

Opening Roundtable: Governance In An Interconnected World
Global INET, April 23, 2012
Geneva, Switzerland

Video/audio of the full session is located here:

http://www.livestream.com/inet1/video?clipId=pla_a773d614-37e0-482d-888c-2390163b1d00

Names of participants are:

Markus Kummer, moderator
Virat Bhatia
Lesley Cowley
Avri Doria
Heather Dryden
Raul Echeberria
Carlos Raul Gutierrez
Nii Quaynor
Jianping Wu

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. It's a great pleasure and privilege to moderate this roundtable. We had great opening speeches. The speeches were about the technology, and now we're going to talk about the governance of this technology, about the past, the history, about the current state of play, and also look a little bit into the future or try to look at a little bit into the future.

Let me start by introducing a little bit of the history. As you all know, and we state on the session description on the website, the Internet developed largely outside the realm of governments. Governments did not notice that there was something taking place, something revolutionary, of utmost importance. And the Internet took off. Then in the mid '90s governments began to get a little bit interested. And 1998 was a key year. That was when the U.S. government decided they needed to have a more solid structure for dealing with the DNS. And they incorporated the Internet Corporation for Assigned Names and Numbers. And in the very same year there were many serial conferences of the WTO and of the OECD. And governments then in their wisdom decided it was best not to do anything about the Internet but let the technology grow and evolve. They feared that taking early decisions on how the Internet should be run, on e-commerce, might stifle the development of technology.

In the very same year the International Telecommunication Union held a plenipotentiary meeting in Minneapolis and at that meeting they decided to hold a World Summit on the Information Society.

And that brings us to the debate we had for the past ten years. This time ten years ago we were in this very building. Many of us in this room were participating in the first prepcon for the World Summit on the Information Society. It was a long and protracted affair. It was the first summit in Geneva that adopted a Declaration of Principles which had some basic principles on Internet Governance and which introduced the notion of all stakeholders should be involved in how the Internet is being run. Also, as principles, it introduced that it should be done in a transparent, inclusive and transparent manner. Between the two summits there was a Working

Group on Internet Governance that delved a little bit deeper with these issues and the findings of this Working Group. Looking around on this panel, two of the members are on this panel, Raul Echeberria and Avri Doria, were in this Working Group. The second phase of the group more or less endorsed the findings of this Working Group and validated the Internet model of a bottom-up multistakeholder cooperation. There was, in addition, a decision to create a platform for dialogue, the Internet Governance Forum. And there is a little bit of thought that, 'Yes, the current system works well. But we need to do more. And we need to start the process towards enhanced cooperation.'

Now the Internet Governance Forum has taken off and the discussion on enhanced cooperation is still going around in circles, as there are different interpretations of different stakeholders of what it means. The next session on enhanced cooperation [mandated by the WSIS process] will take place the 18th of May also in Geneva in the framework of the Commission for Science and Technology for Development [CSTD].

Let me now turn to the panelists. It is our intention to make the session as interactive as possible, to ask individual questions to panelists and ask other panelists to comment. After the first round, we would like audience participation and also remote participation. Raquel Gatto and Nicolas please raise your hands so people in the room so see who you are. They monitor what's happening in the blogosphere and they will bring in remote participants.

Let me first turn to Raul Echeberria, who happens to be the chairman of the ISOC Board of Trustees. He's the chairman of LACNIC, the Regional Internet Registry for Latin America. He played a very influential role during WSIS not in his capacity as chairman of LACNIC but as a representative for his country's delegation. Raul, where are we now since 2005?

>> **RAUL ECHEBERRIA:** Thank you Markus. You mentioned a few minutes ago that this is the same venue in which the first prepcom took place in 2002. I think that this is a very symbolic thing because it's a good reference for evaluating what has happened in the last ten years regarding Internet governance. Some people some times think that the Internet Governance mechanisms are static because we have not created new intergovernmental organizations to conquer the Internet governance arrangements, but we have experienced a lot of changes. If we remember, those of us that were here in 2002, the Internet community and civil society and private sector were not allowed to participate in the discussions. We had to remain outside of the rooms where the discussions were held behind closed doors. And now the reality is absolutely different. We have IGF, this is a very participative and open space for dialogue among all stakeholders. We have built IGFs at the regional level. Organizations like LACNIC have opened participation to all the stakeholders and we are proactively engaging governments, the private sector, civil society in the participation of the life of the organization. The change between 2002 and now have been huge. I think this is enhanced cooperation. When we talk about "enhanced cooperation" it's not a magic concept. This is what we do every day. Every day we are working in enhancing the cooperation among different stakeholders. I think we have succeeded in that. And we are very happy to see that Internet governance today is much more participative and open to everybody than ten years ago. The organizations that are involved in the operation of Internet governance, ourselves, we have tried to improve our organizations in this instance. I think we achieved that.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. Who else would like to comment on that? What about asking Avri Doria from the civil society perspective, and Avri said she wants to be sitting on the very left

wing of this panel. Please, Avri.

>> **AVRI DORIA:** Thank you. Yes, I feel most comfortable over here. I can't disagree with Raul. Certainly it has changed since 2005. Certainly almost every time one goes to a meeting one hears the words multistakeholder. But I actually think it's changed a lot less than many of us would have hoped. I think that we have one or two examples, IGF and a couple of other places where there is a certain amount of multistakeholder. There's a certain amount at ICANN. We have organisations like the IETF, where there's been a multistakeholder model since way before anybody had the words but then if you look around at the other institutions, there's still a long way to go. Earlier, in one of the speeches, it was talked about the Internet being an adolescent. In terms of the multistakeholder model, I think we're not -- we're quite at the toddler stage. We're basically starting to find our feet but haven't quite found them yet. With every new organization or grouping that comes along, the fight has to happen again. We have to try and get civil society and the private sector included. Sometimes some come in before civil society does. We have to find ways to actually enable the civil society participation. Because even sometimes when the door is opened, the civil society can't actually get there. Now, remote moderation has helped. It's an optimistic view of the multistakeholder model and multistakeholder governance, but I think it's a little too early to say "and it has succeeded." We can look at major organizations that essentially have no multistakeholder governance in them yet. And even when we're in organizations like the IGF, which are firmly multistakeholder, some are still more equal than others. And so I think it's wonderful to be here. It's wonderful to be on a panel on how far we've come, but I think we have so much further to go yet. Thanks.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you for that. Lesley.

>> **LESLEY COWLEY:** Yes, thank you, Markus and good morning, everyone. I was reminded in your introduction about a story in Nominet's history. We run the .UK registry and legend has it that when Nominet was created the founders went to the UK government and said: Hey we're going to do the main name system thing and do you want to be involved? And they had done a futurologist's report several months before that didn't mention the domain name system or the Internet for that matter. So they decided, "No we're not actually interested. Just go away and do whatever it is you're going to be doing, because we don't really understand it for that matter. And it wasn't in the report. So it's not of interest to us." In those days multistakeholder, therefore, meant a small number of Internet service providers who were involved in the UK industry. Look how much has changed since then. But I'm slightly to the right [she gestures to indicate the panel's seating arrangement, to laughter from the panel]. So there's some logic to this seating perhaps, Avri. Multistakeholder, maybe this is a vision, maybe is some sort of thing far away that we maybe will some day get to, but actually it's not doing that badly. Look how far the Internet has gone with this multistakeholder model. It's not perfect. But actually we could celebrate it a bit more because it's one of the cornerstones of the success of the Internet so far.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you for that. And we should not underestimate the reach of the decision by heads of state and government in the Tunis [WSIS Summit] decision to validate a multistakeholder model that is contrary to the traditional model of international cooperation. Obviously we also have to remind ourselves that the organizations were set up for member states. And it can be just institutionally very difficult to adapt the rules, to change the rules. One of these conundrums is a little bit with the IGF. It was clearly set up as a platform for multistakeholder dialogue. But it is not a UN organization because the UN is for member states.

