
NETmundial – Setting NETmundial Goals
Wednesday, April 23, 2014 – 14:00 to 15:00
NETmundial – São Paulo, Brazil

VIRGILIO ALMEIDA:

Good afternoon. I would like to thank the presence of you all and ask your excuse for the beginning of the session. But the fact is we had a long but fruitful session this morning. We're going to start now the work aiming at finding together, we, the several groups and all the stakeholders present here, we want to find the goals established for NETmundial, which is a list of principles for the future of Internet governance and a roadmap of actions, concrete measures that should be taken to adapt the system of Internet governance to the need of the network, to the global needs.

The session we are starting now aims at showing the organization of NETmundial, what was done in terms of obtaining the participation of the several stakeholders to collect contributions of proposals, suggestions relative to the evolution of the Internet governance ecosystem, and also to discuss the processes and actions that will be put forward today and tomorrow in order to achieve the expected results relative to the principles and suggestions for the future.

I'm not going to talk about details, but I would like to say that one important characteristic that measures the success of this conference is the participation of all stakeholders, all those involved in Internet governance.

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.

I have a graph here showing in terms of participation in the conference today 20% of the participants are from the private sector, 10% from the technical community, 10% from academia, 23% of the social or civil society, 19 governments and the remaining has other characteristics. So we have the representativeness of a multistakeholder model that has guided the organization of this conference.

The details on the process of how the documents were written, this is going to be discussed by Raul Echeberria who's going to speak now. He's going to talk about this document now.

RAUL ECHEBERRIA:

Thank you very much, Professor Virgilio. My name is Raul Echeberria. I'm the COO of LACNIC, the regional registry of I.P. addresses for Latin America and the Caribbean. And I participated in the Executive Committee of NETmundial representing the technical community. Together with Akinori Maemura from Japan that is somewhere in the room and committees from the Brazilian Steering Committee of the Internet, CGI.

The Executive Committee was one of the committees that was created on the basis of the structure of this meeting. It was said specifically for this meeting there's no precedence so all the structure for the meeting was quite enormative, created from scratch with no past reference. But from the very beginning we focused our attention on the participation of all stakeholders. In addition to being part of the Executive Committee as a representative of the Internet technical community, I have been honored because Mr. Virgilio Almeida, chair of the

(indiscernible), invited me to be one of the chairs of the Executive Committee together with Demi Getschko from the -- from CGI that is here in the front row.

The Executive Committee had different responsibilities. One of it was to define the participation criteria. In that respect, we wanted to be open. Instead of defining a participation criteria, we opened the registration to whoever was interested in participating. And on that basis, we took a group of criteria, gave it priority to different geographical areas, and to the individuals who have made contributions to the contents. And nobody -- nobody was left out. So everybody was approved. And I think that the criterion was the correct one.

The other objectives, the other responsibility of the Executive Committee, was to set an agenda for the meeting, a format for the meeting, and preparation of the documents. And I will focus my presentation on that.

The committee, as I mentioned, the Executive Committee, was a multistakeholder committee. There was participation that was quite diverse. We are multistakeholders; so this ensures diverse opinions, diverse views. But the characteristics of the people in the committee really contributed a very high level of diversity to the committee. The whole work of the committee was made with the spirit of collaboration, our commitment. The commitment of all members of the committee was really very high as well. We have more than 80 hours of work, intense work, through conferences, through meetings, and high level of email exchanges and online work.

We did all this using some collaborative tools that were provided by the secretariat. The secretary really in charge, Daniel Fink. He was around. Daniel, can you please put your hand up? Daniel? He is a low-profile guy.

Daniel Fink was in the secretary and did an excellent job. I really think they have reached the utmost efficiency levels. So this helped us do our job.

At the very first meeting, we started working on the document, preparing the documents. We held some meetings to define how are going to work. And when we sat all around the same table preparing the document, the period for the contributions was over. We received 188 contributions from various sources and we had two options with the co-chair of the Executive Committee, Demi Getschko. We had two options. One was to work on a preliminary document, and the other was to start from scratch.

And we decided to start by the toughest one, so start with a blank page. It really looks like a Titanic mission. It was a huge work. But all the members of the committee were really committed, and so we prepared the first draft. Many of you have read that draft because it was posted in several unofficial sites of NETmundial. Certainly, I cannot verify that all the versions that were circulated were the same. We asked for comments the first time. The first time it was the high-level committee, so it was to check the concepts, to have a first round of comments to see how far we were going, how far away we were from a balanced document.

We received comments from all the members of the High-Level Multistakeholder Committee, quite proper comments.

So on that basis, the Executive Committee worked during two days and prepared another draft. That draft was posted and was intended to be posted from the beginning. It has been published on the Internet for two weeks. And we have received 1,370 comments. So only due to the efficient work of the secretary, we could summarize and systematize them.

One of the committees that was created as part of this constellation of small working groups was a committee called "board," the NETmundial board. There we have the chairs, the co-chairs of the High-Level Committee, the Executive Committee. And the purpose of this board was just to increase the coordination, enhance the coordination and to make some decision that was necessary for the process to move forward efficiently.

