importance of the IGF as a forum that can deal with tough topics but not in a tough way.

[Timer sounds.]

Thank you.

[Applause]

JANIS KARLINS:

Thank you. Thank you very much.

And now it is time for civil society.

>>

Thank you, chair. My name is Matthew Shears for the Center for Democracy and Technology. I'm going to look at Section 1 of the roadmap and address issues that deserve attention of all stakeholders.

I'm speaking on behalf of a number of civil society groups that believe that multistakeholder approaches are central to the future of the Internet ecosystem. They are an important mechanism for achieving greater openness, inclusivity, and involvement of persons around the globe in Internet governance issues. But we recognize there is much work to be done with regard to Internet governance processes.

What is clear is that we are all seeking open, inclusive processes that are accountable and transparent, and all stakeholders have responsibility for ensuring that they contribute to this important goal.

We agree that the multistakeholder approach needs to be elaborated upon, strengthened, and it must evolve. We do ourselves a disservice if we do not look hard at the models we apply to Internet governance. Scrutiny is good.

We need to move beyond the mantra of multistakeholderism to the practical application of multistakeholder approaches at all levels. We fully agree that the open and inclusive governance processes at the national level are essential to empowering individuals and realizing a people-centered, inclusive, and development-oriented information society.

As President Rousseff said this morning, the adoption of the Marco Civil clearly shows the feasibility and success of open multistakeholder discussions as well as the innovative use of the Internet.

Multistakeholder approaches are the means to achieving participatory democracy involving bottom-up processing and decision-making and providing a clear process for participation and accountability and helping to build trust between stakeholders.

Now, speaking as a representative of the Center of Democracy and Technology, I would like to address the issues of roles and responsibilities.

CTD does not support the insertion of roles and responsibilities in the manner of the Tunis Agenda. We have moved beyond those constraints. They no longer reflect the evolving roles of stakeholders, and they have no place in the meeting on the future of the Internet governance ecosystem.

[Timer sounds.]

Thank you.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you very much. And now I'm turning to representative of technical community and academia.

>>

Thank you very much. My name Robert Uzal, Nacional University of San Luis, Argentina. My last comment an hour ago was about the need to face cyberwarfare, international cybercrime, and mainly cyber espionage.

Two operational comments about that -- three operational comments.

(indiscernible) scheme to be applied when cyberattacks occur, taking into account Article 51 of the nation's charter, will probably conduct a cyberweapon proliferation.

There are an important amount of antecedents that indicate the cyberweapon proliferation will be wars of nuclear war proliferation.

Here we have additional support to search an international and a specific agreement. Cooperation is not enough in my opinion.

The development of technology and feasibility of tools to detect cyber espionage, cyber warfare, international cybercrime, cyber money laundering as an example is easy to be illustrated. At Nacional University de San Luis, we have developed prototypes of tools in the (indiscernible). Political support to do that is the key point.

And, last, a question: How to protect privacy without privacy violation? Answer, I.T. profession know that when two or more computers are communicated, that communication is established in seven layers. The most sensitive layer for privacy is layer Number 7, the application layer. Our prototype worked with ---

[Timer sounds.]

And routers. No human rights (indiscernible).

Thank you very much for your organizational effort.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you very much. We have remaining 20 minutes, and I would like to draw the line of speakers at this moment. I see that there are two representatives from civil society in line. There are two representatives of government, two representatives of technical community, and four representatives of private sector plus remote participation. So this is it for today's session.

And tomorrow we will start with the discussion of the third and fourth section -- fourth and fifth section of this roadmap.

Remote participation, please.

>> We have a couple of comments coming from the Sao Paulo, Brazil remote participation hub.

REMOTE INTERVENTION: Brazil, civil society. Which are the measures not to be so dependent on external infrastructure that is with the information of users in other countries? Second question: Brazil, from the academic sector, we know that traffic in the network goes through the United States. What is Brazil doing to get free from this (indiscernible)?

JEANETTE HOFMANN: That was it? Okay. Then next is government.

>> Thank you, chair. My name is Shelley Clarke-Hinds. I'm a representative of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago. My comment is specifically to paragraph 4 and the second sentence. First, I would like to suggest that the use of the word "geographic" before "diversity" could be seen as being very limited, and it might suffice to simply use "diversity." We already have references to "cultural" and "linguistic diversity" as well as

"gender." So in this part of the sentence, it may be useful to just stick with "diversity" which would be more general.