So it was given to the secretary-general to convene. This is one of the little tricks that you can use to actually further the system. Now I wonder if we can have a government view - Heather the chairman of ICANN's Government Advisory Committee.

>> **HEATHER DRYDEN:** Thank you, Markus and good morning to everyone. I note that the first remarks that have been made have focused on actors that are perhaps not governmental - participating in organizations that are intergovernmental. But I think this is quite different from ICANN and the Governmental Advisory Committee, where you have governments that are part of the model. And where you can observe a number of changes that are positive over time with the committee. For those less familiar with the committee, there are more than 100 members, or governments. And that number is growing. All regions are represented in the GAC, as we call it. And we also have intergovernmental organizations that are able to represent regional perspectives that participate in the committee and also are able to contribute substantive expertise based on the nature and work of those organizations. So this is a committee that's growing. However, there are challenges. And we do need to think about those as the committee grows and needs to be able to influence the decisions that are made within the organization to an adequate degree and you have a consensus-based approach. Then it actually relates to the speed at which you can work. And it takes governments to find consensus. I think governments can find consensus on any topic, but you need sufficient time to do that, and when governments aren't determining the pace of work if the policy development process is being driven outside of the committee, then it's quite a different role I think that the GAC needs to undertake that you might find in other settings. So I put that out as food for thought about the GAC and what I think is a success, but one that still has certain challenges. Before I conclude, I would also talk about culture. Because this is an organization where there is a high degree of contact needed between different actors and you have different styles of communicating, different styles of working among those communities. At the same time, you can see a high degree of willingness to find ways to communicate and work together so that we can all advance our work successfully. That's something else that I would put on the table, as well, about the different cultures that are evolving and actually able to get work done. Thank you.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. I think that was an important comment - the different cultures of different stakeholder groups - and it is a learning process. We should not forget that this is basically an experiment of international cooperation that was never tried out before. But Nii wanted to comment earlier, please.

>> **NII QUAYNOR:** I just thought on the left [he was seated on the left side of the panel, and continues the wordplay around that] I would say something constructive about governments here. I recall Africa had its first Internet governance meeting in 1998. There was one UN DESA member and one government. So just judging by the participation I think we have come a *very* long way and we should not underrate the effort it takes for governments to experiment with something that is not so easily understood or accepted except by practice. So from that point of view I think we have done very well and governments have contributed heavily in, I would say, the development of the African technical institutions and we still work very closely with the African Union as well as the African Telecom Union. So from that perspective I think governments are looking very closely and in some cases are even adopting the multistakeholder model within the industry forums in countries, which I think is the right place for it. Thank you.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. Are there other comments on these very broad questions from panelists? Not everybody needs to comment on every question. Maybe can I ask then a

question to the two persons on the very right, which are from developing regions. Carlos from Costa Rica we were all at the ICANN meeting in San Jose, well not all but many of us were there, and we admired the speech by your president which we thought was a very enlightened speech for a head of state on the Internet. Maybe you can explain to us a little bit on how you worked towards having such an enlightened policy in your country or whatever you would like to comment.

>> **CARLOS RAUL GUITERREZ:** Well, I would say she focused on some issues that are important to the users. I mean, I think it's very daring for somebody to come up and say: 'Okay. The Internet should be free and open. But we have to protect children.' She's engaged in the ITU movement to protect the children online. And if you step back and say: 'Oh, well, that's a limitation of freedom of access.' Yes, it is one. And I think this is an area where the multistakeholder model could work very well to translate the issues for the users into government policy. That's one part where I trust the multistakeholder model to help us a lot because we are in a very democratic country. Everybody talks, but that doesn't mean the government listens. On the other hand, this morning we had a very clear distinction by Leonard Kleinrock at the end - that we know a lot about the Internet infrastructure but we are surprised every day by the business models. We don't know what business model we will have on the Internet tomorrow or the day after. And every time Facebook comes out with a new announcement about their privacy policies - where the policy is happening is in the heads of the people of Facebook. And personally I have my serious doubts that the multistakeholder model can replace corporate governance, as such, for private operators. I think we cannot assume that it will replace outside directors for private corporations. I cannot assume it can replace auditors for private corporations. And we cannot assume that all private corporations have the same interest in the Internet, we cannot assume they are an homogenous group. So I like very much these differentiations this morning. What are we talking about? Are we talking about the users? Are we talking about the infrastructure that developed so well under the multistakeholder model? Or are we talking about some very specific interests about very fast, evolving business models?

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you for that. It's always good to ask ourselves: What are we talking about? Well, I think - at least in my interpretation we talk about the multistakeholder model, we talk about a policy development model and also of course a standards development model at the technical level. And Avri made the point the IETF was multistakeholder before people used the term multistakeholder. People go and participate in the standards-developing processes. But next to Carlos is Virat Bhatia from a very big country and he represents a big company. How do you see it? How is India - I do remember we had the IGF at Hyderabad and the Indian government was very, very positive and encouraging towards the multistakeholder model and the need for cooperation with business academia and civil society. Has it evolved since Hyderabad?

>> **VIRAT BHATIA:** Well, as a democracy, the world's largest functioning democracy, it would be expected of us to be welcoming of multistakeholder engagement. If you look at the numbers of the unconnected, the 4.5 billion of which I think approximately 2.5 of that would be in India, China, Pakistan, Nepal, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh those countries would represent roughly 2.5 billion of the unconnected. The manner in which multistakeholder groups engage with the government in these countries is very different. There's democracy. And there's sort of a heavy government hand in some countries and the army in and out of offices in some and stuff like that. It's not a homogenous model. My take from this and I would submit to the group would be that I think

those who have received access to the Internet so far roughly represent a homogenous more or less a homogenous set of characteristics around the world. Even in the countries that have received it, at the next level I think there is a huge difference on how this engagement will occur. And I think to a very large extent specific issues will have to be dealt with. The broad principles notwithstanding - openness, transparency and all of that stuff - I think the challenge of getting this across to the next level is much higher. So just sort of to summarize, I think the multistakeholder has got us to this stage in a reasonably effective manner. But I would submit and I guess we can discuss this later the role of governments to get this to the next stage must not be underestimated. I think it's a massive burden on the governments to get this going by way of investment, infrastructure, access policies, regulations, laws, all of the stuff that will now start coming to bear. And I will just sort of end by saying I know that we have talked about the Arab spring a lot this morning, it's not as if all of the governments in the world are celebrating that, sort of waiting for that to happen again. So what seems like a big opportunity to civil groups, and rightly so, it's not something that governments are comfortable with. I think in the few years or at least the last year or so things have happened around the Internet which need sort of rebuilding of confidence of the government to start putting their force behind this. We can tell you from India, for example, the Right to Information Act which is a big legislation which opens up transparency and access to government files and documents, has been a difficult challenge for the government to deal with because it's bringing in a level of transparency that they are not used to, which is the same thing with the Internet, so I suppose we need to be very careful about how to take this to the next level. We can talk about that when we discuss it.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. And Jianping Wu you come from a country with the biggest number of Internet users. What is the balance between multistakeholder cooperation and other models in China? Please.