But one thing that we should point out is that there was no influence on the board on the preparation of the documents. The documents we have prepared and were the responsibility of the Executive Multistakeholder Committee with that diverse representation and diverse participation that I mentioned before. So we formed a bottom-up process, and we tried to summarize all the comments that we've received, comments and contributions, of course.

It would be difficult or incorrect to say that there's 188 contributions and 1,370 comments represent everybody. We cannot be sure of that. But we can ensure that all the comments we received have been

carefully read, carefully analyzed, carefully discussed and suddenly represent a great variety and diversity of the points of view of everybody. So even though we may not say that it represents everybody, we may say that it represents quite overall views of the Internet governance issue.

The document we prepared is quite balanced. Sometimes you have to take into account that the comments you receive related to a paragraph. We have received comments that are contradictory one to the other. So we try and incorporate those comments. And in some cases, we arrive to a point of saying, well, the text we have prepared is quite closer to common grounds, to the balanced point. So we have to face this meeting with that idea in mind. Our major challenge is through this discussion because discussions are not starting today. The discussions started from the very first contribution that we received when the period for contributions was open. So we have collected lots of those contributions, lots of comments. And now we are at the final stage. In the spirit we used for working at the Executive Committee, and I hope this meeting will use the same spirit in its work, is that apart from reinforcing the positions and the views of each of us, we have to bear in mind that the goal is to reach an outcome that represents the views of all of us who have participated in the process.

So to conclude it, I think I took more than what I was given, more time than I was given. So I apologize to the chair. But a few minutes ago I was talking with someone who's experienced in Internet governance in the cyber-forum and he was saying certainly this is a successful process.

We take into account the time we had to prepare for this, so the time was short. We had to incorporate enormous processes. And I think everything worked quite smoothly. So I was very happy this morning when I listened to Nnenna, that she said we are here, we are participating here because we trust in the process. So I was gratified by that, was really very happy. And I hope all of you share my view. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

VIRGILIA ALMEIDA:

Thank you, Raul, for the information on the process of the document writing. I will ask Carlos Afonso to talk about the inclusive nature of NETmundial.

CARLOS AFONSO:

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I'm still under the impact of the words of our dear Nnenna. I'm very happy by the passing of Marco Civil, Internet Civil Framework Act, sanctioned by the President. I'm happy to be part of this group.

The result is here now. We have hundreds of representatives of all sectors and regions of the planet that are here to discuss the challenges of Internet governance, particularly relative to the rights of citizens.

We had an intensive participation of all stakeholders from the beginning. I believe that all opinions and visions relative to Internet governance were heard. The challenge of searching consensus when compiling hundreds of comments and many, many comments and we

had suggestions, well, it was a challenge to gather and compile this in this document that has --- and I say as President Dilma said also without any --- we need to guarantee the expression of individual opinions. And this is one of the results of NETmundial.

I would like to say something that I said in IGF in Baku in 2012.

We had agreed that it's essential to ensure the participation in the formulation of policies, and multistakeholder process allows this.

We need to be careful because multistakeholder participation cannot be an end in itself.

To open or to intensify the participation of voices of all sectors in governance structures does not ensure that citizenship rights will be protected or that the best policies will be established.

This space is created for pluralistic participation. Well, in these spaces, sometimes government and very powerful forces may take hold of these spaces.

We have to take into account the civil rights of all citizens. Making decisions by the governments must take into account the opinions of all stakeholders. Government, civil society, technical community, private sector, academia may not include all sectors. In fact, we have some movements that do not fit in these categories. We have to make an effort to include minorities, different ethnicities and excluded populations.

Participation goes beyond representation and making decisions goes beyond debate and discussion.

I believe in a participatory process. I believe that this, in NETmundial, took this into account. I'd like to show some figures here.

We tried -- we strived to have flexible and open participation. We had a call for participation of content. We received 180 comments from 140 different countries -- 46 different countries. I'm sorry.

830 participants are here on-site representing governments, civil sector, civil society, academia -- and the academia, international companies and individuals.

Remote participation hubs allowing the interaction are active. We have 33 hubs in 30 cities of 23 countries.

So I'd like to finish, saying that this is the result of this effort of pluralistic participation. This is what helps us arrive here. Thank you.

[Applause]

VIRGILIO ALMEIDA:

Thank you. I'll ask Zahid to speak about the processes that were used to organize this conference.

ZAHID JAMIL:

Thank you, Chair.

It's a pleasure to be here. Obviously there's no translation for those who aren't speaking English and that is a problem for me, but I'm supposed to speak about the conference and the process for organizing.

I represent the business. I'm their liaison on the executive committee, the EMC. And I want to sort of make it clear, obviously, that business is here and wants to be helpful, and, with cautious optimism, to be a positive and reinforcing voice to the multistakeholderism process here that is seen.