Secondly, it should come as no surprise that Trinidad and Tobago would wish to amend that sentence, and the latter part of the sentence, so that it reads, and I quotes, "And includes stakeholders from developing countries, least developed countries, and small island developing states."

I'm not happy that Trinidad and Tobago is perhaps the only (indiscernible) who submitted a contribution to this process. It speaks to the lack of participation on behalf of small states. And even in terms of participation in this meeting, there's only a handful of us here. I think there needs to be a signal sent to small countries that they need to participate actively and not simply be mere recipients of processes and the outcomes.

This is internationally of developing states, of small island developing states, and this process can feed into other processes. So I would like to make that suggestion for your consideration. Thank you.

[Applause]

JEANETTE HOFMANN:

Thank you very much for this comment. Next is private sector.

>>

Thank you. Good evening. My name is Martin Boyle. I'm with Nominet, the dot uk Internet domain name registry.

I would like to start off with paragraph 7 on enhanced cooperation and note that since 2005, the relevant organizations that were identified in the Tunis Agenda have each put in a lot of effort to develop models for enhanced cooperation.

We would note the contributions to the CSTD working group on enhanced cooperation. And we believe that the NETmundial output paper should make specific reference to the work that has been done by the community over the years since CC in responding to WSIS. And we would also like it to encourage governments to engage in those processes. And deliverable time scale for that is, of course, the CSTD working on enhanced cooperation.

I would move to paragraph 16, new mechanisms to consider emerging topics and issues. And we would not favor new mechanisms. Emerging topics are already in the IGF mandate. And if we were to keep this paragraph, it should have a clear reference to the IGF in the paragraph.

For the IANA paragraphs, 25, 26 and 27, in general, we think that these are around about right. The discussion is going on elsewhere. And any contribution from NETmundial should be based on general principles.

And very quickly on paragraph 21, we would greatly welcome more sustainable funding for the IGF.

[Timer sounds.]

JEANETTE HOFMANN:

Thank you very much. Next is civil society.

>>

Good afternoon. My name is (saying name) from the Internet users in Peru.

I want to congratulate the organizing committee in Brazil for this opportunity of discussing relevant issues that motivate us to be here today. Internet users.

So I try and represent right now the end users of the Internet.

First of all, we agree with the general terms of the draft document and we hope that the final outcome document be approved. But we hope that this will not be just a document, but an instrument, a roadmap going beyond April 23.

So we want this instrument to be the genesis of the new Internet. And I'm talking about the new Internet because it's far away from the initial talent that the founders of the Internet that have been with us today in the morning were motivated.

The Internet that wants to be built right now is based on the agents present here, and we would like to include in the final document the words "Internet users," the term "Internet users," because the end users try and -- the governments try to regulate end users, the private sector try to maximize their benefits and have larger products with more quality of service that are targeting the users.

The civil society is projecting its best talent so as to develop new capacities for Internet units.

RFC-1591 created by Jon Postel includes the purpose of the standards and talks about service-oriented, targeted at the end users and the community. So please include "Internet users" as terms apart from state, civil society, businesses, et cetera.

And finally just one second. I would like to congratulate the effort of Colombia to generate the new Internet management committee.

JEANETTE HOFMANN:

--- intervention. Next is the technical community and academia.

>>

Okay. I'm going to extremely fast here. Again, the Information Society Project all the plenipotentiary --- communicate to the U.N. GIS that need to build in recognition of each key characteristics and recognize impacts on the Internet and WSIS goals, measure the outcomes relating to both open Internet and special service, managed service framework.

We need to add a principle to recognize the universal general purpose interoperability of the Internet that we already have, as opposed to policy-based interoperability which is what is being formulated.

And quickly, we don't -- as we proceed toward the U.N. assessment of the future steps at the plenipotentiary at the end of this year, we don't want to prejudge the outcomes of the WSIS+10 process, and this is something that Dilma is particularly interested in.

We don't want to predetermine the outcomes of the WSIS+10 review. We have to fix the ITU's plenipotentiary frame, so the terms "Internet,"

"IP-based networks" and "NGNs" are clarified and so that the outcomes of the Information Society don't continue to produce that confusion. We need to correct those.

Plenipotentiary 137 specifically states the plenipotentiary body's commitment to rolling out next-generation networks to developing countries throughout the world without recognizing the tradeoffs that are implied.

We have to fix the ITU's WSIS measures because they do not recognize the distinction and they are built as a basis for conformance and interoperability in support of the technical barriers for trade agreements.