>> **JIANPING WU:** Thank you, Markus, good morning, everybody. I'm a professor at a university in China and also vice president of the Internet Society of China. ISC. So this is a very good topic for us. So far the end of last year the users in China reached more than 500 million already, half a billion. So governance is still a very important issue in China, internally but also internationally. In China, internally, we gather the consensus for the governance. In China there are two government departments involved in the Internet issues. One is information industry, Department of Information Industry. The second is the Information Internet Office. So one involves the Internet industry like carriers, like vendors, applications, ISPs. In the information office they are involved in the content – ICP, content. So different departments, they have different thinking sometimes and they still need coordination. We have another truly important body, the Internet Society of China. This is the Internet industry organization in China. This organization was established 12 years ago. So in the beginning 70 sponsors came from the carriers, ISP, vendors, some academic university institutions, and so many - 70 sponsors. They want to come together to discuss Internet issues. So far there are 400 members already. So the mission of the ISC is to make a bridge between the different Internet stakeholders. We also want to make a bridge with government, and keep the dialogues with government departments. So another body, important body, is SANIC (phonetic). That's a very early body in China that relates to Internet operations. Normally there are four different opinions sometimes. So we work together right now. We believe in China people can make consensus. The multistakeholder model is a good model for Internet governance. We're happy to say all side of China but international. I'm not sure if we have the most consistency for the multistakeholders. This is very good for us. I want to focus on the Internet Industry Association. I believe it may play an

important role among the multistakeholders in China. So we want to share the experience. We set up this organization for many years. We have 400 members. We have regular meetings every year, several. We have more than 12 committees involved in different issues, to address Internet issues. I believe the ISC plays an important role in the Internet governance in China already. This is important for us. Sometimes the companies, they have so many fighting each other sometimes. If we ask the government to see the issues, it's very complicated, so they ask us, so we send some people between to talk, dialogue, ask people to come together to dialogue the issue. Finally, most of the issues can have good results. So I think it is a very good model. It's very interesting. I want to introduce so many cases for this issue. So I think very important. I also suggest for the international governance for the global Internet governance, we also suggest the Internet industry associations –

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Sorry to interrupt you. Can we hold that back for later. We look to the future.

>> **JIANPING WU:** Okay. Let's stop.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Okay. Thank you very much. Would any of the panelists have comments, questions to what you've heard so far before we open up the discussion to the floor? Lesley, please.

>> **LESLEY COWLEY:** Yeah, just quickly. Several people have referred to multistakeholderism as an experiment. And I would say are we in an experimental stage still or is this just how we are and it's a model that's evolving as the Internet evolves? Because by referring to an experiment, that sounds to me a bit like we're either going to pass the assessment grade or we're going to have some alternative experiment that will produce a different outcome. And very much I think particularly hearing the fantastic work in China, it sounds as though the model is progressing well there, as it is in many other places. So maybe we're beyond experimental stage. We're into evolution and making this thing better.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Good point. Mea culpa. And when I used the word “experiment” I was actually referring to that it was an experiment when it started and we are learning how to evolve it. You cannot expect it to be perfect.

>> **LESLEY COWLEY:** So did we past the experiment?

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Well the Internet works. I think that's the basic test. I think nobody can say the Internet doesn't work so presumably the governance structures we have set up seem to be working, as well. But you would like to comment Virat?

>> **VIRAT BHATIA:** I just wanted to do a contrast on the multistakeholder models vis-à-vis in India, for example, where we have approximately 750 million mobile phones. We're adding about 8 to 10 million - we have slowed down now - mobile phones a month. It used to be 20 million until December of 2010. And I can tell you from my experience of being in the industry for about 18 years that for the telecom business we did not need multistakeholder discussions to the extent that we need them for the Internet. Actually the telecom business works really well with the government, and operators having a discussion, people produce their own content which was voice produced and it would run fairly well. On the Internet side of course we just can't make it work unless we get everybody in the room, and our leading industry association just launched a whole initiative to get everyone that needs to work with this elephant to make it

work: the local content providers, the language providers, the advertising teams, the governments, in fact for the first time we have governments serving on a committee because we just know for a fact that this one is not going to work. And on telecom I can tell you, where we've had tremendous success, we never even thought or needed this kind of an engagement it's just taken off on its own.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Well that's another important comment actually - that multistakeholder cooperation *includes* governments. It's *not against* governments. And it's important that governments participate. Raul you wanted to comment?

>> **RAUL ECHEBERRIA:** Yes, in the same line with the other speakers, I think that really we have made important progress in the dialogue between the different stakeholders. In Latin America there are some formal mechanisms for participation that are working very well. In fact Internet organizations and the private sector participate also in classic governmental environments, so we are well received there. I think we have a very constructive relationship, and we have progressively moved the model to other areas of Information Society debate. So it is working very well. We also have some dialogue by ECLAC the Economic Commission of Latin America and the Caribbean that led all of the original dialogue on the Information Society. We have discovered that there is not controversy at this moment or there hasn't been controversy in the last few years about the IP address management, ccTLD management, even in other more political issues like access or interconnection, it is working well. I think the challenge of this multistakeholder model, both the formal structures and also the informal dialogue that exists among all stakeholders, is when issues are becoming more sensitive. So when we start to discuss about Network neutrality or intellectual property rights, security, this is the challenge, where we really have to work very much in the near future is to see to it that this open dialogue will remain productive and useful when we enter into the discussion of those more controversial issues.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Avri has a comment, please.

>> **AVRI DORIA:** Thank you. I would actually like to speak in favor of viewing as us still being involved in an experiment. I tend to see the multistakeholder model and all of the variety of implementations and instantiations of it as somewhat of a very noble experiment that we're in in terms of furthering the notions of democracy, going to a participatory democracy. I think we're still very much learning how it is it works, in what context it works. I think one of the things that came out in some of the discussions here is also somewhat a notion of the multistakeholder model sort of being recursive and existing at many levels. We talk about a global multistakeholder and global organizations. But then we also talk about within the various groupings, within the countries, within industries, perhaps, also looking at a multistakeholder model. So I don't want to say that it's something that will disappear on us. I certainly agree it's an emerging thing, it's an evolving thing, but I think we're still actively and need to still actively experiment with it. How do we make it work better? How do we include everyone as a peer? How do we actually achieve transparency and get something done? And I think there's a lot of experimenting left to do, though I don't think that there is such a model as an experiment. It's just: "How do we do it?"

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. That's a differentiation I for one can live with. I hope you are happy with that, as well, Lesley. I mean I think multistakeholder cooperation has affirmed itself as a valid way of running the Internet. We as the Internet Society may really defend that. It's a

collaborative bottom-up way of policy development that is adapted to the underlying technology, which is also distributed.