Initially, when the process of this -- or the announcement of this meeting was publicized, there were some challenges that business and many others may have felt with respect to some of the skepticism or the confusing or conflicting facts, and so when -- at the IGF in Bali, there were some questions, et cetera, but by the time of the ICANN meeting, I think there was more clarity and there were more businesses coming on board.

We saw that the 1net list and that the CGI organizing role emerged. We saw that the stakeholders represented -- the liaisons were actually chosen from the stakeholder groups, and they were placed onto the various official positions that were created in the board as well as the HLMC as well as EMC. And that was helpful because it gave us the ability to provide input into the agenda and for the preparations of this meeting.

The first face-to-face meeting was actually very important. It set expectations and had a very inclusive, I must say, constructive atmosphere of trust which began to emerge as a result.

In our deliberations, we balanced the need not just to have -- you know, not -- not to have unfinished documents circulated. Well, this was

respected for the most part. And to be transparent and open for all decisions or documents that were finalized.

Transparency and clear communication were key to ensuring that there was going to be active participation from around stakeholders, and in order to ensure that we avoid misconceptions within the community.

Transparency was also something that we lived by because we ensured that there was not going to be any influence created by any of the sort of hierarchies. The EMC worked fairly independently, I must say.

Initially, there was some limited time provided for consultations by the liaisons to go back to the stakeholder groups, and that was a challenge, but this became far more difficult when less and less time was available.

And this was not, we believe, necessarily a problem of intention but an unintentional outcome of and a function of the limited time that was available, because we were trying to run a process which ordinarily may have taken a year, but it had to be done in a few months.

Therefore, this underscores the importance and the need to give time when undertaking multistakeholder processes.

I must thank ICANN, which provided excellent support for remote participation. I have to say that without those, I think the EMC's work would have been impossible, unless we'd be meeting face-to-face on those several hours that we participated on these remote participation tools, like Adobe Connect.

So there were not -- you know, it was not all smooth sailing, for instance. There were still questions about consensus. You know, how

decisions are to be made. This was unclear, but recently, I think there is a better understanding, once we arrived here in Sao Paulo, and a commitment to be -- to having a much more inclusive approach to decision-making by garnering consensus from all stakeholders was something that was achieved in some preparations within the EMC.

I would like here to also mention the importance given to the contributions, people who provided contributions online. Initially 187 were taken into account by the EMC in preparing the documentation. Now, with the 1,370 contributions and what we will hear at the mics, I think it represents the amount of not just comments that we will be receiving, but the work that we will have to do when we actually try and look at the document again today and tomorrow.

And this represents the inclusiveness and the respect that the ECM and this process has for the voices of the room as well.

In this, it is also vital to mention the great work of the CGI, Daniel. Call him the man on speed. He produces documents overnight with 88 pages. Boggles us. I mean, we have to read them. He actually drafts them up.

Also want to thank Raul, our chair, Ambassador Benedicto, who played a very, very productive role within the process of the EMC but I think the most salient role was -- from at least my experience, was Demi Getschko, who may be in the Hall of Fame but we feel that he did a fantastic job in trying to basically bring consensus to whatever extent we could, who engendered trust and cooperation in one of our smaller

principles group and throughout the process, so that was very important.

The assistance by the CGI and the Brazilian government for me as a developing country person to get visas, et cetera, and other support to come here for logistics on visas and things were very important. I thought that was very well and efficiently done.

But I want to turn quickly to something else which is more important. That is, the issues and the outcomes which may arise from this process.

It is the importance of the philosophy of this process of multistakeholderism, its meaning. The journey is way more important. It's not the destination that is the important thing today.

Whether we all agree or not, the multistakeholderism and multistakeholderism principle today has seen a success and an acceptance across borders.

The values and principles of multistakeholderism work -- and its work have been successfully embraced by leaders and stakeholders in the south. By Brazil, President Rousseff, and again, as you saw today.

This is truly a moment for celebration and celebrating the multistakeholder model and its infusion internationally.

This is not just anymore a North American or European model, but something developing countries find works for them as well, and is the new way forward as an evolution of human progress.

Of course there is still work to be done. For instance, in terms of ensuring that consensus is reached, which is what President Dilma said that must be done, with all stakeholders, and ensure all opinions are meaningfully taken on board. But as I said, that's something addressed in very recent discussions as we move forward to what is an outcome truly representative of the entire community with all stakeholders, or at least the significant majority of each and every stakeholder, on board.

As a member of the developing world, it is for me very heartening to see that even developing countries and the south can now play a leading, constructive, productive, positive, and a bridge-building role in moving humanity and development forward as fully productive and contributing partners in such important areas of development of human progress.

In this case, transitioning from what is an old system of multilateralism to the new era of multistakeholderism, as was very ably demonstrated by the CGI in their work and how we got here as well, and to some extent the Marco Civil, and especially this meeting today and tomorrow.