We have to assess the WSIS+10 candidly in these terms. We have to see how action lines were impaired by this oversight and how the Internet itself is affected by this oversight.

And for Dilma's reference, just go back to the Internet governance principles. Human rights affects Action Lines C6 and C5, and culture and linguistic diversity affects C8, C3, C4 and C11.

JEANETTE HOFMANN:

Thank you very much. I think you got your point across.

So now remote participation.

Is anybody wanting to speak?

REMOTE INTERVENTION: No further comments from remote participation hubs. Sorry.

JEANETTE HOFMANN: Thank you.

JANIS KARLINS: Thank you. Thank you very much. Then I am now turning to the representative of the government. Please.

>> Good night. My name is (saying name) Lopez. I'm speaking on behalf of the government of Mexico.

First of all, I would like to thank the Brazilian government for this initiative. It's been very clear that what we need is that all voices inside this room tonight have a space to speak and may move forward to the issues that interest us all.

So Mexico supports the enhancements of the IGF. We think that the outcome document should go to the IGF, it's the multistakeholder model that we need, and we think this is the adequate space so as to follow up everything that has been mentioned today. Thank you.

JANIS KARLINS: Thank you very much for your comment, and now a representative of private sector.

JAMES SENG:

Hi. Sorry. My name is James Seng. I'm representing -- I'm sorry, I'm from (saying name). (saying name) is the largest data center in China, independent data center.

Two comments on the transition of IANA function.

It's important to recognize that IANA is beyond the domain names and IP addresses. There are a lot of protocol parameters that's being managed and coordinated by IANA, and therefore, in response to Paragraph 25, it's recognized that the process to transition IANA includes stakeholders extending beyond the ICANN community but it's also equally important that the outcome of that process also includes stakeholders beyond the ICANN community, which is what I don't see in Paragraph 29.

The second comment is that with respect to twenty- -- Paragraph 27, there's optimism that we will complete the transition by September 2015. Under the AoC commitment by -- that was signed in 2009, it is not necessary that we will complete in 2015. The U.S. Government has a right to extend the AoC by two terms of two years each, which means the latest we could see this transition happens is 2019.

We do need to make some worst-case scenario that if we don't get the transition happen by September 2015, what do we do. And that may be a session on the way forward. Thank you.

JANIS KARLINS:

Thank you very much. Now, a representative of civil society.

VLADIMIR RADUNOVIC: Thank you, Chair. My name is Vladimir Radunovic on behalf of DiploFoundation and I come from Yugoslavia. At least my badge says so. I'm from Serbia.

As a member of MAG and the steering committee of 1net, I also want to thank to the organizers of NETmundial for the opportunity and also the opportunity to strengthen the IGF even further, which I'm sure is going to be one of the outcomes of this event.

I have two points to make.

One is to improve one of the noncontroversial issues, which is in Paragraph 11, where we mention remote participation.

It should be changed into eParticipation. The change is not just cosmetic. It is conceptual.

Basically, remote participation or online participation, as it will be more fair to title it, serves for the meetings only while eParticipation is much broader concept and gives much more opportunity for participation, including within it intersessional dialogue.

The second point is with regards to the Paragraph 21 where we mention the improvements of the IGF and the funding.

I strongly support previous comments on greater financial support for the IGF, so I invite for the change in Paragraph 21 with a bit of a stronger language which would invite for a commitment by governments and nongovernmental stakeholders to financially support the IGF.

Thank you.

JANIS KARLINS:

Thank you very much. Now academia?

BILL DRAKE:

Thank you. Good evening. Bill Drake from the University of Zurich. I'm also the chair of the noncommercial users constituency in ICANN.

First, I would support all of the statements pertaining to strengthening the IGF. That said, I wanted to focus on a paragraph people have not spent much time on. This is Paragraph 24.

This is the one that refers to communication and coordination and then goes on to talk about creating mechanisms for information sharing.

I would suggest to split that paragraph into two, to take out the third sentence, and develop it a little bit more as a separate paragraph of one sentence, which would read as follows: Full consideration should be given to establishing multistakeholder mechanisms to promote the ongoing monitoring and analysis of Internet governance developments and the on-demand sharing of the knowledge on policy issues, models, and experiences that governments and stakeholders need to help them identify effective solutions.

Why?

This paragraph is conflating two different issues. The issue of coordination among existing bodies. And we all know that this has been

debated for decades, since the early days of WSIS. Everybody always likes to say that all the bodies need to coordinate. Of course none of the bodies actually want to be coordinated.