>> **LESLEY COWLEY:** Absolutely. I mean, in the title of this session, though, are we at the state-of-the-art kind of phraseology? And I was thinking, gosh, no we're not at the state of the art at all. In fact we're a long way from it. But I think some of the people who have proposals as to how this model can be improved *aren't* talking about having a different experiment. We're talking about making things better, making things more inclusive, more open and more transparent, and we're also facing up to the difficulties that Raul was referring to. Some of the easy policy issues, those were decided years ago. We're now at some of the very difficult policy issues in a number of cases that will really test how effective that model can be going forward.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** And also the Internet has gained in importance since. I remember in WSIS when we celebrated the first billion online. Now we have 2 billion online. And there were applications at the early stages of Facebook, YouTube and whatever. And these are now bread and butter of the Internet. But I wonder whether we can open the discussion bit here to hear comments and questions from the floor but first maybe let's go to the remote participants - Raquel and Nicola - do you have anything? ...

>> **RAQUEL GATTO:** So far, no, I think they are still waiting for the Round Table and we have now 130 viewers, individual remote participants and three hubs have connected. Lebanon, Cameroon and SFB. San Francisco Bay.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** They're up early, San Francisco. There's a time difference. Welcome remote participants. Don't feel shy. Jump in. Questions from the floor? Stefano, please.

>> **STEFANO:** Thank you, chair. So the question you asked the panel, is let's say, how since 2005 these discussions about the phase where we are, that is the phase of implementing the multistakeholder model, and then evaluate how this is this is an experiment or not. I am the chair of a chapter of the Internet Society in Italy and next Thursday in Turin, not far from here, we will organize a meeting with the title "Defending the Internet." So I'm trying to explain what I mean by that. Actually this - the multistakeholder [model] - is a question of putting together the users, the civil society, the private sector, and the governments. And personally I have experience being the expert of my government in GAC and in the high-level group on Internet governance of the European Commission, and I find a number of difficulties. One is that traditionally the Internet, when it was mainly a communication infrastructure, was something run by the ministries of communications. Well, since 2005, after the World Summit, many governments started to set up ministries in charge of the Information Society. And then the two kinds of ministries exchanged views, collaborated and said the same story in different environments. ITU is more connected to the communication ministries and the people who are going to IGFs are more concerned about the Information Society. So this is a difficulty for the government. Then the private sector wishes for the possibility of having an open market for developing the economy and things like that. And the final users want to have an Internet completely free with no regulations and so on. So we are experiencing the evaluation of this model that is actually exercised by ICANN very well, and the Internet Society is defending this model. And then in the end we have this question about the different opinions of what Professor Kleinrock [in an opening keynote] called the Internet reach. So the real point is that the developing countries or technologically emerging countries sometimes have different ideas about the equilibrium between the three components - government, private sector, users - and

this is something that, in the end to conclude, needs from our side, those that are either older guys or experts in the Internet model to have a lot of passion. Because we have to discuss, we have to try to harmonize the different opinions, also, of developing countries and more rich countries. Thank you.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. I will gather a few questions from the floor before asking our panelists to comment. Yes, Eric. Yes, please.

>> **ERIC BURGER:** Thank you. I will try to move from the multistakeholder to the multilinguals - I will speak in Spanish. Please put on the headphones. ****The question or comment is in Spanish****

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. Bill, you asked for the floor. And there are others.

>> **BILL DRAKE:** Thank you, Markus. Bill Drake from the University of Zurich. I guess I'm positioned to the left of Avri, so I'll go a little bit further in her direction of saying that we all love the soup but there are flies in it. There are some issues that I think we have to confront. And I would just like to raise two. First of all, last time I remember being in this room, I think it was about two years ago when we were having discussion around improvements to the Internet Governance Forum, we had a situation where all of the Internet governance regulars were sitting here patting each other on the back about the glories of the multistakeholder system. And we had a group from the G77 governments in the back of the room, refusing to speak and afterward there was a dialogue that occurred around that that I thought was very illustrative, and that's played out in other environments. One wonders how broad and how deep the commitment to multistakeholderism really is beyond the nexus of people that are most heavily involved in the ICANN and the IGF, and how do we grow the level of involvement there and commitment. That's the first challenge. A second challenge I think which is related is that - and this is perhaps a little bit more sensitive but I don't shy away from such things - many of the governments that celebrate multistakeholderism repeatedly in various forms when floating around particularly in the industrialized world, in fact don't seem terribly interested in pushing multistakeholderism into new spaces. So for example we're across the street from an intergovernmental body [the ITU] which is in the process of negotiating an international, binding treaty which could impact the Internet and yet within that body the governments from the Western industrialized world that say that they love multistakeholderism have not supported making that body more multistakeholder and allowing civil society, in particular, to get involved. And I think the same thing could be pointed to in a number of other settings. So there is a question then about how deep the commitment is. Is it limited just to the spaces we already are practicing it in? And the last point I would make is I think it's also worth noting that while it's true in a real peer-to-peer multistakeholder setting like ICANN or IGF anybody can show up and you can have a general sitting next to a hacker with a nose ring and so on and that's great, at the same time there are nevertheless significant differences in power and influence among the players. There are big companies with a lot of money at stake. There are governments with a lot of influence. And then there's civil society people trying to raise their points alongside them and business people and so on. And undoubtedly the fact that you can have an open participatory dialogue doesn't negate the realities of the material world where power is distributed asymmetrically and outcomes are shaped by influence. So I think we need to recognize that there are some limitations to the current practice of multistakeholderism and to ask ourselves what can we do to try if we want to if we really believe that this is an architecture worth building on and taking forward, how do we expand its scope, how do we deepen the level of

commitment among all players. And how do we try to ensure that the asymmetries that exist in the broader world don't negate the formal structures that allow that openness?

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you, a question for the last round of discussion there. I have noted Bertrand, Aisha. And that person I don't recognize but he will introduce himself and right at the back is that Sebastian and Fouad. Okay. Let's stop it at that. Okay. Bertrand first but try to be short and concise.

>> **BERTRAND DE LA CHAPELLE:** (laughs) Why do you say that for me? My name is Bertrand de la Chapelle. I'm with the International Diplomatic Academy and on the ICANN Board. I just want to highlight something that Professor Wu said, the very important distinction, that when we talk about Internet governance we are talking about two things that are different and relate to the different layers. There's governance *of* the Internet, as an infrastructure, and governance *on* the Internet i.e. the usage and the activities that people do. And in that respect, I would argue to go in the direction that Lesley has explored, that as far as governance *of* the Internet is concerned, the multistakeholder model was there from the onset, has been proven as working, has been functioning so far relatively okay. The challenge we have is defining the modalities for governance *on* the Internet. And the challenge we have is that we do not have the tools. There have been no specific new spaces created apart from the IGF, which is the first effort. And the challenge is not to come back to the traditional tools but to move forward. And I would summarize this by a formula that says basically we need *more* governance mechanisms. Because if we don't, we will have *less* Internet. Because the only instrument that would be available is the proliferation of national legislations that will partition the Internet again into geographic territories. It is our common objective to design the new instruments for governance *on* the Internet rather than focusing on the part that is the infrastructure which, by the way, is functioning well. Thank you.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. And the gentleman in the row in front of Bertrand, please, and introduce yourself.