We definitely have great hopes that this conference will continue to demonstrate the same good faith in its processes of inclusiveness of all voices and the merits of true multistakeholderism as we move forward today and tomorrow. Wishing us all the best in this endeavor and thanking the Brazilian government again, thank you very much.

[Applause]

VIRGILIO ALMEIDA: Thank you, Zahid, for your words. Ambassador Benedicto. We have Ambassador Benedicto. Thank you for your contribution, Zahid Jamil, and now we have Benedicto Fonseca, Ambassador.

BENEDICTO FONSECA FILHO: Thank you, Virgilio. I'd like to begin saying that it's a great pleasure and honor to be here. I have been involved from the very beginning in the preparation of this meeting, working as a member of the executive committee and also in the coordinating meetings from the Brazilian administration.

So I see -- I'm very pleased to see this level of engagement and participation from different constituencies.

This is very good news for this meeting.

And I'd like now to turn into English because I'd like to address directly the majority.

--- forgiveness for that. Well, I'd like to say that as we were starting preparing for this meeting, we wanted that this meeting would relate to existing processes, Internet governance processes, but also seek to energize those processes.

So we were not thinking of this meeting as something detached from what we have in existence today from the processes that are dealing with Internet governance, but rather, that out of this meeting would come out a message or some call for those processes to be further enhanced and, in some cases where there has been some stalemates, maybe by working in an ambiance that is outside the scope of an

existing process that does not have boundaries that might give us the flexibility to move and try to provide for something new.

So this was based on President Dilma's call for this meeting. This is the context in which we have worked.

Having said that, I would like to say that from the start, at least from the perspective of those members of the Brazilian government that were sitting at the executive panel, executive committee, for us it was crystal clear that the outcome documents arising from the WSIS process are the framework, are the necessary framework for our work.

We don't see anything that we could do in the context of this meeting or any outcome coming outside of this meeting that would be inconsistent with those outcome documents, especially the Tunis Agenda.

That is to say, the Tunis Agenda reflects, to our understanding, a consensus among the global community. And I am saying "global" meaning not only intergovernmental but the global community, because our understanding is that although the WSIS process might have initiated as an intergovernmental process, it ended up being much more than that.

Maybe formerly it was adopted by governments but it reflects a very wide basis of views, so we think this is the legitimate framework we have been working, and nothing -- we won't like to be interpreting that this meeting is -- propose something else outside this framework.

And as a member of the Brazilian government, as the director of the department that is in charge to follow up on Internet governance processes, I would be very concerned if someone comes and tells me that we are doing something contrary or inconsistent with Tunis because then I will have to explain to my superiors what I've been doing here.

So please, if anyone finds anything in the document that is inconsistent, please tell me. I would be very much interested about this.

I'd like to mention three very specific areas, and I want also to relate to some comments I have been receiving that -- for example, in relation to the multistakeholder approach or aspect, that we are here going beyond what is in Tunis by saying that everything should be done with all stakeholders on an equal footing.

There is no such thing in these documents.

On the contrary, we have made clear that everything we do should -- the stakeholders should be done in a multistakeholder fashion, but according to respective roles and responsibilities.

To our understanding, that covers a broad range of situations. Situations in which, according to those different roles and responsibilities the leadership should go to the technical and academic community, but in other areas the responsibility, the sovereign responsibility of states, is not being considered, is not being touched.

I think this was already stated by my president so I don't need to interpret what she said but just say that we are working within this understanding.

If there is reference to equal footing, it refers to, to my recollection, two contexts. The work that is being called upon to be undertaken under ICANN, in the ICANN transition. In that context, it is true we found equal footing would make sense. And also in the context of IGF.

I don't think you will find anywhere in the text any other reference to equal footing in regard to other processes which, as I have said, requires a case-by-case analysis, because according to the issue under discussion, the context, it will require different models of intervention.

So this is one thing I'd like to highlight.

I have also heard that we are here just endorsing the status quo. I'd like to -- in that regard to make two references.

We are -- there is a reference to enhanced cooperation. To our understanding, two very important processes emerged from WSIS. One is IGF, which is running well. That has been implemented. And we want to strengthen IGF. Actually, Brazil offered to host the IGF next year. We hope, by the way, to find all of you here next year.

So IGF is clearly one thing that was proposed by WSIS that has become a reality and we want to strengthen it.

The other one is enhanced cooperation, and here we are dealing with international public policy Internet-related issues.

To our understanding, we know there are different interpretations -- to our understanding and according to the literal wording, that relates very specifically to governmental responsibilities on equal footing, and you may have seen that the document makes reference to enhanced cooperation, makes a call for the process on enhanced cooperation to speed up and to be taken up on an urgent basis.

So we are here saying that the status quo in relation to this is not satisfactory, that we want movement in that regard.

The other thing related to status quo -- and this has already been addressed by my president -- is in regard to the ICANN transition that has been initiated after the announcement by the U.S. Government. So here we are talking about something that will change the present status quo, that we welcome this decision, this announcement. And we want to be part of the discussion towards making it a reality.