But that's an ongoing problem that we always struggle with. And if the text wants to say that we should have adequate coordination, that's fine.

But the third sentence is actually referring to a different sort of idea that has been floating around also for decades, since the early days of WSIS, and this is the notion of having some kind of knowledge bank or clearinghouse, information-sharing kind of mechanism, that would help governments and other stakeholders on an on-demand basis secure the information and knowledge they need to be able to identify effective solutions to problems.

Particularly, with regard to the so-called orphan issues that don't have a clear institutional home. People disagree if those exist. But other multidimensional issues as well.

So I would separate this paragraph. Look at that. Perfect. Thanks.

JANIS KARLINS:

Thank you very much. And now two of our speakers coming from private sector. And so please, ma'am, you have the floor.

>>

Good evening --- so VeriSign has been an active participant in the Internet Governance Forum pretty much since its very beginning.

We have also contributed to the IGF Trust Fund for several years now.

For us, the IGF with its inclusive, open, and democratic nature, is the central and leading venue for Internet governance discussions. However, we recognize, as already pointed out in the outcome document, that there is a need for a strengthened Internet Governance Forum.

Specifically, I'd like to say that improved outputs should include creative ways of providing findings of IGF sessions.

Extending the IGF's mandate beyond five-year terms would contribute significantly to the strengthening -- strengthening of the Internet Governance Forum.

Ensuring guaranteed, stable, and predictable funding for the IGF is absolutely essential and we'll do our best to help in this regard.

And last, but not least, the IGF should continue to support the growth of national and regional IGF initiatives as a key contributor to the Internet governance discussion intersessionally. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you very much.

And the, again, representative of private sector.

TIM CONWAY:

Thank you very much. My name is Tim Conway. I'm from Australia. I'm the member representative of the Australian Information Industry Association to WITSA, it is World Information and Technology Services Alliance.

Like everybody else, congratulations to the organizers. I don't envy your task in drawing this together in less than 24 hours.

I wish to address institutional improvements, and in particular meaningful participation.

WITSA is a global alliance of 85 ICT associations. A key feature of its membership is while its membership comprises the major ICT organizations of the developed world, in fact, the majority of our members by number are drawn from developing ICT industries of emerging economies.

If you go to the Web site WITSA.org you'll see a membership map that strikingly illustrates this.

It is important to understand the implications of this distribution, and especially the representation and meaningful participation of the ICT sector from these nations as stakeholders in Internet governance arrangements.

As we said in our content submission, the Internet and the ICT sector are mutually dependent. The presence of the Internet enables the development of the ICT sector, especially in emerging economies, and the development of the ICT sector in those economies strengthens and extends access and capability of the Internet in those countries.

However, all too often the ICT sector in those countries is unable to effect -- participate effectively in multistakeholder meetings such as this. Why? Because many of the programs that provide support for attendance and participation specifically exclude the private sector.

That is quite simply discriminatory and reflects incorrect perceptions.

The private sector in those countries is almost universally startups and SMEs.

All stakeholders should be treated equally and we request this be given priority consideration for all future multistakeholder meetings.

Thank you.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS:

So thank you very much for your comments.

That brings us to the end of a discussion of Sections 1 and 2 of the roadmap, and since this is -- this was about Internet Governance Forum and strengthening of Internet Governance Forum, I would like to use this opportunity in my capacity as chairman of the MAG to remind that there was a call for voluntary contribution of information by 30 of June on the very simple issue.

Those who are skeptical about usefulness of IGF usually says it is just a talk show, and the call was to provide information what decisions or

concrete actions has been taken by organizations as a result of discussion in IGF of relevant subject matters.

So we would like to compile that information and present it at the opening of IGF 2014 to demonstrate that the discussion forum brings concrete results where these decisions should be -- should be made.

So the deadline for submission is 30 of June and I would invite you to look at IGF Web site the -- where address, email address, is indicated.

So that brings us to the end of this session, and for concluding announcements, I will turn to Jeanette Hofmann.

JEANETTE HOFMANN:

Yes. We'd first like to commend you for your stamina, your patience, and your attention. I think that's quite remarkable, considering the time.

Second, I'd like to announce that we now will have a break for half an hour, so that all people can find some food, and the session where we then address all the comments received today will start at 9:00, but there is a change of room.

We will now meet in the upstairs lounge, which is in the annex building across the lobby on the second floor. 9:00. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]