>> **MOHAMMED IBRAHIM:** Thank you very much. My name is Mohammad Ibrahim. I'm from Somalia. When a few years ago I started going to ICANN meetings and the Internet Governance Forums there used to be a word. It was "stakeholders." I was told I was a stakeholder and, 'You have a say in this,' and I was enjoying it and then I was told later on, "You're now part of the multistakeholder." I said, "It's getting better." Then recently I'm hearing "multistakeholderism." I say, "Oh, okay." All of this, to me, is Orwellian language. To me the bottom line is I'm interested in the governance of Internet. Why? Because I'm from Somalia and I'm interested in getting my people exposed to the rest of the world and expression of ideas and sharing of knowledge and so on, but as the word gets longer and longer in fact I think the significance is getting less and less. So the idea to me, what I'm interested in is yes, I'm a stakeholder. I want to have a say. How do I do it? My voice is getting less and less, my ideas are not getting any further. So ICANN came up with an idea that helps me. I came up with the IDN. So I said this might be a way to get out. So what do I do? I will create .swahili or .somalia and I will use my language and I will say to you thank you very much now I can do what I want and I'll exclude you. But that's not really the intention because the whole idea of the Internet, when I came to it, was a noble idea where humanity, in general, can share the good things we do together and so on. So I guess what I'm saying is perhaps we should go back and get some clarity in this word, so that we all understand from stakeholder to multistakeholder to multistakeholderism to multistakeholderismization, I don't know what's the next one? Thank you very much.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. Aisha.

>> **AISHA HASSAN:** Aisha Hassan from the International Chamber of Commerce. I really appreciated a number of comments from the panelists and the questions that have been coming out and I thought it might be helpful just to underscore that what we're striving for in the experiments that have been described is the multistakeholder approach is we're all stakeholders are on an equal footing. So that's the governments, civil society, the Internet technical community and business. And from a business perspective and I think from – I assume the stakeholders who support this approach - it isn't just about the process, it's about the reason why we think this approach is the right one. And that's because none of the issues that we're trying to tackle in the past years, today or in the future can actually be dealt with by any one stakeholder group alone, and absorbing that and thinking about that I think will help us as many organizations, processes, perhaps new structures or forums at the region, local and global level try to best approach a dialogue among the stakeholders - keeping that in mind that actually nobody can do that on their own - and it is the collective wisdom and experience that actually makes the multistakeholder approach in the Internet context a success. I would also say that as we look around, there are many interpretations of what is multistakeholder, what is multistakeholderism. And one of the concerns we have is where that gets a bit defined out of what it really is meant to be. So I would just caution as we're going into more discussions about the multistakeholder approach, improving it in various organizations and forums as well as in the context of the discussion on enhanced cooperation, that we bear in mind the objective and purpose. And as our colleague from Somalia has just pointed out and some others have posed the question in their comments, I think it's really critical to be looking at how we improve the inclusive participation of cross-stakeholder groups in these processes and forums. We hear a lot of dialogue about that. I can say from a global business perspective there are many efforts that are being made at a local, regional and global level to raise awareness. But I would be interested in hearing more concrete ideas today and as we go forward to understand what really can be done to improve that. And what really are the challenges that are being faced and how can we all collectively build towards a more inclusive participation across stakeholder groups in a range of these processes and discussions. Thank you.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. I had Wolfgang and Fouad and is that Sebastian? Okay. Raquel has some - let's give precedence to the remote participants, please.

>> **RAQUEL GATTO, reading input from a remote participant:** Thank you. It's a question from the ISOC Lebanon chapter hub. They are asking do we know of successful stories where multistakeholder governance influenced positively government regulation and actions in some democratic countries. That's the question. And I would like just to highlight some of the other remote participants - what the participants have already mentioned. But they want to know why it's not easy to participate in Internet governance. And, if a multistakeholder would like to be involved, which are the key issues? So it's a broad question. I would just like to highlight and make their voice heard.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** I think I would happily answer the first question. I think Kenya, for instance, and I'm looking up to Alice [Munyua]. Kenya is a good example of a country that has made tremendous progress. And they have fully embraced the multistakeholder approach. I talked to a senior official who said, "It can be painful at time, but it helps us make better decisions." I think that's an excellent summary of a multistakeholder cooperation. But back to our discussions in the room, Wolfgang, you've been patient.

>> **WOLFGANG KLEINWACHTER:** Okay. My name is Wolfgang Kleinwachter, I'm from the University of Aarhus. As Bill Drake said, we all like the soup but we have a different idea how spicy the soup should be. It's good to see in the G8 Deauville Declaration the heads of states of the eight leading industrial nations support the multistakeholder principle for Internet governance. It was good to hear from our colleague from China that multistakeholderism is seen as an important principle for managing the Internet in China. And you have this lip service to the multistakeholder principle now everywhere, nobody talks against it, but it's different if it comes to the very concrete issues. I think we have two processes where this plays a role. One is the policy development process, and then comes the decision-making process. I think in the policy development process it's much more easier, that it means you just listen to everybody, everybody has a seat at the table. And in this field it's a growing number of groups and individuals and organizations who want to participate, and the IGF is the ideal place for it. Nobody is excluded from the IGF. But if it comes to decision-making then it gets much more complicated. You know, the OECD was celebrated, you know the multistakeholder approach, by inviting civil society to create an advisory body and then they had a concrete project on the table - principles for Internet policy making - and the advisory board from civil society disagreed with the draft, at least in two articles. And then you know the problem was what to do with this disagreement. Do governments go ahead and ignore it? Or how to accommodate this disagreement? So finally the document was adopted by the intergovernmental council of the OECD, but in these two very key questions, the role of intermediaries and intellectual property regulations, we have this disagreement. And I think this would be a challenge for the future to work on procedures, how you deal with such disagreements, that you have a certain procedure in place so when governments are facing disagreements from nongovernmental stakeholders that they understand how to handle this. Thirdly, somebody has to make a decision, and not all stakeholders are equal, so on the definition from the WGIG we have this formulation "in their respective roles" certainly the role of government is different from the role of civil society but they have to learn to live together and this has to be also fixed in a certain flexible way in procedures which are not yet on the table. Thank you.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** And to all those in this room I do remember the discussion on procedures can be extremely painful. Remember PrepCom 1 ten years ago. We spent two weeks discussing nothing but procedures and civil society had to knock on the door to be heard. Sebastian in the back of the room.

>> **SEBASTIAN BACHOLLET:** **RESPONSE IN FRENCH**

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you, Sebastian.

(Applause)

>> **FOUAD BAJWA:** Thank you, Markus. Fouad Bajwa from the ISOC chapter for Lahore, Pakistan information. Trust me, we all like our soup that was mentioned and I come from a part of the world where there are a lot of spices but no multistakeholderism. (Chuckles) Together we look at the Internet public policy revolution as collaborative Internet governance today, and we need to break out of our own, sole perception of the multistakeholder model we claim to have developed in recent years. To a great extent, we are defining it for ourselves. And we have to advocate it, beyond just what we all do. To address this, we need to take extensive steps towards evolving multistakeholderism within various other sectors and environments, in other settings. Achieving an equal footing and a stakeholder balance that my colleagues have already

mentioned will continue to remain a major challenge for all of us. Will multistakeholder and multistakeholderism be confined to only to a handful of settings or will we be able to extend it beyond an open-space dialogue without outcomes or in a buffer zone where technical coordination and unilateralism are at two different ends? Where do we go from here? And where do we see multistakeholderism within the next one year? Thank you.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. I have I think two more speakers in the room that put up their hand and then the remote participants and then I would like to take the discussion back to the panel.