And then you see that the document makes a call for this process to take into account public interest, to be a comprehensive process that will encompass not only those insiders today but also have more comprehensive participation. So, again, here we are talking about changing the present status quo.

I think some of those criticisms that have been voiced, as we look into the actual language that is being proposed, I personally would be very comfortable to discuss it with anyone and try, if there is some adjustment to be made, to clarify some of those areas. Again, I would be first interested in doing so because I bear responsibility in that regard. And, again, I'd like to join my colleagues in welcoming in

proposing this document for your comments. It can certainly be improved. It reflects an attempt that was made by us working under very severe conditions of time constraints and working on the basis of hundreds and hundreds of pages, contributions, and comments. So certainly this is not a perfect document. It is to be improved. But we would like this to be seen -- and this has been our perspective -- in the light of something that has a framework. We are not working outside. We are not inventing something new. We are trying to implement something that has already been agreed, and we want to do it. Of course, the message that is being sent is a clear message in regard to the endorsement of this notion that emerges clearly from the WSIS process. And this is our contribution to try to make it a reality but in a way that we'll serve the interests of governments, civil society, private sector, everyone.

We don't see an outcome that would be detrimental to government or detrimental to -- again, if that is interpretation, I would be very much interested in discussing this and making sure this is not the case. Thank you. I apologize for being so long. Thank you very much.

[Applause]

VIRGILIA ALMEIDA:

Thank you, Ambassador.

And now we have Professor Jeanette that will talk about mechanics and how we reach consensus.

JEANETTE HOFMANN:

Yeah, my name is Jeanette Hofmann. I'm an academic researcher in the field of Internet governance. And I live and work in Berlin, Germany.

I'm a co-chair of the conference as the academic person on the board. Now that we've heard how we got where we are right now, it's now my task to introduce the working methods or modalities of this meeting that we will use in the next two days.

Working methods can be quite trivial and sometimes even a bit boring. But I can assure you in this context, working methods are everything but boring. They're actually quite interesting.

As an U.N. representative yesterday really well put it, multilateral and multistakeholder processes have co-existed for quite some time. Now is the moment for them to meet and to learn to interact.

This is what we want to facilitate in these two days.

So we want to create a process here that chose respect to both traditions, the multilateral tradition but also the multistakeholder tradition. From the perspective of multilateral procedures, this might mean to sort of deal with the diversity of stakeholders and views involved and present here in the room.

From the perspective of the multistakeholder processes, the challenge might be to produce an outcome that all stakeholders can live with. So it's really new ground that we try to explore here.

We've spent quite a long time asking ourselves how we could make this process possible and how best to deal with these challenges. And we

have literally refined the process until a few minutes before this meeting now started.

So I will now introduce what we came up with and what we suggest. The agenda of the next two days will roughly reflect the structure of the document. This means we have two tracks with each two sessions. One track covers the first part of the document which deals with principles. The second part of the document will cover the roadmap.

We have for each track two chairs and a group of advisors. The chairs and the advisors will structure the discussion and record the comments. At the beginning of each session, the chairs will briefly reflect on the many comments we have got, so they will highlight a few controversial issues. We will then have two hours of discussion. The first session will be on principles. The second session will be on the roadmap.

Each speaking slot will be exactly two minutes and not longer, and I can tell you there will be means of enforcing this rule.

You can see here in the room we have already microphones put up. And they all have a color code. Each color represents one stakeholder group. If I'm correct, it is blue for business. For the technical community and the academics, it's green. Governments have yellow. And the fourth one I cannot see. But I'm sure you will find out.

We will have -- we will have all in all six speaking slots, four for the stakeholders assembled in this room and two additional ones for remote participants. This means one round of comments will consist of six interventions.

We expect that each of the sessions will all in all cover six -- include six or seven rounds of comments. This means we will get per session roughly 40 interventions and per track even 80. This is quite a bit.

All these comments will be then taken notice of and at the end of this day, the chairs and the advisors will meet in the room upstairs -- it is the Palm Room -- and will address the comments we got today.

For the purpose of transparency, but I emphasize not participation, transparency, we will have open meetings. Everybody interested is welcome to join and to listen what we will be discussing. But you are not allowed to speak because otherwise we will just have another session. We want to avoid that.

So the idea is that we get all the comments and address them and suggest changes to the document. And who's interested in how we're going to do this is welcome to join and observe the process.

We will then do exactly the same -- we follow the same procedure again tomorrow. We will have two sessions until afternoon, and then the chairs and the advisors will meet and address the comments.

So the final document will be released at the closing session and then instantly made available on the Web site.

Transcripts will be made available a few hours after the respective sessions. So even if you don't see your interventions included in the next version of the document, you can still be sure that it will be covered by the transcript and for everybody to see.

Now, two final points. The first one is we really try to show that this is not a precooked process. The document is not fixed. It's still open to changes, but we ask you to be reasonable in what kind of changes you want to see. You have to take into account that we are 800 people here, and we cannot in the limited time that we have here accommodate substantial changes that would sort of require a totally new round of discussion and consensus building.

So we will include modifications, but we cannot add totally new text. So this is the first one.

And the second one is bear with us if the process doesn't quite work the way I have described it to you. This is a sort of experimental process. We are sort of setting up a sort of laboratory for multilateral and multistakeholder processes. So we are still learning. And I hope you will be tolerant enough when this is not as smooth as you are sort of used to.

I think that is about it.

Oh, perhaps one thing, please speak only once and not several times. So don't just join the queue again once you had the chance to speak.

Thank you very much.

[Applause]

VIRGILIA ALMEIDA:

Thank you, Jeanette.

And now we have Janis that will conclude the observations about the process, the views in the conference.

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Janis Karklins, ambassador from Latvia. And let me start my very brief remarks by thanking all of you for a warm response to the announcement that was made earlier today by U.N. Under-Secretary-General Mr. Wu concerning the nomination of the chair of IGF Multistakeholder Advisory Group. I feel honored with the trust that the U.N. Secretary-General and the Internet governance community place in me. And I certainly will perform my duties with dedication and a full sense of responsibility.

[Applause]

JANIS KARKLINS:

Thank you. I was asked to think and describe the differences and similarities between IGF and NETmundial. And, certainly, there are very many similarities.

And I would like to just mention a few. First of all, the multistakeholder nature of preparation and participation in both forums. The contribution -- substantive contribution of both forums to the ongoing multistakeholder dialogue on Internet governance, about Internet governance, and about actual use of Internet. The outcomes of both conferences inform and contribute to the decisions that need to be taken and are taken in different places, different organizations. Like in U.N. or U.N. specialized agencies, technical organizations like ICANN,

IETF, IAB, 3WC, national governments, civil society organizations and so on.

Certainly, there are some differences that one can identify. NETmundial is a stand-alone event with a clearly defined objective to address two issues: Internet governance principles and a roadmap of Internet governance ecosystem evolution. IGF has a much broader scope and addresses a wide range of issues.

The NETmundial had a bottom-up multistakeholder process of developing draft outcome document. And as we saw, it also put some stress on the conference because we need to negotiate the outcome of this conference and reach consensus on the document. IGF does not have this stress and is a free-floating exchange of views and information. That makes the ambience in the conference very free and open.

In conclusion, the IGF and NETmundial are clearly complementary. We will discuss IGF during this conference, and there has been many references already to the IGF as well as IGF is referenced in the outcome document.

And NETmundial will be discussed in 2014 edition of Internet Governance Forum in Istanbul in the context with the other processes where Internet governance is mentioned, WSIS +10 review, CSTD, ECOSOC, and others. That would be maybe a brief comparison of differences -- or similarities and differences of NETmundial and IGF. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Applause]

VIRGILIA ALMEIDA:

Thank you, Janis. I would like to thank the advisors and the teams from CGI and 1net and a number of international collaborators who have worked diligently in order to make the NETmundial a reality.

An Internet -- the development of the ideas and the proposals for this meeting occurred through a multisectoral or multistakeholder, pluralist and inclusive initiative. And the result will be important for the development of a very safe environment, cybernet environment for all countries.

We have time for some questions if you have any. So we have two minutes per question. We have time for five questions. Therefore, I would like to ask the interested parties to refer to the queues with the microphones, color-coded microphones.

There is a movement between the lines. Please. Go ahead. Yeah, sure.

>>

Good afternoon, distinguished colleagues, delegates.

First of all, we -- I wish to express my sincere appreciation to you, Chairman, to the team that worked with you, that are here or behind the scenes, which everybody considers that you have dealt with an extreme complex issue. Very, very difficult. And for the first time covering the entire scope of everybody. Inclusiveness now comes into reality.

I would like to assure you that it is incumbent to any of us from all parts of the sectors -- government, civil society, private sector, technical community, and so on and so forth -- to do every effort to contribute to the success of this meeting. It's quite clear that it is almost impossible that all views are reflected, but we are sure that you made every effort to include, to the extent practicable and possible, a document which grows a model, reflects the views of everybody. If not totally, it is the beginning of the process. We could not expect a miracle, as I put in the Document 121 that we have written to you, that we need some beginning of the work.

Now, coming to the point, there has been a few comments made yesterday and this morning. There is a need that you address the issue that you're following the WSIS guidelines in general. If there is something missing, please intensify that.

There is a need also to intensify the issue of the Internet -- the issue of the enhanced cooperation. That should be properly mentioned.

And the issue of the public -- Internet public policy also should be mentioned more extensively, in order to satisfy those distinguished colleagues that we have problems.

With respect to the accountability, you need to also intensify a little bit the accountability. What does it mean. It has been spread over the whole document, but you need to say what accountability means to parties, the one who is policy making, the other who is policy implementing and the policy itself. It should be clearly mentioned, Chairman.

We don't expect anything more than that. We are not dealing with the U.N. community. We are not dealing with the private sector community. We are dealing with everybody together.