>> **PETER BRUCK:** My name is Peter Bruck I'm the chairman of the World Summit Award, and I want to come back to what Bertrand was very succinctly putting to us. Which is: Is there a difference or do we make a difference in terms of governance *of* the Internet to governance *on* the Internet? The World Summit Award started as a follow-on activity to WSIS process 2003 and 2005, and the Internet Society has been very much involved in this. And I recall a discussion I had with Hamadoun Touré when he became secretary-general of the ITU regarding ITU. And he said, "You are with the World Summit Award, looking at the uses of the Internet. And you are *not* in the telecom realm." So what he said is, "You are media and you are not engineering." I think this is something very important to say. There's a freedom of the pipe which is actually, if you want to reduce it, it's the freedom of engineers, where people are building infrastructure. But when you get into governance issues regarding the freedom of citizens, then you are entering a completely different kind of domain. And so what Bertrand was saying is governance for *on* the Internet - what's happening on the Internet - is very much related to the questions of freedom of expression, freedom of opinion, freedom of movement and freedom of activism. And I think that it's very important that that we discuss this here very clearly in terms of the pros and cons. There's a lot to be gained. But there are also dangers ahead if one moves from a governance *of* the Internet to governance *on* the Internet. In terms of what we have experienced with the World Summit Award, it is very clearly that people are willing to talk about e-content and applications when it's coming to innovation but very much less when it comes to depth of content, creation of applications which are challenging, actually, things in the world. So from my point of view the question to this meeting and also to ISOC is, "Do we want to move, and how far do we want to move in terms of the issues of governance *on* the Internet and do we not enter into a different kind of space of power relations where we are having much less control and much less expertise? And what is actually a good way of doing this step-by-step? Thank you very much.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. And the gentleman there. Yes, please.

>> **Audience Member:** Okay. My name is John Pladine (phonetic) from Sweden. My question is for a direct proof of concept for the multistakeholder model. As we know, the international telecoms regulations from 1998 are now about to be updated with intergovernmental talks in December in Dubai. As our role with association to the ITU we can see that our text proposals from certain countries that directly affect the Internet. Wouldn't it be both appropriate and logical that these intergovernmental talks would be open and inclusive as per the multistakeholder model for the Internet at least for those text proposals that directly will affect the Internet in the future? Thank you.

(Applause).

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. The remote question, Raquel.

>>**RAQUEL GATTO:** It's from Anriette from APC and she asked – “The panel has focused on participation in Internet Governance. What about accountability and recourse? Who can a user hold accountable if, for example, they don't have affordable access or freedom of expression?”

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** That you have. We have had a rich discussion and not that much time left and I don't think we can actually answer all of these questions or act on all of the comments. They are many of them are indeed related. But basically I would like to also look forward, how to take it from here, Internet Governance, multistakeholder approach. Well, our Chinese friend started already with making a proposal. So why don't we take it from there and you say what you wanted to say when I rudely interrupted you.

>> **JIANPING WU:** Okay. I just want to say for the multistakeholder model, the Internet industry association may play an important role in the future. In China's situation if something happens on the Internet the government asks ISC first. They ask us to give them suggestions. In other words to do something, give them some suggestions. I think that we have with the dialogue with government. Not just the association. But also we have the industry partners, so many members need to work together. I believe this is good. But not just the internal way to do something. Also to outside. For example, for the - we have the working group, I mean the copyright committee. We also informed the internal - also with the fighting sometimes they have lost sight with something related to China, you can ask us. I think it's a very good model. I suggest even if you have you something happen outside, international, we have to discuss. This is not a good thing - that the Internet Society of China is still not a member of the ISOC right now. This is a big problem for some reason. I hope - we are hoping we can participate in this organization. This is my hope. Thank you.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. Listening to the various comments, we have on the one hand traditional organizations, traditional procedures in place, and they increasingly touch on issues related to the Internet. We discussed that at length in the Working Group on Internet Governance. Whether we want to call it governance *of* or governance *on*, what the Working Group proposed was a very broad-ranging definition of Internet governance that touched on the infrastructure of the Internet but also of the use of the Internet and the abuse of the Internet. And for most these questions related to intellectual property, for instance, to trade there are organizations in place, they have their established procedures, but they don't take into account what happened in 2005 in WSIS when governments agreed that any issue dealing with Internet governance should be dealt with in cooperation with all stakeholders. It's a slight dichotomy we have to live with. But it was a summit. It's not a binding result. It's a declaration of principles. It's a plan of action. It's a Tunis Agenda. These are basically noble principles, but they don't automatically change the world as it is, which does not mean that we should not work towards changing the world as it is and calling for more openness, more open procedures, more involvement of all stakeholders in the existing processes. This is what happened earlier this year in the U.S. with SOPA and PIPA and broader with ACTA, where Internet users stood up and started to protest. Internet users basically don't want governments to decide anything that affects the Internet without their having their say. I think it was a very encouraging movement, and governments have started listening. So this is basically the question: How do we want to move on? Lesley I'm turning to you. I was at a meeting in London where you coined the phrase Internet Governance 2.0. I think that may be a good start to take us further.

>> **LESLEY COWLEY:** That was my coming plan for world domination that you just revealed to everybody. Yes, I guess for me the place where that phrase came from is about this experimentation thing I touched on earlier. This is the model, but as the Internet has grown and as we have worked together, increasingly, you know, we need to get onto newer versions and upgrades and so on. So maybe to respond to Eric's point and Bill and several others, for me, the 2.0 of Internet governance is really about getting people into this discussion. And also old-timers being very welcoming to new people in these discussions, too, because there's going to be many more participants who really – we'd better not speak in acronyms, too. But I think key in model 2.0 for me is about sharing information, sharing new perspectives, and people listening to those perspectives. And as a result, really developing a better understanding in order to inform policy. So sometimes the arguments about procedures, et cetera, are really not a positive contribution to that model. And I think really we need to demonstrate the value of this model further and better than we do. So I like the ISOC Lebanon idea about case studies that actually really demonstrate the value of being here, the value of listening and developing understanding so as to get better policy whether it be better national policy or global policy. That would be Internet 2.0 for me.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you for that. Virat, please.

>> **VIRAT BHATIA:** Specifically to the question on how we get this multistakeholder group going: In India, the approach - I know the French-speaking gentleman spoke about that in telecom the roaming rates are high, but I would argue that the approach that we had has actually delivered outstandingly where access is concerned in mobile telephony. But clearly we have not had nearly that success in Internet so one of the routes that we are using, just to specifically put a plan on the desk here, is to let the industry associations lead this discussion with the multistakeholders to begin with, because they seem to have a higher level of credibility with civil society, governments - who we work naturally with - our members, which are ISPs and mobile operators, and India telecom mobile operators will have a significant role in delivering broadband wireless, it's not going to get delivered the way it got delivered in the West, with fixed-line, and so they are a big part of this discussion - as you know we have a very vibrant content industry, IT, this is very strong, so we're beginning at the industry association and bringing the groups together. The first meeting that we called the industry association - my colleague is here somewhere - we didn't even have addresses, e-mails of people to invite to the meeting, because that's not the normal mandate so we are actually jumping into new waters and trying to get civil society in, and we were quite pleased to see that they were trusting of us and they were willing to come to the desk and have this discussion. So that's the model that we are building and the plan for this year is also to sign an MOU actually with ISOC. We'll end this panel and get out and start discussing the MOU with Vicki hopefully to get more international engagement on international practices. The thing that's working with the government or we hope will work with the government in India is that the younger ministers are less worried about what Internet can do. In fact they have incentives in having it grow because they're using it for getting re-elected, creating jobs - as somebody spoke this morning about more jobs being created. So we're actually hoping to create incentives for politicians - even if they're narrow incentives - for them to get into the game and start having this discussion in good faith. Industry for example, business case doesn't work in India. It works perfectly well in telecom, not in Internet. So they need to get in front of the government. The laws need to be discussed. We are a terrorist-prone country, we've had various issues in transport of calls and Internet access and