Different culture, different understanding, and different expectations. We have to mix them up, we have to put them together, and that should be an example.

I think it is an obligation to all of us to contribute to the success of this meeting organized by Brazil, and you deserve a big round of applause, Mr. Chairman. You and all your colleagues. And thank you very much.

[Applause]

VIRGILIO ALMEIDA:

Thank you. I would like to ask you all to ask very short questions so -- we don't have a lot of time, so please -- yeah.

>>

I'll speak in Chinese. I come from China and my name is (saying name).

Good afternoon, everyone. I'm very happy because today is my birthday! So I am feeling -- it's very meaningful for me to have my birthday spent at this meeting.

[Applause]

>>

So here I would like to send my sincere appreciation to the organizing party, the Brazilian government, and also thanking everyone present that -- your contribution to the development of Internet.

In China, there are 600 million Internet users and there's 350,000 -- 350 million Internet sites, so the development of the Chinese Internet has come together with the world development.

We are very concerned about the Internet governance, so we believe this governance should go with the U.N. resolution, as well as the international relationship principles, and we should respect the national sovereignty within the Internet community, and every country should make their own decision based on their own situation, their people's idea, and their happiness to decide on the Internet policy and their law, and also to follow and enforce that law to build their own infrastructure and promote their own Internet activities and they would have their own laws to follow and to ensure their freedom and their right.

We want to ensure the Internet governance should have a balance between the obligation and the responsibility. The human rights should be respected. So is their privacy. It should be sufficiently respected. However, the -- there is no order, there will be no freedom in the Internet. So any organization, any person should not -- well, please, then when you exercise your right and your responsibility, you should not disrupt other people's right and their freedom.

So here we have two amendments that we would like to forward to the organizers. Thank you very much.

VIRGILIO ALMEIDA: Two minutes, please, and then we have time just for four people in total.

So you're going to be the third one and he's going to be the next one.
Sorry for –

>> You're totally right and I do have a question, in fact.

VIRGILIO ALMEIDA: Yes.

>> Okay. The question to the process is, because we have limited time, limited resources for our comments, I'd like to know how -- when you summarize the -- each subject, are you, well, including the comments made be -- online and give us a clue in which direction you will go if they are contrary so, well, we can maybe, well, avoid senseless speeches here.

JEANETTE HOFMANN: Senseless?

>> Well, no, not senseless, but, well, avoid comments which have already been accepted.

JEANETTE HOFMANN: What I can tell you is that we have already -- we have already highlighted controversial issues in both of the parts of the document, and in fact, we will talk about them at the beginning of the session.

So it's not that we want to swipe anything under the carpet. That is not the issue here. We will -- we have various means of dealing with those issues where there is no consensus.

An easy way out is to just delete a paragraph or a sentence or specific wording of the document, if there is no other way to accommodate that problem.

We will deal with this tonight and you are really invited to watch us.

>> I'll do that.

VIRGILIO ALMEIDA: Thank you. So the next one, please. Two minutes.

>> I will speak in Russian.

My name is Robert (saying name). I'm going to speak in Russian.

Dear colleagues, I would like to ask a question about the process that is going on today.

Of course this is an issue of transparency and the approach of multistakeholderism.

Of course we are all saying here that what is going on is maximum transparency and multistakeholder approach.

In my view, we are dealing with the most untransparent document I've ever seen in my life because it's not clear how we're considered and not considered, different comments, or how with such few -- such little amount of time, limited time, such questions could be dealt with, taking into account that serious corrections to the text cannot be allowed.

Unfortunately, my country had to deal with a situation when our comments, our input, were not taken into account, and I'm sure they will not be taken into account because we -- that's why we will not have any transparent or clear discussion. We have no mechanism, you know, for clear decisions.

And the most important thing is that of course respecting the -- the opinion, yes, of the organizers of this beautiful event, it's not clear what kind of high-level group we are talking about, what kind of mandate they have to deal with such important decisions outside, yes, these transparent procedures.

This needs correcting. Yes, this needs revision and a more serious approach, if we really want to be responsible for our decisions and for the decisions that are very important for millions of Internet users.

Of course we have to bear in mind that Edward Snowden was the culprit, yes, of this event, the organization of this event, so he was the one who set those questions. Thank you.

JEANETTE HOFMANN: Do you want a reply?

[Laughter]

JEANETTE HOFMANN: Okay. I wanted to point out that we are in a very early stage of a process that we expect will go on for quite some time. Procedurally, it is about getting, as I said, multilateral processes and multistakeholder processors to interact more than they have done so.

Part of that will be also to talk about the limits of such an approach. The question is, can they sort of -- is the scope infinite or can they only be meaningful in specific areas.

That is something that all stakeholders and governments need to find out together.

That the process is more in-transparent than others I find surprising because all the comments are online. You can read them. We have now also a 80-page synthesis document that tries to summarize all the 1370 comments we got for the second version.

I don't find that very in-transparent.

And we invite you to come tonight and watch us discussing what we do about the comments today.