so the laws and the secrecy and the privacy issues have to be discussed. I'm sure you're aware of Shashi Tharoor, he ran for the UN secretary-general, he works with social media, on the Internet has over a million followers and Twitters and he's sort of bringing it out there sort of symbolic of people that are using it successfully, internationally successful. That's the kind of environment we're trying to create. It's a tough one. The decision-making is far more difficult when you have so many voices, but that we are used to as a democracy, as a very noisy, very noisy democracy. I have to end by saying that the recent year has been more difficult there have been more exposés thanks to Internet. The Arab Spring has had the governments worried - not in India so much but I think the overall influence of: Where this is going, what does it mean? But we are hoping to use the industry forum to bring everybody together and slowly move it into the point that - how deep is the commitment? I can tell you that it's not as deep as it should be but we are hoping that over the next two years there will be real discussion and engagement on some of these substantive issues because without a truly multistakeholder discussion at least you know where 1.2 billion India is concerned there's no way we can move this one forward even half an inch.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Carlos, please.

>> **CARLOS RAUL GUITERREZ:** Yes, in terms of looking forward I propose to benchmark it, measure it. Who participates from the users, from the companies, from the governments, how many people participate and what do they produce? I wouldn't dare to ask Markus what the participation was in the last quarterly voting in Switzerland. But this is what we need to do and I think the ISOC chapters are best suited to start measuring and the next time we meet we'll have some benchmarking of how is it working?

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Switzerland is an interesting example. We have very participatory democracy but not everybody takes part. But they have the right to take part. They have also the right to abstain if they are not interested in an issue. But Raul you wanted to comment.

>> **RAUL ECHEBERRIA:** Yes, thank you, Markus. I think that the multistakeholder model is something that will be very difficult to stop in the future. And I think that multistakeholder approaches will be adopted in many areas, much more than just Internet. This is one of the questions that were phrased: What was the scope of the application of the multistakeholder model? I think we cannot decide the scope. It will be decided by the people. But I see that there is much progress in this area that are very close of Internet matters and other areas that are far away from Internet issues. This doesn't mean that there will not be obstacles in the future, and we will make progress and we will go back many times. Of course the current model is not a perfect model. As Avri and Bill suggested, there are forums in which some people are more equal than others. That's true. So we have to work on that every day. Some examples have been mentioned, like the ITU. I think the ITU has to change, and many other intergovernmental organizations. ITU has 700 members from the private sector. And it is very few. LACNIC, only a regional organization, has more than 2,500 members. Many people are not able to give their voice to some forums. They need to implement changes. We have to provide new ways of hearing and giving the opportunity to these people to influence the processes. It will happen in one year, two years? I don't think so. I think it will take more time. But I think at some point it will happen. One important thing is that all the people that are involved with monitoring organizations or forums have to be very proactive in engaging other stakeholders it's not enough to just provide a good model and a perfect policy development process that is open to the participation of everybody if the stakeholders don't come to participate. So we have to be

very active in engaging the people and try to understand what their expectations are as to how to think, their expectations, and how to accommodate the process also for permitting broader participation. So summarizing, I think that a multistakeholder model is something that came to stay and will remain here, and we will see in the near future more organizations and forums implementing multistakeholder approaches. Aisha mentioned something important. Many people are just realizing that nobody has the monopoly on wisdom. Governments are very open themselves in some cases to engage people from the private sector or different sectors - civil society and some specific sectors depending on the area - in order to deal better with the broad agenda they are facing. So governments have to participate in many forums. Those forums around the world in different areas, they need collaboration from stakeholders that are outside of the government. So I am very optimistic in the sense that the multistakeholder model is something that will be applied in many forums and many different areas besides those that we know today. There will be obstacles. We have to face the obstacles and to work in order to skip them but I think the future is good in that sense.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you very much, Raul. Governments are an important stakeholder.

>> **HEATHER DRYDEN:** Thank you. I've jotted down I think a few notes from the discussion, so I'll share some thoughts that occurred to me as a result of that. Regarding what approach is best suited to deal with a particular problem, it occurs to me that this is how governments pursue finding solutions. The challenge is to balance competing interests, to ensure things like operational effectiveness or allow for that to happen and to have as a result the best decisions possible. And so this is really how governments, I think, try to tackle the problem of choosing a particular model or approach. The question around multistakeholderism is really a good one because there has to be a limit to how far you can stretch the meaning of multistakeholderism in different organizations without rendering the word as having little value. So what are those features that are really at the core of this concept of multistakeholderism? At the beginning of the discussion I heard a greater emphasis on two divides, two tracks. So whether that's different organizations, whether it's different parts within a single government, or two philosophical approaches to looking at things, I think what we're coming to is a recognition that while there may be a duality that these dualities do not exist in complete isolation. I think I'm also hearing that we think that the Internet governance perspective based on the multistakeholder principle is more likely or more likely to need to influence other approaches rather than the opposite of that. And the risks are that we're mistaken, in fact. But when all is said and done, governments are equally committed to various models, for example they may be equally committed to ICANN and the ITU, for example, and so we need to think about that and really how that plays out in the future. But with this evolution, this ongoing evolution, and the successes we have talked about, like increasing participation from various parts of the world and an increase in terms of number, interest, capacity to participate, we have created some new challenges for ourselves. But that's okay because, in fact, we can find ways to organize regionally or locally. Many of us have talked about the successes of the regional Internet Governance Forums, well why did they resonate so well? Because people think that they have greater influence or a stronger voice by being active locally and *also* being able to impact things at a global level. When all is said and done, I think it's useful for us to keep Internet users at the center of all we do. Thank you.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you very much. Nii, would you like to say something?

>> **NII QUAYNOR:** I would like to make the following observations: I think the concept of experiments is not considered favorable from my region because we are trying to play catch-up,

so don't change the experiment, don't move the bar. The more we keep things stable, the faster we can maybe connect with the rest of the world. And so we would like to take a somewhat different view of that. I would also to associate myself with the view expressed by Aisha that it's becoming difficult to expect one stakeholder group to have the expertise, the knowledge that is required to deal with such an interconnected set of issues that we are handling, and I think governments in my environment are beginning to appreciate that and trying to exploit the multistakeholder approach. I think in any restriction or any suggestion of an approach that takes away from the openness and free flow of knowledge and so on will be detrimental to Africa's efforts. And we will not take it too lightly. Regarding 2.0, I think we should move away a little bit from the center and let's go to the edges. I believe it is local policies, largely, that affect access, that affect the community, the building of the capacity to support the access that is to come. So finding out the right policies that increase investment, that grow the community and make the community strong is really where we ought to be going. And we should be looking for more concrete things. I don't think the abstract things help if people are trying to play catch-up. So we should be looking for things like how do I as a nation do or how do I engage the rest of the developing countries to help and engage with open data so we know how to account for housing, population, whatever. I think that's what will help my community be engaged in the process.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** As I heard someone once say, good Internet governance begins at home. Avri.

>> **AVRI DORIA:** Thank you. Actually I really very much enjoyed many of the comments that were given. Some of the ones that especially rang with me were looking for levels of commitment to multistakeholder. And when I heard that, I also started wondering about the sincerity of the commitment to a multistakeholder model. And by the way I stay away from multistakeholderism because I start to think that that's a thing that's already cooked, known, understood and over with, so I tend to think of a model that is still being learned, still evolving. When I look at the sincerity of commitment one of the things for example that ICANN taught me is that all of these organizations, all of these associations, we have both the good actors and the bad actors. And that's a notion that I've started bringing to Internet governance to the governments the civil society, the private sector. Which are us are good actors? Which of us are bad actors? Which of us are actually working to further the model whereas which of us are working to stymie the model and hold it back? And that's one of the questions. I'm not about to sit here and point fingers. Maybe later over a beer I would do that, but certainly not sitting here. But that's certainly something that we have to look at when we are looking at getting together in a room saying we participate openly and we participate as peers. How many of us are really doing it sincerely? How many of us have intention of forwarding, of moving this model forward? When I look at the question of where do we go, where do we take the multistakeholder model and - taking the view that I've got that we're just at the beginning of it - I would go and say we have to bring this model to every single one of the governance functions that does not already use it. I get a little worried when I hear of let us lead the effort and we'll include you all. ICANN was a private sector-led effort and it's lately become a multistakeholder model-effort. But it's still really a private sector-led and getting beyond that to a full peerage notion is very difficult to do. So when we talk about enhanced cooperation - and enhanced cooperation is the moving beyond the talking that we do in the IGF to actually the deciding and doing - that needs to become a multistakeholder process. It isn't yet. It's still seen as between government and those doing governance. Well those doing governance is all of us. So I think of moving forward in

terms of moving forward to where we get to the point where governance that is not multistakeholder is *not* seen as legitimate. Now, Anriette asks a really good question which is who is accountable and I think it's anyone who presumes to sit in this room so open our mouths to participate in the ICANNs in ISOCs in IETFs perhaps in ITU if it becomes multistakeholder, that we are the ones that become accountable by sitting here and talking, by sitting here and making decisions. And it remaining open and having remote moderators who constantly bring in the voice of the user who is not there and say: "But wait a second. You're not taking into account my needs. You're not taking into account my realities." So I think it's us that has to remain accountable. And that's pretty much it.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you for this. We have set out to make quite a number of elaborate questions. But the discussion took off and we had to create interaction also with the floor. But I think one question I would like to pose to the panel: What is the best approach to promote a multistakeholder approach? Like Avri I prefer not using the word multistakeholderism, it sounds to abstract for me. But how to promote this approach? And one of the questions coming from the remote participants: actually has it an economic impact? I think that is a very good question. My answer - my gut reaction to that would be yes because it helps you take the better decisions and I think there are also examples and well, I'm turning to you again Lesley; the UK is proud to be I think the fastest growing e-commerce market and what factors are behind this?

>> **LESLEY COWLEY:** Thank you. Of course as soon as we say that and feel very proud of that achievement somebody else will overtake us. So Markus is referring to a report a couple of years ago I think from Boston Consulting Group which identified the UK's Internet sector as having a very high GDP and per capita. It was higher than anyone else and I suspect we'll lose that position rapidly I'm sure. But in the UK the Internet sector accounts for 7.2% of GDP which is actually higher than the utility sector, the construction sector and so on, which is just incredible I think from my perspective. And so if I can kind of locate that back to multistakeholderism or multistakeholder model - I do apologize I get a bad actor label now - for us in the UK they're very much seeing a self-regulatory, light touch regulation model as one of the key conditions that has enabled that growth. So in terms of a case study, having a distinct *lack* of regulation in this area, having a distinct *lack* of legislation that generally tends not to address the issue it's trying to address has been absolutely key to that result and also the multistakeholder model. So bringing those two things together, for me I think it's about policymakers who are trying to make good policy. They are trying to make good policy that benefits end users, businesses and others so that they can have economic success, particularly in the current environment. And if we can really build on that good intent and work together then I think we have some optimism, some opportunity there. But I'm going to be totally realistic, as well. So I think that there's a danger. You know, some people think we're [people who advocate the multistakeholder model] all kind of *not* in the real world. And there does need to be a bit of real-world cynicism here. Over the next three to five years this model is going to be sorely tested and it very much needs to demonstrate its value, both nationally and globally. There are some really difficult policy decisions to be made. And all of the easy policy decisions were done quite some time ago. So therefore, there will be a need for compromise. There will be a need for people to be heard but accept that your view may not actually to be able to be followed and that's going to be a test of the model.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. Can we have a very quick last round of sort of 30 seconds each of a concluding statement, please?

>> **VIRAT BHATIA:** On this issue we believe, and I think I speak for some of our friends from Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Nepal and Bangladesh who are here. I think engaging the governments at this stage is very crucial for us. The large-scale investment that's required in basic infrastructure is not coming from the private sector where broadband Internet is concerned, it's done with the telecommunications piece, they will probably do the last mile as wireless broadband. I think at least of the 4.5 billion unconnected the next 2.5 to 3 require *very* serious engagement of the government. What we are trying to attempt is to provide a platform where they all come and have a discussion. We don't believe any one person owns that. We need the activists there. We need the NGOs there. We need the lawyers, the government, but we believe that the government really needs to. And the fact that large numbers of government representatives are not here in this meeting today or in the room next door I think is a challenge. But we are hoping that more of them will get into these discussions because without them connecting the next 3 billion is very tough.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Carlos is one of the persons who will go to the room next door [to the ITU later in the week] to the other meetings. You can take the message across. Please, your thoughts.

>> **CARLOS RAUL GUITERREZ:** I just hope over the years when we see the multistakeholder model working, we can recognize it. It's still too fluffy.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** That's a good point.

>> **RAUL ECHEBERRIA:** I think that the way to promote the multistakeholder model is just building successful cases, taking advantage of any opportunity to participate constructively, making the effort to understand each other as to how to engage each other in productive cooperative work and discussions. Basically it is this. Thank you.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. Heather, nothing to say? No? Nii.

>> **NII QUAYNOR:** Yeah, I think we need to get people to practice it. Because it's not something you read and immediately can imagine. So every opportunity to make different people think about a problem should be encouraged. So it's education.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Thank you. You have the last 30 seconds.

>> **WU:** Yeah, I want to say, a good Internet global governance will influence roles in the next 20 years.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** Avri.

>> **AVRI DORIA:** Yeah, thank you, I think that we have to keep striving. We have to keep as it were knocking or perhaps pounding on all of those doors to make sure that - I'm sure the word multistakeholder will remain whether it's the just something that's paid lip service to or whether it's real is up to us to make sure that it happens.

>> **MARKUS KUMMER:** That was a nice link to the introduction. Pounding on the doors - that's where we started ten years ago, and I think we have made progress since, the stakeholders are in the room now. Well, I think we are just about to conclude the session. I think it was a great

panel. And I would like to thank all of the panelists. And thank you on the floor participating. My conclusion is that the multistakeholder model is here to stay. We go with the tide of history. And governments will have to adapt and to talk to other stakeholders. It helps them make better decisions. We are not there yet. It's by no means perfect. But I think, I've felt the sense there's an energy in the room to work to improve the model as we go along to reach Internet Governance 2.0. With that, I would like to thank you, all.

(Applause)