I think that is quite a robust process, but I guess that all people in the room are open for improvements that will surely happen over the coming months and years, because even if this is a unique event, we

know that there will be further processes dealing with these very same questions.

VIRGILIO ALMEIDA:

Okay. Thank you, Jeanette. Now we have two comments from the -- from the -- from the board.

One from Raul and the other one from Benedicto.

RAUL ECHEBERRIA:

With respect to what the Russian representative said, I think that the position of many of the participants, and not only governments but some other participants from some other stakeholder groups, will not be reflected in the document, are not reflected in the document, because the document has already been produced, and I think that they will not appear in any future document.

Our goal should be that the outcome document should not include things that we can't live with; that our objections are so strong that we cannot accept that piece to be there in the document.

That, as Ambassador Benedicto said earlier, the results of our works are not in the detriment of any stakeholder group, specific stakeholder group.

So of course there will be many views not included in the document, but this is not the end.

This meeting is one-off meeting. There's some other processes, multistakeholder processes, intergovernmental processes, so in some other processes, we should continue discussing the issues we are discussing here in this meeting.

One of the important things, one of the important factors, is that when there is more controversy, we tried -- even though some other players that do not belong to governments does not have the value given by governments to an agreed language, we have taken that as a reference, saying if there is a dispute, if there is a controversy, we may base ourselves on concepts that have already been agreed or language -- on a language that has already been agreed in some other fora, so that it should be a road based on prior agreements, so that nobody in particular was rejected, even though these have been the words of Ambassador Benedicto.

He mentioned, as an example, his vision, his view about building this document on the basis or in line with the agreements and on the Tunis Agenda. We may mention some other examples of how we used all these prior documents. This is an example of how we work, and I hope that at the very end, there would be a document that all of us may feel that that document does not include anything that is so strong, so contradictory and so opposite to our views that we cannot live with. And of course there may be some cases. That may be the case of the Russian representative as well. Thank you.

VIRGILIO ALMEIDA:

I'd like to add two quick --- these -- but it is very clear that all the wealth of notions and issues related to the Internet governance ecosystem cannot be addressed by this meeting. I think this is something we should maybe accept as a reality that we cannot have in-depth discussion on so many important issues, and particularly on those issues that are controversial, that we cannot here solve, you know, things are being discussed extensively in other fora.

So the -- anyway, the ambition is, let's say, more limited to the sense that we want to have an outcome that can be agreed, that can serve as a consent that can be meaningful, but I can relate to governments concern.

So one of our concerns was exactly to anchor all we have done, to the extent possible, in agreed language coming from WSIS, from other parts, because I know this gives comfort to governments. Being myself an official, I have to relate.

So this was an attempt.

I'd like -- my second comment refers to one aspect of the Internet governance process I have not touched upon in my first intervention. That is WSIS+10.

We have been working around how can we devise a way to provide for a review, a 10-year review of WSIS.

I know that this is contradictory, there are different approaches, but I'd like to say that people are discussing this in New York. They are also looking at us here and they are expecting that from this meeting, maybe

there's some ideas or something that can energize this process and help to overcome the kind of stalemates that have been taking place there.

So certainly in regard to Internet, a new paradigm of cooperation is required. So as Jeanette was saying, this is an experiment and we'd like everyone to work in a positive approach, going as far as we can without compromising positions, so that we can maybe by the end of the day come up with something that is new that can serve as a contribution, even if we can think in the context of this WSIS+10 review.

So I think this is -- would be a way to relate to a not existing process that is in very bad need of some reinvigoration to the benefit of all of us, all of us that are here, all of us that want Internet governance to serve its purpose, to be an avenue for cooperation, for progress, and for innovation. Thank you very much.

VIRGILIA ALMEIDA:

Thank you, ambassador. And Zahid will close the session. As I said, we had time for only four questions. So sorry for those –

>>

You say five. Read your document. It said five. Read your paper.

VIRGILIA ALMEIDA:

Go ahead.

ZAHID JAMIL:

I wanted very quickly -- just a very quick comment. I think it is very important that we understand that one individual comment of one player cannot dictate a document. I think that's an important part of multistakeholder process. That's why we have stakeholder groups.

And it is also important as a matter of transparency and non-discrimination that one player can't just do anything. The second point I just wanted to make -- and I think it's important -- the Russian comments as part of the 187, they weren't part of the 187 because they came in late. And if we were to take them into account, we would have then had to discriminate and also then there will be the question of other late comments. So we had to basically respect the fact that the deadline had been missed by the Russian contribution.

And so I hope that the Russian government will take this opportunity to work positively within this process. And that's all I have to say. Thank you.

VIRGILIA ALMEIDA:

Thank you. So we have a 30-minute break and then we come back for the first session.

>>

Ladies and gentlemen, we will take a 15-minute break and then return as quickly as possible. We have a very full afternoon. So we'll take a 15-minute break and then come back to continue our meetings. Thank you.

[END OF TRANSCRIPTION]